

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, April 25th, 1972

(The House met at 2:30 pm.)

PRAYERS

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 53

The Federal-Provincial Farm Assistance Amendment Act, 1972

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill being Bill No. 53, The Federal-Provincial Farm Assistance Amendment Act, 1972. As a brief explanation, Mr. Speaker, the present bill allows the province to enter into agreements in the agricultural field in relation to a number of areas -- farm credit, crop insurance, rural development, farm or land use. This will extend this to the question of farm manpower and is essential if we are going to develop programs related to the farm manpower field.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 53 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 66 The Highway Traffic Amendment Act, 1972

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill called The Highway Traffic Amendment Act. There are quite some significant changes in this act. One refers to the policy governing the health certificate, of senior citizens over the age of 70. This is a change of policy from the former regulations where a senior citizen was also required to have a driver test. It also deals with the operation of bicycles and equipment on bicycles on the highway requiring safety factors, such as reflectors, lights at night, and riding on the right-hand side of the road. It also deals with repairs to vehicles which are brought into body shops and the owner of the body shop has a responsibility of reporting small infractions of damage, such as bullet holes, etc., to the police. In other words, it has to have a sticker. It also involves speed limit setting in rural municipalities. This would enable cities like Calgary and Edmonton to set speed limits which they felt were safe in the operation of the traffic within their bounds. It also deals with setting speed limits in regard to trailer parks as well.

The amendments also in this act deal with The Possessory Liens Act. This is streamlining this particular procedure, as in the past it has been cumbersome to administer, and quite costly, so the amendments that we have brought in will help speed up the administration of this particular part of the act. It also deals with the aeroplane speed checkmarks that are on the highway. In the past, every time an officer was to prosecute, he had to be accompanied by the surveyor to chain out the distances of the speed check. This won't be required now under the amendments brought into

36-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

this act. It gives the municipalities the right to establish speed limits -- I've already mentioned that -- and further it has a section which is a regulation on the trailer park sites on camp grounds. In the past, some of the citizens have abused the rights of campsites by parking their trailer in a particular favorite spot at this time of the year, and leaving them there until the fall, denying the use of the campsite to other citizens throughout the year by using it almost as a permanent parking area. This will be governed and controlled under the amendments in this act.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 60 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 61 The Social Development Amendment Act, 1972

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 61, being The Social Development Amendment Act, 1972. Mr. Speaker, there are four amendments proposed to the act, all of them important and two of them would be considered to be of substantial importance.

The first one is the consolidation of the reference to the word 'dependent' in the act, and provides a correction, in a sense, to the way the act was previously drawn, in that 'dependent' was used only in one section and now the definition applies throughout the act. As well, the definition will expand to include a child who is over the age of 16, but who is not attending school and who is unemployable. By allowing that the allowance be paid without the older child living on his own, it will enable family units to be kept together in such cases, or more likely to be kept together.

Section eight will be amended. Where parents of children are unable or unwilling to care properly for their children and the children are being cared for in the home of another person, this slight amendment will allow that the social allowance may be paid to that other person, or indeed, to an institution, if that's where the child is.

The last two proposed amendments are substantial, Mr. Speaker. The establishment of definite guidelines with respect to disclosure of confidential information is a matter of great importance. In this act, these guidelines will be similar to those in The Child Welfare Act, which deals with the intimate circumstances of children and their parents. The proposed control sets out those persons and authorities to whom disclosure of information may be made in the administration of the act. Otherwise confidential information may be disclosed only upon the written consent of the minister or an authorized official responsible for the administration of the act.

Mr. Speaker, the last amendment relates to the voucher system. It is proposed that the act be amended to provide for a system of issuing social allowance cheques through regional offices. Although a large portion of social allowance payments are issued on a payroll basis through the data centre, this may only be done where the circumstances of the recipient have become stabilized. Where a person initially applies for assistance, there is a period of adjustment. Usually the person has an immediate need that cannot be met by the payroll system. Therefore, there will be flexibility until a monthly amount of assistance can be paid. It is now necessary to provide social assistance by means of voucher authorization and submission of accounts. This is the system that, through this amendment in due course, will bring about a change in the existing voucher system.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 61 was introduced and read a first time.]

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-3

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure for me to introduce to you and to the members of this Assembly students from the Rose constituency of Camrose. Today we have 33 students from the Camrose Composite and their teacher, Mr. Bob McLean. These students are seated in the members' gallery, and I would ask that they stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I have the very distinct pleasure today of introducing to you and through you to this House, 55 Grade IV and V students and their teacher, Mrs. Wygera, from the Fulton Place School in the Edmonton Gold Bar constituency. They are seated in the members' gallery, and I would ask them to stand and have their presence acknowledged by the House.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in introducing to you and to the hon. members of the Legislature a prominent lawyer and solicitor from the city of Drumheller, Mr. Robert Ross. Mr. Ross is seated in your gallery, and I would ask him now to rise and be recognized.

MR. J. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly 30 Grade VIII students from Lloydminster Junior High School, accompanied by a staff member, Mr. Ken Tradewell and his wife, Mrs. Tradewell, and also six Grade VIII students from St. Mary's Junior High School, and their principal, Mr. George Bunz. These students are also accompanied by Mayor Hudson of Lloydminster, and Mr. and Mrs. Art Shortell. Mr. Shortell is president of CKSA Radio and TV, who are sponsoring this tour as a CKSA adventure in citizenship. They are seated in the public gallery, and I would ask that they stand and be recognized.

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, as the House is aware, the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce is organizing economic advisory committees throughout the province. Presently they are organized in Medicine Hat and Lethbridge with plans for Calgary, Red Deer and Edmonton. Just two weeks ago he organized a Northwest Economic Advisory Committee at Grande Prairie. The chairman of this committee is Mr. Fred Tissington, who is in the Speaker's gallery today. I would like to ask him to rise and be recognized.

TABLING REPORTS AND FILING RETURNS

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to file copies of a Return ordered by the House which was originally Question No. 159, but I think last Thursday it was ordered to be made a Return by the House.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to file a Return which has been ordered by the House.

36-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Senior Citizens' Housing

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Mr. Minister, the opinion is frequently heard that senior citizens could obtain rental accommodation more quickly at rents within their means if they were given ready access to small public housing suites. Does the government recognize that your present policy of building senior citizens' homes on a cash-to-mortgage plan denies federal matching grants to the province and results in rents far higher than many senior citizens can afford?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter about which we have been very concerned for some time -- the great differences in what would appear to be otherwise equal accommodation because of the different efforts of financing. The Alberta Housing Corporation and other members of government staff are presently undertaking a review of the entire approach and philosophy of the rents and their scales that are charged for senior citizens, and also the matter of the policy of perhaps trying to bring more of our senior citizens' accommodation into the public housing sector where the rental scales are so very much more attractive.

MR. FARRAN:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is there any legal barrier to the public housing approach for senior citizen accommodation? I understand it is practised in Manitoba and Ontario.

MR. RUSSELL:

Not as far as I am aware, Mr. Speaker. I know the Ontario Housing Corporation has used that technique to very great advantage. Many of their public housing schemes include in the development a high-rise along with row housing and town housing, the high-rise being set aside specifically for senior citizens. And this has two advantages. It increases the units per acre insofar as the density is concerned and gets a more attractive return. It also makes the public housing units available at the lower rental scales in a subsidized manner for our senior citizens. The particular scheme has a great deal of merit.

MR. FARRAN:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. There were reports that the Edmonton Housing Authority and the Calgary Housing Authority, for some reason, didn't want to build small bachelor-type suites. They were concentrating on building two- and three-bedroom suites, and had some sort of a policy objection, anyway, last year, to the building of such suites for senior citizens. Is this so?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of the specific guidelines individual housing authorities are adopting in their construction of housing units. I am aware that the high vacancy factors or rates are occurring in areas or in classifications of the three- and four-bedroom suites, and the long waiting lists appear to be for bachelor and one-bedroom units. Kiwanis Place which just opened here two weeks ago in the City of Edmonton, I understand, with its bachelor units and one-bedroom units, is proving to be extremely popular.

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-5

MR. DIXON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, regarding housing, to the hon. minister. Is there any co-ordination between the Social Development Department and your department regarding the need of housing for some of our welfare recipients? Taking into fact the recent report that you gave us Mr. Minister, there are almost 200 vacancies at the present time under Alberta Housing, and I was wondering if these are made known to other departments such as Social Development, because there are many people in our cities who are on welfare who are paying quite high rent. It would probably save considerable money for the government if they could be put in this type of unit.

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, there was direct co-ordination in two areas I can think of immediately. The Alberta Housing Corporation was building until it was asked to cease to do so, some time ago, a program of housing units called welfare housing -- not building, but acquiring older homes in which welfare recipients were housed on a rental basis. The other tie-in is in attempting to get a certain low percentage of public housing units accommodated by families receiving welfare. You can appreciate that for a number of obvious reasons you wouldn't want to have an entire public housing development filled with welfare recipients, but there is an attempt to get somewhere in the neighbourhood of 5 per cent to 10 per cent of the units occupied that way.

MR. WILSON:

To the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Was the change in policy regarding the acquisition of used housing economic or social?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I don't really know the answer to that. It happened some time ago, and I understand it happened at the request of the Department of Health and Social Development prior to August 30th, if that is what you are wondering.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vegreville followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West and the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview and the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo.

Proposed Extension of Trapping Season

MR. BATIUK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Over the last couple of days several constituents have inquired of me whether there would be a possibility of extending the deadline for trapping, which is April 30th. Because of the severity of this winter and the cold spring they stated that trapping was hampered to a great extent and also that there is no sign of any deterioration of the pelts. They were wondering whether you would consider extending the trapping season at least a week longer.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, that is a very good question and it has come forward to me from some different areas of Alberta as well as in the Vegreville area. I think it's fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that one of the advantages of an extended winter is that the value of the pelts is high for a longer period of time. In recognition, we have this under consideration now and expect to make a decision momentarily so

36-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

as to not inconvenience any of the trappers who would be wondering whether they will be at the end of the trapping season at the end of April.

MR. BATIUK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would you be able, within the next day or two, to notify the public of your decision, because this week is the deadline and this would have to be done at least a few days in advance, or very soon?

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we'd make that response immediate once it has been fully considered.

Boating Regulations on Lakes

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. What, if any, consideration are you giving to either expanding the facilities of Park Lake - that's a small provincial park just north of Lethbridge - or in the interests of public safety are you prepared to recommend and hopefully enforce some safety regulations? In particular I refer to the use of motorboats on that very small lake. It would appear that some regulations may be advisable as to the maximum size of boats, or maybe even the number of them, keeping in mind the size of the lake and the overcrowding that occurs in that park.

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there certainly is a very great need for some small boat regulations in order to enhance the safety of the people who are using water for other reasons. I might say Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. Member for Lethbridge West for giving me notice on this question, and I'm sure you note that this is a question that you yourself asked me privately a couple of weeks ago.

The regulations that control boating are under federal jurisdiction -- The Canada Shipping Act controlled by the Small Vessels regulations that are pursuant to that Canada Shipping Act. Some time prior to the change in government there had been pursuit on the part of the provincial government to try and get a proper set of regulations within the federal jurisdiction under the Small Vessels regulations to cover the problem of motorboat limitations endangering safety on small water bodies in the province. We have made a renewed effort on this and have had an affirmative response that probably we can look for action on these regulations, and I got that response very recently, Mr. Speaker. So I'm optimistic that we can do this. To reiterate the importance of this question I would point out that even in the roped-off areas within provincial parks to protect small children, the roping-off that we do is actually illegal. So there is a desperate need for these kinds of regulations in order to enhance safety and still use the small bodies of water in an attractive and multi-use way. I appreciate the question.

MR. BUCKWELL:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. minister consider taking over Keho Lake Park to relieve the congestion?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I don't understand that that's a supplementary. I was talking about the motorboat regulations, perhaps that's what you are talking about too.

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-7

MR. MOORE:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Does the province not have authority on bodies of water that are wholly-contained within the province in respect to regulating motorboats?

DR. WARRACK:

Not respecting the controlling of boating of any size from the very largest to the very, very smallest boat that could be used on water bodies in Alberta. We do not have that control; this is under federal jurisdiction, The Canada Shipping Act and the Small Vessels regulations pursuant to that. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that we have prepared a set of provincial regulations that we would use if we can get the authority from federal jurisdiction. We have that prepared in advance.

Mineral Tax Assessment Plan

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. Can the hon. minister advise the House whether or not a further Position Paper will be tabled advising the House as to the mechanics and the details of the proposed mineral tax assessment plan?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question I would have to say, no. I might also say that I could foresee, Mr. Speaker, a series of questions dealing with the position paper filed by the government on its Tentative Natural Resource Revenue Plan. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion it would not be proper parliamentary practice to deal with a series of questions during the daily question period. I can appreciate that some of the hon. members may have questions of clarification dealing with the position paper. I have given this a great deal of thought as to how we might accommodate them -- I did think that perhaps we could deal with it when we filed the proposed bills dealing with the amendments to The Mineral Taxation Act or The Mines and Minerals Act.

However, I think that might not be quite soon enough so I have thought about an alternative and that would be to deal with the questions during the estimates of the Department of Mines and Minerals. With that in mind I did discuss the question with the Government House Leader and asked him if he could bring forth the estimates right after the estimates have been dealt with by the Attorney General's department and Health and Social Development. So I would suggest to hon. members that if they have questions for clarification on the Government's Position Paper if they could bring the questions forth at that time we would be glad to accommodate them.

MR. NOTLEY:

This is a supplementary question, perhaps to the hon. Government House Leader. In view of the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals' answer, are you in a position to advise the House, sir, that the next order after the Attorney General Department's estimates will be, in fact, the Mines and Minerals Department?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is intended that the government will bring forward, after consideration of the estimates of the Department of

36-8

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

the Attorney General which will be coming up after completion of Industry and Commerce -- hopefully today -- the Department of Health and Social Development, and then immediately following the conclusion of consideration of estimates of the Department of Health and Social Development, we would go to the Department of Mines and Minerals.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. Has the hon. minister decided whether he is able to make available to the members, particularly on this side of the House, copies of The Mineral Assessment Act within the next few days?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I have also given that some thought and I think the hon. member is referring to The Mineral Taxation Act. It is proposed that we do bring in a bill dealing with proposed amendments to The Mineral Taxation Act. Those amendments will be quite extensive. I would like to suggest that, at that time, we will arrange for additional printing of that bill, and that will be distributed rather than have the existing Mineral Taxation Act distributed.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, would that give people the necessary information who are reading the act along with the position paper?

MR. DICKIE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I had that in mind when the hon. member raised the question and I felt to give them the existing act without the changes wouldn't give them the information they require. And it was for that reason, when we were discussing bringing in the proposed amendments to The Mineral Taxation Act, we felt that this would give them the information required. I might also say, to accommodate the hon. member, we did meet with the Legislative Counsel this morning; we did ask him how soon we could have that at the printers and into the hands of the hon. members. He assured me he would give us excellent co-operation on that and is doing his best to expedite that as quickly as possible.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, followed by the hon. Member for Innisfail and the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight, and then the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Miles For Millions Safety Regulations

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Highways and it rises out of the fact that on May 11th the annual march of Calgarians, known as the Miles for Millions, will take place. This year for the first time, Mr. Minister, there will be a 64 mile bike-a-thon -- a portion of which will take place on Highway No. 2 south of Calgary. It appears that over 20,000 Calgarians will either be walking or riding their bikes in the name of international aid. My question arises out of the concern of many Calgarians with respect to the safety of the cyclists that will be using this highway and I am wondering whether or not your department has addressed its thoughts to that problem and whether you are doing anything from the point of view of protecting the safety of those involved in this worthwhile venture?

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-9

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, when we learned of the program that was being initiated for the walk -- or the bike-a-thon -- we were concerned because it involves a very busy thoroughfare on No. 2 Highway south of Calgary as well as No. 2A Highway south of Calgary to High River, which is a very narrow thoroughfare. We are led to believe that it will be adequately patrolled by the police and we hope in future that perhaps the people that are setting out these walk-a-thons will maybe choose routes that are not quite as heavily travelled as this particular one is.

We hope that there will be no accidents to the young people who are taking part in these walk-a-thons.

MR. SHITTER:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would it be possible to reduce the speed limit on that highway during the course of the bike-a-thon, or in the alternative, at least to place signs on the access roads to ensure that people will be aware of the fact that the highways will be crowded with bicycles?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we'll try to have signs, and certainly with the assurance of the Mounted Police the speed limits will be reduced and we hope that it will be adequate this time.

Grain Elevators

MR. DOAN:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. In view of the threat to the assessment base of small towns caused by the over-generous economic obsolescence allowed to country elevators, what does the government intend to do to rectify the situation?

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. members who have small towns, hamlets, or villages with a fair number of grain elevators have caught the import of the question that the hon. Member for Innisfail just asked. We were extremely disturbed by a decision made during the past few months by the Assessment Appeal Board with respect to the obsolescence factor allowed grain elevators in a certain area in the province. We've had a number of meetings on the matter, and also referred it to our government task force. It's our intention to bring in legislation which we hope will not allow that kind of thing to happen again.

Land Reclamation

MR. LEE:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, Dr. Warrack. Has any action been taken by your department in the matter of Alberta Gypsum Ltd.'s clean-up and reclamation of an access road in the lower Kananaskis Lake area? You may recall that this is the matter which was brought to public attention about a year and a half ago when Mr. Lougheed and Mr. Copithorne visited that particular area. You may also recall that those were the days when we had a highly alert and extremely energetic opposition.

36-10

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Lands and Forests has taken action on this matter, and this matter is not a laughing matter at all.

This is one of the unattended problems left for at least a year and a half beyond the date when action to be taken was obviously necessary, and we have issued an order that the clean-up be undertaken by the company in that particular case and completed by July 15th, 1972. This action has been taken, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DIXON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. What action does the government plan to take if the company does not go ahead with the clean-up campaign. Are you going to close the operation down?

MR. SPEAKER:

That is a hypothetical question. The event has not occurred.

DR. WARRACK:

Please let me answer it!

The clean-up in question has to do with a roadway -- it has to do with a roadway that was part of a licence of occupation that was issued around mid-1968 along with the accompanying quarrying lease as well. The subsequent actions in this regard did not follow the approved plan in terms of the Department of Lands and Forests, and also a very small deposit or bond was made in terms of any penalty if the proper actions were not taken, and proper reclamation did not occur. The leases and licences of occupation were cancelled about the end of 1968, excuse me -- about the end of 1970, and there has been no further action taken at all in terms of the reclamation.

The reclamation is estimated by the department to cost \$6,000 to \$10,000 if this reclamation is not undertaken by the company. We have checked with them, and the answer is that the company is a solvent company. If the action is not taken to reclaim this area, then we'll have to undertake it as a government.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, the fact that it wasn't a hypothetical question is one of the reasons I asked the question. I wondered whether the company was solvent and the hon. minister has answered my question.

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe the hon. Member for Calgary Bow was next on the list.

Metric System for Canada

MR. WILSON:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. In your government-to-government negotiations, has the federal government advised you of their intentions on the adoption of the metric system for all of Canada?

MR. GETTY:

No, Mr. Speaker.

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-11

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. minister advise us what the position of the Lougheed government is on the metric system?

MR. GETTY:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. minister aware that some North American companies are now changing over, and in fact are using the metric system?

MR. GETTY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Inasmuch as the United States is currently preparing for a change-over to the metric system, is it the opinion of this government that Canada and Alberta can logically abstain?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member is not really trying to seek an opinion. However, I am not certain either that his argument is correct that the --

MR. WILSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. minister repeat his opening remarks? I detected that he impugned motives.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, if I did, I can't imagine what they would be. Mr. Speaker, the argument that the United States is shifting or about to shift I don't accept. I am not sure if the hon. member has any other questions along this line.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, could the hon. minister advise us if the Lougheed government is, in fact, giving any cognizance to the changes going on in regard to the metric system and when we might expect to know what their position is on this issue?

MR. GETTY:

That is a different question, and the answer is yes, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, it may be helpful for the hon. member if our Minister of the Environment gives you some information regarding some of the work that he has been involved in.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I would be very pleased to. Several years ago the federal government of Canada adopted as a policy matter, the possibility that Canada would revert to the metric system, and has, as a matter of fact, set up a fairly substantial committee to investigate all aspects of possible conversion to the metric system. If my memory doesn't fail me -- and I don't believe it does in this particular instance -- the Alberta Research Council has representation on this federal committee. We, of course, in our meetings with the Alberta Research Council being on that board, discussed and will be giving some very serious consideration to

36-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

expanding the Alberta role in this regard. What we would really want to know as a government is, if Canada decided to adopt the system -- and I want to suggest that there are many companies in Canada using the metric system as well as some of the government organizations like Atomic Energy of Canada -- and if, in fact, we did move in this direction as a country, we would like to know at the earliest possible time what the effect would be on Alberta, because of the fact that in the energy industry, for example, all the units used are the British units and there would be some major difficulty in conversion, particularly if it was done over a short-term base. I want to suggest to the hon. member that we are cognizant of what is going on in this regard in Canada. We, of course, are interested as to how it might affect Alberta. We have representation on the federal committee and we will be giving, and are giving at this present time, serious consideration to increasing the Alberta examination of this particular aspect.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood followed by the hon. Member for Vegreville and the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury. I find that if you have more than four in a row, the last ones tend to be forgotten.

Alberta Strikes

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. How many strikes is the Alberta economy burdened with at the moment?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, the question was, "How many strikes is the province burdened with at the moment?" The answer is that there are no strikes in Alberta at the present time, and I might say the questioner didn't know this, because we settled the last strike just a few hours ago.

There are some disputes across the province, and negotiations, mediations, conciliations at various stages, but no strikes. This happy report is not to be intended as a comment on a long-term base. It's hoped that it will be that way and we'll work at it but the heavy season for negotiation in construction and the road building industry and others is yet to come. But at the present time there are no strikes in Alberta, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TRYNCHY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Can you tell how many are unsettled at the present?

DR. HOHOL:

No, I can't. There are eight negotiations in various stages that I'm aware of, but I'd really have to go into the files to get the exact number. But I know that there are eight that I'm familiar with.

Egg Grading and Retailing

MR. BATIUK:

Mr. Speaker, I want to direct this question to the hon. Deputy Premier. Would the hon. Minister of Agriculture be aware whether eggs which are sold in large chain stores, such as Safeway, are graded before they are retailed? At present, all eggs which are resold must be graded. Eggs which are used in hotels, restaurants,

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-13

and sold for for human consumption must also be graded. I am aware that Safeway trucks are picking up eggs from the Hutterite colonies and other large producers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question, question.

MR. BATIUK:

Let me finish this question. This refers to the question and I would like to ask, when these trucks pick up the eggs from the large producers, they pay these producers some 15 to 20 cents per dozen.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please resume his seat while the point of order is being stated.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding that a certain amount of latitude ought to be given to a member who can't word a question properly, this question is entirely...[Interjections]...entirely cut of order. No, he's making a speech. He's making a statement that may be true or may be not true and I think that the hon. Minister of Agriculture, the hon. Deputy Premier, must have got the message by now, and he should answer the question. But if you permit an hon. member to make a speech following a question, that sets a precedent which ought to be permitted to everybody. I submit that that question was entirely out of order and ought not to be allowed.

MR. HENDERSON:

There was no question.

MR. LUDWIG:

No, he asked a question.

MR. HENDERSON:

Oh, he did.

MR. BATIUK:

Mr. Speaker, if I wouldn't give this prefix to it, the hon. minister wouldn't know the question. Let me conclude that farmers are getting between 15 and 20 cents per dozen for eggs, yet Safeway retails them between 60 and 65 cents. I wonder whether there is any justification and whether the minister is aware of this.

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the general situation with regard to eggs in Alberta from the producer's point of view hasn't been good over the last couple of years. We're trying to resolve that situation. In regard to Safeway, I must say that they have been, in my view, good corporate citizens of Alberta and have used Alberta products almost exclusively in their stores. This product has been graded prior to its being sold as the regulations say that it must.

The real problem, of course, has been the dumping of eggs from outside of the province at substantially lower prices than the Egg

36-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

Board has set in Alberta, and this has created a serious surplus situation over the past two or three months. The Egg Board, in its attempt to resolve this program themselves, has had a surplus removal program in effect, which the government has assisted by guaranteeing loans to them and substantially, we're hopeful that we've removed the surplus situation from the production in the province at the moment. In addition to that, of course, the Egg Boards from each of the provinces are now meeting or have met in Ottawa in relation to a national plan, and hopefully we can get production tied to the domestic market fairly shortly.

The additional problem that we face in Alberta is to provide some sort of outlet for the smaller producer to market his product at the same price that the other people are getting, at the set price by the Egg Board. I would hope that in the very near future we can make some positive announcement in this regard, and negotiations are going on at the present time.

MR. EATIUK:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is there any indication that smaller producers such as I am, with only a few hundred birds, will have a chance to dispose of our eggs?

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is the problem we are working on right now, a system of collection and a grading system whereby a smaller producer will receive the same price as the larger producer, providing the quality is there. The low quality eggs will be sidetracked, if you like, to the breaker plant at Two Hills.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury is next, followed by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking and the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake and then the hon. Member for Drumheller.

Petroleum Prices

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. In light of the statement that the hon. minister made yesterday, what steps does the government plan so that Albertans are not hit with a disproportionate price increase in petroleum products once the proposed or even amended proposal comes into effect?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, this is the type of question I thought we might deal with under the estimates of the department of Mines and Minerals. I wasn't sure whether the hon. member was in the House at the time I made that statement. Again I will repeat that we would like to deal with questions for clarification on the Position Paper and some of the problems when we consider the estimates of the department of Mines and Minerals.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I was in the House. Supplementary, to the hon. minister. Is there any mention in the Position Paper of a device the government is considering to guarantee Albertans that there is not a disproportionate price increase in petroleum products?

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-15

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, again, I can answer that and say there isn't anything in the Position Paper, but those types of questions are the types I think we should deal with under the Department of Mines and Minerals' estimates.

MR. CLARK:

Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the hon. minister propose to introduce any legislation that would deal with this matter of a disproportionate increase in the price of petroleum products in Alberta?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I think I can answer that and say not at this session of the Legislature.

Daylight Saving Time

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. Premier. What steps have been taken to publicize the change to daylight saving time this coming Sunday?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would refer that question to the hon. Attorney General.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, we have run an advertisement advising of the change on April 30th. I can't from memory recall all media that we used. My memory is that it went into all newspapers within the province.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the civil service change their hours as they have done in the past, or will they just go on straight daylight saving time?

DR. HOHOL:

Yes, that's right, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Attorney General. In trying to find the advertisement in the weeklies, I have been unable to find one in any weekly in the province. Is the government advertising the daylight saving time in the weeklies as well as in the dailies?

MR. LEITCH:

It was my memory, Mr. Speaker, but I will check and let the hon. member know.

Loans to Farmers

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Has your department made any decision to assist Kinuso farmers and the Buffalo Bay farmers in any way?

36-16

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of ways in which we can assist the farmers in that area and in other areas which suffered severe crop losses last year. In addition to the loan programs that I have outlined to the House before -- and I wouldn't want to go through that exercise again for the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View -- The Agricultural Advances Act makes it possible for farmers to get advances in relation to seed and fuel for spring work. This can be done in the organized territories through the county or municipal offices in the ID's through the Department of Agriculture or the district agriculturalist in High Prairie.

MR. BARTON:

I passed a note to you yesterday. Have they been covered by crop insurance this year in the Kinuso area?

DR. HORNER:

I am sorry, I haven't got a report back from the commission on that, but I will find out.

Lakeside Subdivisions

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is the government considering increasing the minimum size of lots in subdivisions, particularly near recreational bodies of water?

MR. RUSSELL:

Not that I am aware of, Mr. Speaker. I have had discussions with the Minister of the Environment asking if it wouldn't be suitable for his department personnel to look at some sort of guidelines for development of subdivisions around the water bodies in Alberta, but I'm not aware that they are dealing with the details of lot sizes.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Should there be an increase agreed upon, would there be some time period allowed for people to get used to that before subdivision applications were refused on the basis of the new size?

MR. RUSSELL:

I think that is a hypothetical question, Mr. Speaker.

Alberta-B.C. Fire-Fighting

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Smoky River followed by the Hon. Member for Calgary North Hill and the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway.

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests arising from press reports, I believe it was Saturday last, of a meeting with the hon. Mr. Williston, Minister from B.C. Did the two ministers, on behalf of the respective provinces, come to any agreements with respect to natural resource management or fire control at that meeting on Saturday?

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-17

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. As was announced yesterday, by the hon. Minister of the Environment, the hon. Mr. Williston, the hon. Mr. Yurko, myself, and members of our staff, met on Saturday. One of the questions that we did consider was ways and means whereby we might mutually benefit each other both in terms of effectiveness and in terms of cost efficiency in handling our respective fire-fighting situations.

I was rather shocked to learn that it had been a very long period of time since there had been a bilateral meeting of ministers between Alberta and British Columbia in this regard. That was step one that was resolved even on Saturday. Even through preliminary discussions we had an opportunity to ascertain ways that we could help each other by fighting each other's fires near each other's borders and have a continuous exchange of information so that we could act more quickly in order to cut down on the cost and react more quickly to fight these fires effectively.

Another thing that I would point out is the observation that was made by the people from British Columbia, that they had a closer operating relationship on this matter with the American states to the south than they had with the Province of Alberta. And I think that is something we certainly want to rectify.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. What steps are being taken to work with the federal government? They have offered to have a pool of aircraft that they could transfer back and forth across Canada as is necessary for fire-fighting.

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is an important question too. We are following that up at this time, and the results that we will achieve on this will be related to the whole aftermath of the Bonaventure matter with which we are all familiar. Those matters are not resolved as yet in terms of the facilities we might be able to get for water bombing purposes, left from the Bonaventure salvage job that is basically going on. Those matters are not as yet resolved, but that is an important question.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question, to the minister. Does he feel that aircraft stationed in, shall we say the eastern provinces, would be available here soon enough? Does he not feel that for fires once they start, you need aircraft immediately, not in a matter of hours?

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. They can be here rather quickly, but that is not all there is to it. I think we also have to take into account the kinds of weather patterns that might correlate or be similar across the country. We would like to be in a position where it is dry in one area (and conducive to forest fires) and wet somewhere else. If you have an operating relationship in several directions, the probability of being able to obtain additional fire-fighting facilities and equipment quickly is much, much better than if the relationship is tied only in an east-west direction. You might both have the high level of operating need for fire-fighting at the very same time, which has often been the case.

36-18

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

Calgary Mill Rate

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Mr. Minister, as you doubtless know, there are reports from Calgary, and I had one call from an open-line program this morning, concerning the desperate efforts by the mayor to avoid a sharp increase in the mill rate. His Worship has claimed that the provincial government plans in this session to legislate for a supplementary roll which would give relief of up to two mills to the Calgary property owner. Would you explain what is meant by a supplementary roll because a lot of people seemed to be confused by the term?

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, very basically what the Legislation would allow, and we do propose to introduce, is for the municipality to assess and catch up on property which has become completed or occupied during the period since the last assessment date, so that you can keep your assessment rolls up to date throughout the year and thereby continually build on your assessment base.

While I am on my feet I should say I have been rather concerned and puzzled by the reports emanating from the City of Calgary that there's something this provincial government is going to do that is somehow magically going to solve the current problems insofar as setting the final budget and mill rate in the city is concerned. I have said many times the only assistance I can think of that any municipality is getting is their increase in the municipal assistance grant and whatever assistance they might get through the proposed legislation dealing with the supplementary assessment roll. So I'd like to clarify that again, once and for all, just to clear up any misunderstanding that there might be.

MR. SPEAKER:

The time allotted has passed.

MR. TRYNCHY:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if we could revert back to Introduction of Visitors so I can introduce visitors who are in the gallery?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. TRYNCHY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce to you and through you, 22 students from the Niton Central School. They are accompanied by their principal Mr. Bob Price and also Sister Jean Marie, formerly of Jasper, who has done a tremendous amount of work in the Jasper Hospital. Also I would like to introduce 23 students from the Archbishop Macdonald School in Edmonton Jasper Place. They are accompanied by their teachers Brian O'Neill and Miss Loretta Foley. Would they please stand and be recognized.

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-19

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Questions

181. Mr. Ludwig asked the Government the following question:

1. Which Ministers of the Executive Council of Alberta attended a Finance Ministers Conference on or about the 31st of January and the 1st day of February 1972, held in Jasper, Alberta or elsewhere in the said province?
2. How long did the said conference last?
3. How many staff members from each Department of the Government accompanied each Minister attending the conference? Please provide Minister's name, and names of staff attending each Minister.
4. What were the specific responsibilities of each Minister and each employee of the Government attending the said conference?
5. Were any dinners, luncheons, meals, refreshments provided at the expense of the people of Alberta during the said conference? Enumerate please.
6. What was the cost of all meals and entertainment provided for at the expense of the people of Alberta during the said Finance Ministers Conference?
7. What were the transportation costs to the Alberta Government in relation to the said conference?
8. Did the Conservative Caucus Committees, or Conservative Task Force Committees, or any members thereof attend the said conference?
9. Did any MLA's other than the Ministers of the Executive Council attend the conference?
10. What was the total cost of the said conference to the Government of Alberta?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I move that this Question No. 181 be made a Motion for Return.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there a seconder for the hon. minister's motion?

MR. GETTY:

The hon. Deputy Premier.

[The motion was carried without debate.]

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

1. (a) How many aircraft have been purchased by the Government of Alberta since September 10, 1971?
- (b) What type of aircraft has been purchased?
- (c) (1) What were the primary purposes for which the aircraft were purchased?

36-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

- (2) To what other use or uses are the aircraft being put?
- (d) What is the price paid for any aircraft purchased?
- (e) What is the amount of money spent by the Government on any aircraft purchased since September 10, 1971, for such items as modification, mechanical equipment, furnishings and air-worthy tests?
- (f) Were the aircraft tendered; if so, what are the bids and from whom did they come?
- (g) When did the Government take delivery of any aircraft purchased since September 10, 1971?
- (h) What type of airfield or airstrip is required for landing any aircraft purchased since September 10, 1971?
- (i) What is the air speed of the said aircraft?
- (j) Is the aircraft suitable for water bombing?
2. (a) How many pilots are employed by the Alberta Government
- (1) full-time?
- (2) part-time?
- (b) What are their salaries?
- (c) (1) How many persons in addition to the pilots are employed by the Alberta Government to service or work on Alberta Government aircraft?
- (2) What are their duties?
- (3) What are their salaries or wages?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, this question would refer to the Department of Lands and Forests and I would move, seconded by the hon. Mr. Dickie, that this question, too, be made an Order for a Motion for a Return. It's of considerable detail and will take some time to prepare.

[The motion was carried without debate.]

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

183. Mr. Ruste proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Buckwell:

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

A copy of the car rental contract covering the vehicle used by the senior officials of the Department of Agriculture that was replaced by the 1970 Chevrolet from the Minister's Office.

[The motion was passed without debate or dissent.]

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-21

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Recreational Facilities in National Parks

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move resolution No. 1, standing in my name on the Order Paper, seconded by the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight, which resolution reads:

"Be it resolved that this Assembly consider the approval of the concept of expanding recreational facilities in our national parks for Alberta families and visitors to our province and to encourage the establishment of restricted recreational zones within our national parks."

The resolution I believe, Mr. Speaker, deals with an issue that is of great concern to the members of this Legislature as well as to the citizens of the Province of Alberta, in that it deals in a broader sense with some of the matters that have been raised pertaining to the Village Lake Louise situation, of which we are all aware. I might say that the issue is of further concern to all Albertans in that it deals in a broad sense with a considerable portion of the land area of this province, the future development, if any, of this land, and the pressures upon this land by an ever-growing recreational population that enjoys the use of the land in our national parks.

It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that the Banff and Jasper National Parks alone cover some 6,700 square miles of this province. The issue brings to the surface many of the most sensitive concerns of Albertans, for it is an issue which demands an answer, if possible, to the question: Can operational patterns be developed in our national parks which will harmonize the twin objectives of meeting the recreational needs of Albertans and visitors to Alberta, yet preserving the natural beauty and character of our environment?

In order to consider this question, the prevailing counter opinions of many seemingly competing groups must be examined and understood. We must look at the position of the environmentalist, the wilderness lover, the naturalist, the natural historian, the biologist, the botanist, the fish and game advocate, and many others; all of whom are concerned in a most meaningful and sincere way with the preservation of the natural beauty and character of the environment in our national parks.

On the other side though, it appears that there are groups who are also sincere in their environmental concern, but are also very concerned as well with the increased use of our beautiful parks by millions of Albertans and tourists, the lack of facilities in our parks to care for the needs of these visitors adequately, the positive economic effects of the tourist dollar which immeasurably assists in keeping our Alberta economy healthy, and the tourist development which creates so many jobs for so many Albertans.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the intricate and complex tugs and pulls of this issue, many of which appear to be irreconcilable. But does it necessarily follow that these views of necessity must be irreconcilable? For, shorn of all of the sentiment, the emotionalism, the petty bickering and the irrational judgments which we hear on occasion in matters of this nature, I submit, for the consideration of this House, that the issue can be solved so that a necessary harmony and balance can be achieved. In fact it can be achieved in an orderly and well planned manner under strict guidance and controls, so that each and every point of view can be dealt with in the context of this solution.

36-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

Now how to accomplish this balance, this harmony, is the essence of this resolution. And one to which I trust the hon. members of the House will particularly direct their thoughts. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that all Albertans will agree with the contention that our national parks are very special places. Special in a very individual sense to each of us who have enjoyed our parks in many different manners. To many of us it may be a scenic, exhilarating experience; to others it may be the thrill and the excitement of a mountain climb; to others it may be a stroll in the isolation of the wilderness; to others, like myself, it may be a recreational experience where one can remove oneself from the hurly-burly of city life with its rapid pace and slow down a little and enjoy the majesty, the immortality of nature that brings one's thoughts into a proper perspective. To many Albertans it may be the enjoyment of skiing, albeit in a commercial sense, and the necessity of adequate ski lifts, motels, restaurants, trailer facilities and development close enough to the recreational areas so that we can truly enjoy the closeness of the mountain majesty.

But what kind of development and where should it be located? For if there is to be any development in our parks it must be considered, solely, on the direct effect it will have on increasing the public's enjoyment and use of the national parks, and of maintaining the parks, not only as sanctuaries of nature, but for nature. But it does not necessarily follow, Mr. Speaker, that development should not be undertaken in the parks. In fact, particularly, it does follow that adequate, well-placed development is needed to provide the average visitor to our parks with satisfactory and, yes, even commercial amenities that they have become concerned with and expect to enjoy when they are on their vacations.

For after all, as the hon. Member for Calgary Bow suggested when he addressed this House on March 30th, only 7 per cent of the 13 million visitors to our parks areas in Canada last year were seeking a wilderness experience. It is also the domain, Mr. Speaker, of the weekend skier, the Sunday driver, the three-day tourist, the golfer, and in fact the largest portion of visitors to our parks, who may never go further than Banff or Jasper, the nearest ski lift or golf course, and then go home.

What then should our parks policy be? Or for that matter what should the federal government's parks policy be? By way of background, all parks policy must evolve around Section 4 of The National Parks Act already quoted a number of times in this House, which defines the general purposes of the national parks as follows:

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

To many this section is a contradiction, a statement of general purpose that may never be achieved. For to many, any benefit, education or enjoyment must mean in a totally 'natural' sense -- without development, of any nature or kind. For any development they would contend, would impair the enjoyment of future generations. I submit that this is a much too narrow and selfish point of view for I suggest that those who created this legislation clearly had in mind the need for some forms of development in our national parks to assist the people of Canada from the point of view of their enjoyment of these marvellous areas.

On September 18th, 1964, the Hon. Arthur Laing, in an address to the House of Commons made a policy statement with respect to the problem which committed the federal government to a zoned development policy in our National Parks. The comments of the hon. minister are worth repeating, for they set forth the federal policy with respect

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-23

to development in the parks. And I quote from the Hansard of that date which reads from the speech of Mr. Laing as follows:

"Where best to locate such development, and the intensity of development permissible, without the impairment of natural values are matters best decided by reference to a land-zoning system. In any large area such as a national park, every point does not have the same scenic quality, the same potential for public use, the same practical advantages for development. The areas that now remain as superb wilderness and are unlikely to be heavily used by the public in future because of their isolation from the routes followed by most visitors will be defined as wilderness zones. The type of development allowed there will be slight, mainly trails or canoe routes, and primitive overnight shelters; the barest facilities that will allow access to these areas for the few park visitors who wish a true wilderness experience.

Visitors' service centres will be established in heavily used areas. An urban shopping centre, a visitors' service centre will be a grouping of all those services a park visitor wishes, a campground, motels, restaurants or coffee shops, gas station, information bureau, a store where supplies may be purchased. These will be located at less scenic locations convenient to the main points of visitor concentration and yet close enough to scenic viewpoints and other places of interest that visitors can drive there quickly.

The establishment of visitor service centres in the national parks will inaugurate an orderly development pattern faithful to the purpose of the parks. It will end the scattered development of services that is so irritating to park visitors; the situation where visitor services are scattered haphazardly along roads and highways so that a visitor desiring a number of different services must make many stops.

The policy that we have adopted in regard to the national parks as a national asset, protected by the national government and a public service provided by the national government, has a contribution to the health and happiness of the citizens."

In conclusion, the hon. minister in setting forth the policy of his government concluded as follows:

"The over-all policy we have adopted towards the national parks is aimed at achieving maximum public use and benefit, consonant with the maximum conservation of the recreational resource, the growing use of the national parks by the public, the expanding demand for outdoor recreation space that will service both present and future generations and the need to preserve with respect and in dignity, all that expresses Canada's heritage, demands a positive, clear and uniformly applicable policy."

As a result of this policy statement, Mr. Speaker, back in 1964, the National and Historic Parks Branch proceeded to the development of additional zoning policy whereby development areas would be controlled through rigid application of a five-class zoning system of which many of the members are aware, the five classes being briefly as follows: (1) Special Preservation Areas; (2) Wilderness Areas; (3) Natural Environment Areas; (4) The Parkways for circulation systems, for park visitors; (5) The Intensive Use Areas, which set forth the zoning where the intensity, variety and complexity of development is such that the area is more urban than natural in character. In other words, visitors' service centres included in this area are national transportation arteries such as the Trans Canada Highway and railroads.

36-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

I heartily endorse, Mr. Speaker, the zoning approach to be a natural, realistic, rational basis upon which to consider the complexities of the problems of the development of our national parks. I applaud the policy of the federal government as set forth in 1964 in this regard.

Although I applaud their policies with respect to zoning development, Mr. Speaker, I am not nearly as enthusiastic in my attitude towards the manner by which the federal government has implemented their declared policies, which has placed the matter of zoning development in our national parks out of proper perspective and has created controversial and often hysterical arguments directed at the concept, instead of a clear understanding as to the re-zoning and the reasoning behind the policy judgments of the federal government.

In this regard, I now wish to deal specifically with the case of Village Lake Louise, in relationship to the policies expressed in 1964 by the federal government which, of course, is presently embroiled in a swirling debate centred around the public hearings which were recently held in the City of Calgary.

In order to look at this matter in its true perspective, Mr. Speaker, I believe that certain elements of the background behind this controversy should be well understood. Development in the Lake Louise area is certainly not a new phenomenon. Its long history as a visitor's service centre can be traced back to the CPR rail-line and the construction by that company of the hotel that is well known to all of us. Although the hotel was adequate at that time, the continued growth and popularity of Lake Louise, and the change in habits of the visitors by the transformation of the area, required the provision of motels, hotels, campgrounds, stores, ski lodges, and the like.

In 1963 a study was commissioned for the long-range development of a visitor facility to be located on the valley floor of the confluence of the Pipestone and Bow rivers. The plan was consistent with the policy of the hon. Mr. Laing as enunciated by him in 1964. From 1965 to 1968 efforts to interest private enterprise in commercial aspects of this development through public advertisements met with limited success. Only a few of the required commercial facilities were established and in the spring of 1969, the Department of National and Historic Parks Branch conducted a series of invitational presentations as a further step to encourage public interest. Several parties expressed interest, but only one -- Village Lake Louise Limited -- presented and followed up with a proposal for the total development of visitor services. I might add that, of course, this was at the request of the federal government.

Following this submission, the Department and the developers commenced negotiations which started in June of 1969, and in fact, a memorandum of intent was entered into between the Crown and the company in March of 1970, whereby the development and the operation of the accommodation and services in the complex were to be carried out by the company.

It is following this stage, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government, in my view, lost control of the situation. Apparently, in order to avoid a final decision-making process, they appeared to opt out of their responsibilities and move into the public hearing route of excuses and debate which allowed them to postpone a final decision with respect to the situation.

The first public hearing, in a general sense, dealt with the provisional master plans of the Banff, Jasper, Yoho, and Kootenay National Parks. Hearings were held at Calgary, Edmonton, and Vancouver from April 19th to April 26th, 1971. The purpose of these public hearings was to review the provisional master plans for the

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-25

four mountain parks. I know the hon. Member for Drumheller was well aware of those hearings as he made submissions at both Edmonton and Calgary. The preliminary report arising from these hearings indicated agreement to the concept of limiting future development on the basis of restricted zoning.

Notwithstanding this affirmation of the previous federal government's policies back in 1964, the federal government again decided to proceed to public hearings in order to allow submissions pertaining to the particular development proposed by Village Lake Louise Limited for the Lake Louise area. This resulted in the dramatic hearings which took place in the City of Calgary. The result of these public hearings appears to me to merely be a polarization of views, which in little way will assist the federal government in coming to their final conclusions. For surely, after all of these years of consideration, the federal government should well be able to show the leadership required in dealing with this situation rather than avoiding their responsibilities to come to a decision in light of their well-professed policies.

It should be noted that if the federal government cannot live up to their responsibilities from the point of view of well-needed policies, possibly this one-tenth of the land in the Province of Alberta which falls within the boundaries of these parks, should be administered by the provincial government. I am certain that the required leadership that is apparently lacking in coming from Ottawa, could well be found within this Legislature.

I am sure that Albertans would much better be able to develop policies which would be acceptable to all Albertans and would allow the continuation of the policy that parks are for the benefit, the education, and the enjoyment of all Canadians and that these parks should be unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

For if the Village Lake Louise proposal is too expansive, then let the federal government regulate it and restrict it. If there are adverse ecological effects to the development, then let the federal government tell us about them, and by regulation ensure that there will not be adverse ecological effects. This would be as a condition to the allowance of the development to go ahead.

If the project is designed, as some allege, to satiate the luxurious desires of the jet set, then let the federal government impose regulations on the zoning within the site itself, to ensure that rents on a nightly, monthly, or a yearly basis in certain areas, not exceed certain amounts. This will ensure that there will be reasonable rents under governmental controls so that hopefully, more Albertans and tourists will have the opportunity to utilize these facilities.

If the design of the project will offend some, then let the Parks Branch, by regulation, impose higher standards to ensure the aesthetic qualities of the development. If this development will result in additional crowding problems for skiers on the mountain, then let the Parks Branch require the immediate additional construction of more lifts to take the pressure of the additional crowds off of the mountains.

But let not these issues cloud the real fact that the decision with respect to Lake Louise was made many, many years ago, for we have development in that area, and a development, I might suggest, of a very low calibre.

Let me take you through, for a moment, the average day of a skier who comes to the Province of Alberta. We'll deal firstly, for the moment, with a person coming from Calgary, who is proceeding to the mountains. Not only is there, say, an hour and a half or two hour drive to Lake Louise, but on top of that there is usually, on

36-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

the weekend, a half hour to a 45 minute wait to get up the mountain. Once up the mountain, you have the same problem of inadequate facilities. You have a spot there where you can get a sandwich, cafeteria style, in a location which often smells to high heaven from the cooking that occurs right within that location. You have dirty washrooms and toilets that don't work. You have broken lifts and long delays, and in fact, you have an embarrassment to all of us who have had the opportunity to utilize the facilities. Not only that, but considering the fact that we have some of the very finest skiing in the world, it is an embarrassment when you look at the facilities that are provided for the skier.

You know, the hon. Minister in Charge of Tourism proudly showed us a brochure that was tabled in this House, called "Vacation Alberta." In this brochure, in the ski area, it talks in terms of the marvellous skiing, which is indeed true. It talks in terms of the wonderful scenery, which is indeed true.

And then it goes on later and says,

"and later when the lifts shut down and the hillsides grow dark, turn on an apres glow. Lift you glasses, link arms, sing, dance and suddenly strangers become friends. Friends, what are you waiting for? Alberta is here waiting for you."

This, in my view, is a deception. I have talked to many tourists who have come to our mountains -- Do you have a question, sir?

MR. HENDERSON:

You do that in Calgary.

MR. GHITTER:

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is a deception practised on the tourists that are coming to the Province of Alberta, for many that I have talked to come here with high anticipation. They are indeed not disappointed by our mountains, but they are certainly disappointed with the lack of facilities that we have, from the point of view of enjoying the amenities surrounding ski resorts throughout the world.

The average tourist that comes to this province settles in some form of accommodation in Banff to go skiing. He is far from the slopes. He must get up in the morning and drive 30 miles to the mountain. He must drive back. It is not what he is accustomed to, if he is a skier who has enjoyed the marvellous facilities of any major ski resort in the world.

It is something that we must be vitally interested in. It is something, if we are going to send beautiful brochures like this around the world, I think we should not be holding ourselves out to be other than we are. We must do something about this, so that when people come to Alberta to enjoy our facilities, they will not leave with a sour taste in their mouths as they have to fight the inadequacy of our facilities within our national parks.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. GHITTER:

There is no doubt that the government policy is for development in our national parks; there is no doubt the federal government is playing 'kitty bar the door' with making a decision as to what is to occur. There is no doubt in my mind that the parks should be under

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-27

the control of the Alberta government and not the federal government. Because to me it is a disparity that 1/10 of our land in this fair province is controlled by the federal authorities -- when it is within the boundaries of the Province of Alberta.

It is time that the federal government showed us some leadership so that we could either support them or deny their point of view. But it is time we heard from them, and it is not good enough to wave red herrings around this Assembly and in the community, of foreign ownership and all of these other arguments we have heard, when since 1964 we have all known that the declared policy of the federal government has been for zoning development within our national parks.

On that basis, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to propose this resolution for the consideration of the members of this honourable Legislature in hopes that they, too, agree that proper zoning and development in our national parks would be of advantage to all Albertans and visitors to the Province of Alberta.

MR. LEE:

Mr. Speaker, in seconding this motion I want to cover two basic concepts related to this particular topic. First of all, I want to speak about the jurisdiction and the responsibility of the two governments that are related to this particular area, that is the provincial government of Alberta and the federal government. Secondly, I want to talk about the relationship of the provincial and national governments in the planning of parks development in our national parks.

First of all, in looking at the jurisdictional responsibility, I think we should note that both the provincial and the federal governments do have a responsibility to their respective citizenry in the area of parks development, planning, restrictions and communications. I am going to deal with each of these separately, and then hope to tie them together later on.

First of all, as a province, I think it was graphically pointed out in the two days of debate we have had on parks policy within Alberta, that there is a necessity for a definite provincial parks policy. There were opinions expressed regarding needs of the cities, in regard to developments in the north and in regard to zoning of parks for Alberta provincial use. Sectors in this debate discussed the needs of people for various recreational outlets, such as skiing, hunting and snowmobiling, at all points throughout our province.

The relationship with the federal government generally doesn't come into play until you run into those areas where it does have jurisdiction. The one we are discussing now is the national parks. The area we are speaking of mainly here, as far as a provincial policy, would be the Canmore Corridor and when we speak of the Canmore Corridor we are thinking of the plans we must develop for that particular area.

As a provincial government, we are also looking at the whole area of tourism -- I hope that our hon. Minister of Tourism would have a few comments in this area later on -- in the area of tourism we will also have to develop a policy vis-a-vis our provincial parks, and more specifically, once again, this Canmore Corridor. As a provincial government, it has been pointed out that there is a need for planning and control within the province; that we do have a responsibility to our citizens here in Alberta to provide this planning and control, and to provide perhaps some new incentives in the whole area of tourism for the Provincial Treasury.

Secondly, going to the federal responsibility and jurisdiction in this area, I might point out first of all, that this is carried out mainly by the National and Historic Parks Branch of the

36-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development under the leadership of the hon. Jean Chretien.

Now, the federal responsibility is very similar to ours as a province. The federal responsibility is also to its citizenry, the people of Canada. And in fulfilling this commitment, they have established throughout Canada, various national parks. In Alberta we have two of them. We have the National Parks of Jasper and of Banff.

This commitment to the Canadian people has been expressed and has been stated often in section 4 of The National Parks Act. Now, it was made clear also in later sections of this particular act, that in dealing with facilities, and in dealing with development control, that these restrictions were not necessarily just on the wilderness areas, for wilderness preservation; but the provision was being made for present enjoyment of our national parks.

So, the implication in the act, is that there must be provisions for recreation and visitors' services for these people. I would like to say that it is the responsibility of the federal government now to provide recreation and visitor facilities. It would be a disservice for them to discourage visitation to these parks. The national parks are their responsibility and their responsibility is to the citizens of Canada, not to Alberta. I would say also, that it would be highly selfish and narrow -- as has been in the case of many people in Alberta -- to discourage this particular visitation.

It does become questionable and I think very debatable, when the national government does promote the national parks for tourism. But I am speaking of their commitment now to the Canadian people.

At present, there is an obvious lack, as my hon. colleague just mentioned, an obvious lack of visitor services in the Lake Louise area in Banff, and all through the national parks. Lineups that you find at the ski lifts, the problems you have at a place like Tunnel Mountain in finding a parking spot for trailers and so on, are evident to those visitors who do come.

As my hon. colleague has also pointed out the National and Historic Parks Branch has really recognized this commitment. They have recognized their responsibility and they have acted in a certain way in this regard. I would like to read quickly to you a statement that they have made, which does show they really do realize their commitment. This is from the departmental statement on the Lake Louise planning area, Banff and the National Park. There is one paragraph here that does state the National Parks Branch commitment, and I quote:

"Consequently the first priority is to reduce the impact of the visitor upon the park environment in the hope that as many Canadians as possible, now and in the future, may enjoy their parks without destroying them. This will be accomplished by various means; reducing use of the private automobile wherever possible as technology and economics permit; concentrating needed services in as few and as tightly compacted areas as possible and locating them in areas already committed to services or areas of minimal ecological significance; encouraging establishment of visitors' services outside of park boundaries whenever possible; intensifying education interpretation programs on the proper use of park resources and carrying out more research and scientific monitoring.

"Restricted entry to the parks should be our last resort. It should not be beyond our ingenuity to welcome increased visitors to this magnificent 8,000 square mile park complex. But they must be subject to ground rules which will assure them and future generations of an insight into a natural environment as close as possible to its original character. At the same time

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-29

very stringent restrictions and even absolute denial of entry will be required in certain zones, either because of their extreme fragility or to provide an opportunity for recovery."

As I say, the federal government as illustrated here, does recognize their responsibility, and they do recognize the dangers they face in undertaking this.

So the federal government has faced five facts:

- (1) They faced the fact that there is a transportation corridor that is running through our national parks right now, the Trans-Canada Highway;
- (2) They have faced the fact that the present Lake Louise facilities are there;
- (3) They faced the fact that these facilities in the Lake Louise area, and in Banff are at this point in time, inadequate for the Canadian citizenry;
- (4) They have faced the fact that there will be the probability of increased visitation from all parts of Canada and possibly the world;
- (5) Finally, they have faced the fact that probably the best way to deal with the situation is not to create new areas, but to deal with present facilities and upgrade them.

They have recognized their responsibility; they know that they have it with or without Alberta. Now this is where the crunch comes, when we start talking about how they will facilitate this responsibility. Both governments now recognize their responsibility to the citizens and now let's look at the nature of the planning that we both must accept.

Now if we accept the need for increased development of recreation and visitor services as an integral commitment of the federal government and the provincial government, then what we are going to have is an increased resident population. If we increase these facilities in the national parks, we as a province are going to have to provide schooling, we are going to have to provide health and social development activities and a number of other services that we have jurisdiction over as a province. So we can't say that the federal government is undertaking this strictly in a unilateral sense. They should not plan, then, the future of the parks in a vacuum outside the provincial jurisdiction.

I don't accept, and I don't think too many people in Alberta accept, the contention that was stated by the hon. Minister of Northern Development and Indian Affairs when he stated offhandedly a couple of years ago that the Alberta border stops at the park gates. I think that most people in Alberta would reject out of hand this particular contention.

So what I want to do now is examine how this planning should take place at this particular point in time. As my colleague from Calgary Buffalo has done, I endorse certain things that the federal government has done to this point. I endorse the 1953 commissioning of a study and the establishment of a policy on the parks. I endorse the fact that they have made this public. I endorse even the public hearings that have been held and especially those public hearings in April, 1971. But I do question the necessity for the public hearings that were held in March of this year on a particular application of the zoning policy.

Now as a provincial government we have also undertaken certain responsibilities in this planning. I'm talking now about the national parks and specifically about the Village Lake Louise area. As a provincial government, first of all we must develop a provincial parks plan, we must come to early decisions on what will be the

36-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

nature of development in the Canmore Corridor, and what will be our policy on tourism in various parts of the province.

But in talking about the national parks and the hearings in Calgary, we did have in attendance observers who attended throughout the three days of hearings at that time. In having these observers and various members of the provincial government present we were able to monitor those opinions that were expressed on this particular development. These people now are in the process of providing reports for government so that we as a provincial government can arrive at a position on this application.

So now the responsibility, in my opinion, is consultation. A unilateral decision at this time would be unwarranted and I would say a somewhat arrogant approach. The citizens resident within our national parks are citizens of Alberta and we as a government do have a responsibility for services to these citizens. We as a provincial government and the federal government must co-operate then on the future of the national parks, because in fact, the Alberta government just does not end at the park gates.

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, tourism is the third largest industry in the province. This business of tourism brings in an annual revenue estimated at being in excess of \$350 million, but the sad thing about this great bonanza is that we are presently running at about a \$79 million deficit, whereas more money is being spent outside Alberta than is being spent in it.

You know, Mr. Speaker, that when we try to crowd 4,000 people into a camping area that has been designed for only 75 people, it is time that we opened up our eyes to this sleeping giant on our doorstep. I think we'd better wake up fast and realize that with the advent of the jumbo jet and the charter flight that our province will be the playground of the world.

Many can foresee the day when our parks will become saturated and we will be restricted first only to Canadians, and then as the parks fill up only Albertans will be able to enter them, and finally, people of this province will be put on a quota. Mr. Speaker, how nice it would be if we had the foresight and the commonsense to do something about this situation now before it happens. Instead of being satisfied with 40 acre plots of land, let's have provincial parks that take in several townships or a thousand square miles with complete recreation facilities all within one area.

There are several areas in Alberta that would lend themselves to such parks, for example, Grande Cache, Robb, Nordegg, Sundre, Kananaskis, Coleman, and Cold Lake. Now Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at Nordegg, for example. This gem of the Rockies, west of Rocky Mountain House, could be used as a service area for about 20 miles either side of the David Thompson Highway with motels, stores, garages, boat marinas, and even outlets for tourists who appreciate the opportunity to quench their thirst.

Then further west on the David Thompson could be an area that would be reserved for trailers and campers only, and still further down the road that portion for tenting privileges. Now the next section of the park could be the beginning of some fairly rough country from Windy Point on the Kootenay plains, that should be set aside for horseback trail-riding and for the great number of Albertans who prefer to pack in without the aid of horses or mechanized vehicles. And the last area of this park, strictly for the tourist trail-hiking up in the high country.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, several parks like this in Alberta would fit the bill for several generations. These super parks,

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-31

complete with recreation facilities, all within one area and with relatively easy accessibility, with roads into service centres, and to be used year round, could also be used for winter sports. And believe you me, this is one area that is sadly neglected now in the parks program.

Instead of our park wardens hibernating in the winter with the bears, greater emphasis could be given to snowmobile areas with specially laid-out routes; with campsites and with cross-country skiing with which you, Mr. Speaker, and your family are so familiar. Cross-country areas in the parks could be used exclusively for cross-country skiing with picnic sites and in the summer time this area could be reserved then for nature-hiking.

And Mr. Speaker, what about summer canoeing from lake to lake, river to river, with private campsites which would include a shelter? In some areas hunting could be allowed and in others, industry, such as at Grande Cache where mining is permitted. These areas could be co-operatively developed for recreation use.

Mr. Speaker, by getting full year-around utilization within the areas greater land usage would be realized with greater facilities for the visitors. Depending upon location, whether there be historical sites or Taylor's "Valley of Old Bones", lake areas, wooded areas, or mountain areas, planning should be provided as to the maximum use of each area.

Mr. Speaker, let's not kid ourselves. If we as a government are going to put some effort into recouping this \$79 million tourist deficit and if we are going to give serious consideration to the Albertans who make up 80 per cent of the population, who in no way, shape or form can, due to commitments to time and money, afford to travel outside of this province, then I seriously believe, Mr. Speaker, that with the job we have ahead of us to provide parks and recreation for our people and to tackle the job properly, we should reevaluate the whole parks program. By this, may I suggest that the Provincial Parks Branch is not only in the wrong pew, but in the wrong church. And by this I mean, Mr. Speaker, that with the task of promotion and advertising ahead of the Parks Branch, the Parks Branch should be transferred to the Department of Tourism.

MR. PARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to declare my position on this particular problem and I come down foursquare in favour of the sentiments of the resolution. There is something so wholly impractical about the views of those who would completely deny the parks to people, that I sometimes wonder if I live in the same world. I know there is something admirable and morally uplifting to put nature before people, as if mankind weren't a part of nature. But to exclude people from huge stretches of beautiful country entirely is to deny the whole purpose of conservation. You can put a minefield around the parks and sure, then they'd never be desecrated by man. To me it would be like those parlours they used to have in Victorian times, and my grandmother had, with Wedgewood china and antiques and polished tables, and nobody ever went in there unless there was a birth or a death, everybody lived in the kitchen and nobody went in the parlour -- and that to me is how the ultra-conservationist looks at the parks.

I love the national parks and I've enjoyed wandering among them for more than a quarter of a century. I love skiing at Mount Norquay or Sunshine or Lake Louise. I regret the conditions, mainly the lack of a market, but also the uncertainty over snow which closed down Pigeon and Snowridge outside the park. But I know that the North American at Banff is the ninth most difficult downhill run in the world, that Sunshine has the best snow conditions anywhere in North America, even though it can be bitterly cold in January and February

36-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

and that Lake Louise has the best variety of runs anywhere in Canada, and lifts which can be enjoyed, maybe for a shorter season than many places and the snow is not all that certain, but when the snow is good, Lake Louise has the best variety of runs.

I also love cross-country skiing, down the trail north of Banff to 40 Mile Creek and on to Elk Lake, along the Assiniboine Trail from Brewster and Egypt Lake trails from Sunshine, up the Ptarmigan Valley from Temple Lodge to Skoki and the Lake Louise area.

I also love these mountains in the summer. Most years I've been in beyond Skoki, north of Lake Louise, fishing. Last year I went in for 28 miles north of the highway up the Pipestone Valley to Devon Mountain and then down to Clearwater -- fishing all the little known lakes where the cutthroats still bite - some of them bite so well they rise to a cigarette end.

I've often stayed with Elizabeth Rummel in her fishing camp at Sunburst Lake near Mount Assiniboine. I've walked and I've fished all the trails from Spray to Wentworth, from Rock Island to Euhippus, up Johnson Canyon to Lake Llewelyn -- all over the mountains in the Banff Park part of the National Park. And I tell you that I seldom see people off the highway. I've walked for three and four days and not seen a single soul. There are very few people even getting as far as Skoki which is only eight miles north of Lake Louise. They've kept a guest book there since the end of the Second World War -- there are not 500 names in it.

There is no danger of the national park being over-run by people unless the attitude of people in the Western world changes.

Oh, there is a little note here -- I must tell you about this. I had better qualify the Rummel bit. Elizabeth Rummel is an oldtimer whom most people in Southern Alberta know. She is over 70 has a game leg, and runs a fishing camp near Assiniboine. There are usually other people there but there is no danger that people will overrun these parks unless attitudes change.

Of course there are a lot of people on the highways -- on the main highways that go through the park. They take the trails, maybe very close to Banff. They'll walk half a mile or something in the afternoon from the Banff Springs Hotel. They won't get very far from the beaten track. They travel the gondola and the chair lifts, go up Sulphur Mountain, go up the sedan chair at Lake Louise, and they enjoy the little bit of the park they see from the strip of the highway. And so they should -- it is right that they should enjoy it.

But it is a very small fragment of the park that they actually see. We must have some accommodation for these people who are the majority of the people. They are not the people who go into the wilderness. We must have accommodation for these people and if we don't have proper facilities, then the road strip itself tends to be overrun and perhaps polluted like the little creek that runs down from Chateau Lake Louise, where there is a big sign saying "don't drink the water". This is the sort of thing that happens on the road itself when the facilities are so poor.

There is not enough accommodation for the workers in Banff, let alone the tourists. There is nowhere for the people who work in the motels, in the restaurants and so on to stay. They toss some sleeping bags on the floor in bathrooms and motels, or they squeeze in at highly inadequate dormitories at the Banff Springs. There are some of them that still sleep in the old cubicles in the Brewster building and there are usually about four to a cubicle, not because of the present mode of life or anything, but because there is nowhere else for them to sleep or stay.

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-33

Lake Louise is a dump. It is one of the ugliest collections of buildings in Alberta. There is one that comes a close rival and that is the town of Jasper. Let me tell you this, Lake Louise wouldn't even exist as a dump around that great big ugly monstrosity which has no architectural merit whatsoever -- the Chateau Lake Louise, -- around that big building there wouldn't be anything at all if it hadn't been for the endeavours of a pioneer called Sir Norman Watson who was an Englishman with a lot of tenacity and not enough money to see his dream come to fruition. He was a fellow who started the Canadian Ski Club of the Rockies; he was a fellow who built that Old Post hotel; he was the fellow who built Temple Lodge and Skoki Lodge; he was the fellow who put in the first ski run.

He dreamed that this would be a resort like the beautiful rolling meadows of Switzerland. Do you know, he even brought some Swiss people out from Zurich. One of them is the mother of Reto Barrington, who now is our big hope in the Canadian ski team. She came out with that group of Swiss people who Sir Norman Watson thought would have little cows -- you know, brown Swiss cattle in the Lake Louise Valley with bells around their necks -- it would all just be a beautiful replica of Switzerland. It never worked out because there was always the opposition of the people who didn't see the national park in the same sort of light as Sir Norman Watson. They couldn't understand that his dream was a beautiful one. They put all sorts of obstacles -- bureaucratic and otherwise -- in the way of fulfilment.

Eventually, he sold out to a young fellow who was a keen skier called John Hindle, who had been fortunate enough to inherit a little bit of money from a paper company that his parents had. He had, as a side kick, a young English lawyer called John Hopwood. They tried to fulfill Sir Norman Watson's dream because Sir Norman Watson could no longer even get the small amount of money he had left out of Britain. So they put in some more lifts at Lake Louise to try to develop the area into a reasonable tourist centre. They took out some of the old pomas that had been there for donkey's years that used to break down about once every half hour, and they put in a chair-lift. Then they put in another chair-lift on the Temple Lodge side.

At the moment they lose money. They have lost money ever since they put this investment in there because they need at least 1,000 skiers a day to break even. To get 1,000 skiers a day during that short season they have to get 2,500 on each day during the weekend. They only get 2,500 at the peak of the season, because Alberta weekend skiers quit early. Skiing is beautiful right now -- best snow there will be all year. There will be nobody up there, maybe 700 skiers at Lake Louise.

They have to close down this weekend. This is the last weekend, and yet they've got good enough snow -- probably this year it will go till the end of May. The reason is the market is so small. This is a good year for snow, and yet they're going to lose money this year. Last year they didn't have any snow. The snow was very poor, and of course, a lot of people who were sold season tickets got mad and perhaps went to Sunshine.

These are the economic reasons why these places don't work, and why you've got to encourage somebody with the bucks to put in a better development that will increase and expand the size of the market, because if they don't make a profit, then they won't continue to exist. They'll go down the drain just like Pigeon, Snowridge and West Castle and all the rest of them. There won't be a tourist industry and there won't be job opportunities for the young and there won't be an alternative in terms of employment to this over-reliance on natural resource industries when the oil companies are long gone.

The people that oppose this sort of thing, I believe, have vested interests which are much more dangerous than the vested

36-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

interests of the so-called multi-national corporation. Let's just list some of those who I regard as walking tragedies to Alberta. We have those who oppose foreign investment on any count. There are people starving to death in South America and undeveloped Africa, and so on, who go on their hands and knees asking for somebody to come in and industrialize their country so they can have some jobs and raise their standard of living. Of course, when they're there, they begin to demonstrate and tell them to go home again, but at the moment they are in this rather competitive market begging the western world to come out there and industrialize their country.

In this, I think the very under-developed Province of Alberta -- a huge province, two-thirds bush, only one-third of it developed, 1.6 million people, huge acreage -- is where we say that we don't like a buck because it traces back to some foreigner. I think this is utter nonsense. The foreigners they discriminate against most of all are the Americans. There's not quite so much antipathy to the Japanese dollar or the German dollar or the British dollar. It used to be once upon a time the British dollar, but not any more. The big antipathy is directed at the American dollar. I just don't see it. I just don't understand it. I don't believe there should be any nationality to a buck. We should welcome them all into Alberta and hope that some of them will stay.

Then there are the others who are just merely selfish. These are the guys who are the day skiers. They don't recognize that if the company that provides the facilities can't make a profit they'll lose altogether. It won't be a question of their having to stand in the line-up with somebody from Colorado or Wyoming or something and perhaps wait 30 seconds longer to get on the tow. There won't be any tows at all if those people don't make a profit.

Then there are the merchants with a monopoly in Banff. They buck it too, because they realize that they can continue to charge high prices for poor service as long as there's no competition in the area. The landlords with the monopolies in Banff and Jasper -- the same thing applies to them. They can continue to provide lousy meals, poor accommodation at high prices, because there's no sophisticated competition. They've got a little corner there. They managed to get in under the bureaucratic umbrella and nobody else can.

There are also the little Albertans, the ones who can't see any further than the ends of their noses, who dream of this mountain playground as a reserve for themselves that they rarely visit. They dream of it as they sit watching their television sets back in Calgary.

Then there are the xenophobes who hate Americans, and if there's any suggestion that an American is going to enjoy a national park, then keep him out. And the Socialists - our friend for Spirit River-Fairview is not here at the moment, but he knows the group I'm talking about - those who think it's evil to make a buck, who are jealous of success.

Now I was certainly against the proposition of putting a new road up Pipestone Creek. That was a nightmare to me and I was very glad when that plan was dropped, and it was dropped long before the public hearings into Lake Louise and the outcry against that was popular. We don't need any more main roads through the parks. But I just have no time whatsoever for the TV watchers who preserve the wilderness from their living rooms, who don't know what they are talking about. I believe that the Lake Louise development isn't all that bad. I think we should congratulate Imperial Oil, or really John Hindle for having talked Imperial Oil into being ready to put up this money if they ever got the consent. Because the real feathers in the cap go to the local boys who promoted it.

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-35

We should be grateful to a large corporation that is prepared to re-invest profit dollars in Alberta. The only thing I have against foreign corporations, is if they take all the money they earn and head back home. But if they re-invest it in job-producing, tax-providing secondary industry right here in Alberta, then I say; "Good for them. Give them a medal, let's pat them on the back." The more they do it the better as far as I am concerned, and I believe the better it would be for all Albertans.

When I was up at Lake Louise a week ago last Sunday, when I was taking time off from my arduous duties with my constituents, I stood on the top of the hill, on the top of Wixy Waxy -- that is the first easy slope that comes down from the top of the chair -- and I looked down on the great, broad flood plain of the Lake Louise valley. You could see a great expanse of the top of trees. You could see just a few little cuts through it like veins on an old man's hand, of where the roads had been cut out. I looked down at the site for this proposed Village Lake Louise, and it was no bigger than a postage stamp stuck on a wall, it was so insignificant in size compared with the valley as a whole.

Now I believe that that particular plan is quite tasteful; the design of the buildings is good, in low profile, and I don't think there is anything evil in having a drink when you have had a day's skiing. I believe there should be a bar there, but I don't think, in my opinion, it should be on the upper car park. It should be down by the road, down by the bottom of the gondola lift. If this is inconvenient, and they have to put another tow up to connect with the bottom of the chair lift --

MR. LUDWIG:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, The hon. member is debating the motion which is proposed on the Order Paper by the hon. member, Mr. Notley. I believe he has rambled far afield, he got back to Lake Louise, and he is debating the very motion that is before the House under the name of another member. And I don't think it is proper to be debating the same issue under two motions. It is certainly not in the interests of good business in this Assembly. The hon. member is entirely out of order in crossing from one motion to another, and challenging the views of a mover of a motion, who has every right to know that that motion will not be debated today. I believe the hon. member now debating, should not only be advised not to debate the Lake Louise issue, the pros and the cons of the development Lake Louise as he has been doing, but furthermore, his remarks have been out of order, and to that extent they should be struck off Hansard.

MR. HYNDMAN:

On the point of order, I submit that the remarks just raised by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View are wholly wrong. This resolution, being a very broad one, may well contain within it the concept of Village Lake Louise or any number of other developments within national parks. I submit the wording of it is exactly, and fits within the remarks that are now being made by Mr. Farran, and it is entirely proper and opportune for him to discuss this at this time under this resolution.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, speaking to the point of order, the hon. minister's remarks are utterly ridiculous because I can now put another motion on the Order Paper broad enough to permit me to debate the Lake Louise issue again. That is contrary to the rules of the House; it is contrary to common sense, and I believe you ought to make a ruling on it, because we could never finish a debate on a motion that could be repeated under other broad motions. We have a

36-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

specific motion and I would read it to show what I mean. I believe it is Motion No. 15.

"Moved by Mr. Notley, seconded by Mr. Wilson, be it resolved that this Legislative Assembly oppose the proposed Village Lake Louise project."

The hon. member is now debating in favour of it, and I am saying that he is addressing himself more to the contents of this specific motion than he is to the motion before the House. And I am saying that that is out of order. It is contrary to common sense even though the hon. Minister of Education thinks it isn't. This ought not to be allowed. This makes a mockery out of all debating in the House because if I want to debate the Lake Louise Project and it is No. 15, then the thing to do is to put on broad motion and debate any issue we like. It is clearly out of order.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is some problem here that is not obvious to the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View --

MR. LUDWIG:

The problem, Mr. Speaker --

MR. HYNDMAN:

. . . well, the hon. member seems to make a number of remarks about common sense, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps he is not the one to be making remarks in that regard, bearing in mind that -- [laughter] However, certainly it is correct that it is against the rules of the House for one member to have more than one motion on the Order Paper, but there is nothing in the rules to my knowledge that prevents subjects on the Order Paper on Tuesday or Thursday afternoons being dealt with, even if they may be similar or may overlap. In any event, there has been no decision taken by this Assembly in respect of the other resolution on Village Lake Louise, so we are not duplicating something on which the House has decided. I would suggest that the parameters of this Motion No. 1 are obviously wide enough to cover what is being so ably discussed by the hon. member, Mr. Farran.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I would agree with the point raised. I would only suggest that Mr. Farran would cover all the other national parks. I believe he has covered Jasper and Lake Louise.

MR. FARRAN:

We will just finish with Lake Louise and I intend to move on to Jasper, and Yoho, Waterton -- [laughter] If the hon. member for Calgary Mountain View will just be patient, I will finish this Lake Louise thing very quickly. I just hope that it will result in an affirmative vote.

I know that everybody doesn't think alike over this Lake Louise thing, but I just want to point out that I have some real experience of the area. I know that the cabins that Bud Gourlay once owned -- back of the Post Hotel -- that were expropriated by the federal government for alleged improvement of the park, are still sitting there with the windows torn off and the shutters hanging on by one nail -- just part of the general dump. I know that people like Ray Lelsace, the famous oldtimer from Lake Louise, would agree with me that some tasteful development is definitely needed for that little townsite in the park. But you can't just cram everything into the limited townsite of Banff. It is just beyond all reason to think

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-37

that you can advertise your beautiful Province of Alberta from one end of North America to another, and expect them all to fit into Banff and to be satisfied. I say there is hardly enough room there for the workers, let alone the visitors.

The broad concept of expanding recreational facilities in our national parks for Alberta families is not enough, so I am glad to see we have added to it "and visitors". It is possible that the recreation facilities are too much to be viable for the Alberta families already. Our population is just not big enough to support them alone. Do you realize it was only last year that the Banff Springs Hotel began to open in the winter, or the year before last, and it now has no extra available accommodation? You have to put in your name on a waiting list at least two or three months ahead of time to get into the Banff Springs over the peak of the winter season. It is time, of course, that Chateau Lake Louise was also opened during the winter -- monstrosity though it is. It is not too bad inside. Inside it is better than it is outside.

If we could also persuade all these people in Edmonton who think that the Village Lake Louise project is an attempt to despoil the park, to rape the park; if we could persuade them that some face-lifting thing is also needed in Jasper, then we would be really moving along. If we could persuade them that if Imperial Oil puts \$30 million into improving Lake Louise, then they should persuade a rival like Shell or British Petroleum to put \$30 million into Jasper to improve Jasper, then we would, I think, be moving forward towards the sunny uplands that all Albertans really dream of, that is, a province where there is no unemployment, where everybody makes over \$20,000 a year and they all have at least three months each year to enjoy the national parks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear! Hear!

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, I'm a little hesitant about putting the question before at least I have expressed some of my views. They may coincide with some that have been expressed, but nevertheless, I am very much surprised that the hon. members in the opposition have absolutely no view in this area with respect to this motion. However, perhaps I should count --

MR. LUDWIG:

A point of order. I would like to advise the hon. lady that I have been around the parks as much as the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill and I have a few views on it.

MRS. CHICHAK:

I think perhaps the hon. members on the opposite side, if they had the same views, might wish to express them slightly differently. Anyway I think I can have a comeback at this time and count the number that are on the other side and say that there are so many silent -- on the other side.

But I think we have to consider that this is an extremely good motion and I think it's at a time when we should really take the opportunity to express our views as to how we do feel in the area of expansion of recreation in our national parks, and whether we as a government should make some definite stand and approach to the federal authorities, and perhaps make some gains in having a joint responsibility, if, in fact we cannot convince them that the provincial government should have jurisdiction on that area of land that is within its boundaries.

36-38

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

I think that it is a direction to the government, when we talk about individuals and about people expressing their views and giving direction to the government as to how Albertans feel. This time I have to say that I am disappointed that there aren't any members on the other side who want to express the views of their constituents -- how they feel in the area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame! Shame!

MRS. CHICEAK:

I have to say that the matter of expansion of recreation is a very important one. Whether we agree with the matter of the Lake Louise Project or whether we have in mind other projects I think that it is important to be absolutely and clearly aware and have a position with respect to expansion of recreational facilities in the national parks.

Surely we all recognize that our daily work day and our period of leisure are expanding and that somehow we must take up this time or have planned programs in recreation to take up the leisure -- planned leisure recreation. Unless we look ahead and plan the facilities to accommodate the people that will be requiring them and have these facilities developed beforehand, certainly we will be found in a dilemma where the excessive numbers of people who required leisure do not have a place to travel or a place to relax and participate. So I think that it is very important for each and every one of us to express our views.

Although for a time I felt that this side of the House was dominating this afternoon's discussion and motion, I can see now that perhaps this was necessary because members on the other side don't seem to have any view to express and perhaps don't have any feeling in the area of leisure time and recreational facilities and I hope this will talk them into expressing some of their views.

And I am sure that the hon. members will recognize that each time any debate has taken place in this House, I have never requested that they put the question while they were speaking, and I think it is very rude on their part to do this -- particularly to me when I have not reacted in this manner to them. I certainly hope that they will give me the opportunity to express my views, whether they are five minutes or whether they repeat some of the views of other members, but nevertheless they have no idea of what I have to say and I do have something to say.

Some time ago I had an opportunity where I discussed the matter of recreational facilities in parks, only at that time I was discussing the expansion of provincial parks and recreation. But I think this is very important; the two can be complementary, the provincial and the national park, and in areas where we want to accommodate people who are not able to travel a long way from home.

But we must also consider those who can manage to get away for a little distance from their homes and have a longer holiday than just a one, two or three day excursion. And so we must look for very good planning, that the facilities be developed, but developed in such areas that will still not interfere with the wilderness areas of our parks. We can have a good balance of both and good planning will create a good balance of both.

I think that the original setting aside of national parks when they were first created, when Canada was still a child -- at that time certainly it wasn't the intention that national parks should never be used for anything else but as national parks and as wilderness -- I think the idea of the plan was that they should be

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-39

available for the people of Canada and for people from outside, from all over, to enjoy them. But the areas and the type of recreation that are made available are, of course, the key factors, and so I would just like to reiterate and say that we must have planned recreation facilities.

Certainly we should consider the need to expand them because at the moment, as they are, there are thousands of people who are precluded from enjoying the facilities because they, perhaps, have not had the opportunity to get there. It comes on a first come, first serve basis and there are just no more facilities to accommodate them. I think that if we had key centres -- key areas -- that were developed with recreational facilities we would probably have less destruction in the wilderness areas and perhaps more enjoyment in them.

I feel very strongly that we need to take a position in having some provincial jurisdiction in the area of national parks -- in what percentage -- that may be something that could be determined by how far we can succeed with the federal government. But nevertheless I think it should not be 100 per cent and 0 per cent -- 100 per cent in the federal area and 0 per cent in the provincial area. This is land that certainly is within our boundaries and so definitely we must have some say and some contribution in its development.

I think it is important that facilities be provided for all citizens to use and have available -- not only the elite -- so that they do not become such that only those who can well afford a very high price can enjoy them.

These are some of the things I wanted to express and I hope the hon. members on the other side will express their views, rather than passing up the opportunity in letting Albertans know just how they feel or how the people in their constituencies feel about the expansion of recreational facilities -- albeit in whatever manner -- that are developed in the national parks.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, I have been so overwhelmed by the charming discourse from the very beautiful Member for Edmonton Norwood and the very logical presentation from the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo in regard to this very meaningful and important resolution.

I, for one, am prepared to go along, with certain reservations, with the intent of this resolution, certainly in an area the size of Banff and Jasper -- an area encompassing 6,700 square miles -- and one that has been set aside for the enjoyment and the edification of people.

When you think of people you have to think of all people, of all particular types of people. You have to realize that in their cities -- and our cities are becoming of greater and greater significance -- the amount of leisure that is available, the areas that people can travel in and people can enjoy, have been greatly limited, limited even in my particular lifetime in that I can recall in my own area that there was not a fence for 30 miles in any direction. And in our area at least, we do have available to us, within a very short distance, one mile on the south and seven miles on the north, the entire area of our forest reserve, of the entire Crowsnest Forest and this gives our young people and all people an opportunity to go out into this particular wilderness area.

However, prior to the development that took place in the last 10 or 15 years, that is as a result of logging and oil exploration and so on, the amount of usage that was made of this particular area was very insignificant and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is the situation that presently exists in many wilderness areas. I can take

36-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

people from within this Legislature to an area within three miles of Blairmore and I can venture to say with confidence that probably not more than two or three people visit this total area in a year. Hence it can be pre-determined that the amount of use and enjoyment that people have has a direct relationship to the facilities that are basically available for the purpose of their enjoyment.

Also people are not all in the category of being young and vigorous and eager to climb mountains. In fact, after you climb enough mountains the mountains start to get a little bit steeper. Also, what particular group is most interested in seeing the wilderness and enjoying the park areas of our province? I think it can well be concluded that these are basically the young, growing family types, people with families who are probably able to drive into a park area. Most certainly with the developments that we have and the furthering of developments that we do have in the future, the opportunities of going into many areas will be vastly curtailed.

What better then would be the opportunity of people being able to visit the physical facilities of our parks? Certainly I'm not suggesting that to do this they should take a pack-sack -- although there will be many areas because -- as it has been mentioned -- the total development in our national parks as presently projected will be very small.

However, I take a very dim view of the concept, although it is realized that one-tenth of the Province of Alberta has been set aside in national parks, and I might point out to the hon. members that this was done long before the Province of Alberta was even considered or even brought into being. I would suggest that it would be wrong for us to take the position in this Legislature that the responsibility for the national heritage -- the heritage of all Canadians -- should be relegated to the position of being that which would be probably basically secular if it was put under the purview of the Province of Alberta. So I am not prepared to go along with the concept that any change in the management or the ownership of our national parks could be considered.

Mention has been made of the economic benefits that can be derived from the development of the physical facilities in the national parks. And certainly I am not thinking now in terms of commercialism; I am thinking in terms of people. I am thinking in terms of a family that can drive out into a national park where there exist facilities for camping, sanitary facilities, and places where they can enjoy and commune with nature.

I would be unilaterally opposed to any development concept in our national park. Certainly the implications of the program of zoning, the relegation to basic areas, the different usages, is one that can be properly approved. There is a place for those who would seek out and commune with nature, who enjoy the pleasure of being slapped in their faces climbing through brush, and so on. But not all people, physically, as I mentioned before, are capable of this particular endeavour. Certainly I think of our children, and children are probably our most precious assets, and when we think in terms of development, we should think in these particular terms.

So having this in mind, I do not find anything wholly wrong in the concept of a development for people. Of course, when you do develop for people, you also enter the realm of economics. I think one can offset the other. I have been in areas of this Province of Alberta where you could go 200 miles in any direction and you would not meet one single living soul. These areas will be there for many, many years to come. So I question the enjoyment that the average person, the average Albertan, would get by travelling through particular areas like this. There is also the aspect of population growth that will have to be considered. In making the total assets of our province useable, a concept of judicious use in our natural

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-41

resource areas and the recreation areas is one that can be well considered.

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the challenge of the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood and the issue that she leads the charge of all government members on the Department of Highways to establish and extend Highway No. 58 to the borders of Wood Buffalo Park.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this. I was refraining from speaking because I thought, here is a chance to perhaps get one resolution voted on by this Legislature. It seems like we talk every one out and it goes to the bottom of the list. I was hoping that we might be able to vote on this, and perhaps there is still an opportunity this afternoon.

The second reason I had refrained from speaking earlier is that our stand is very well known because it is in writing. We submitted a brief, as the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo mentioned, on behalf of the previous government, which was accepted as the philosophy of the Social Credit Party and of the members here. I thought possibly since so many hon. members have not apparently seen that written submission, that I should outline some of the major points. It is not saying, of course, that every member on this side of the House has to adhere to that particular written document, but that was generally the thinking of the people who are now on this side of the House.

The first concept was that we believe in the objectives set out in The National Parks Act, that we use the parks and leave them unimpaired for future generations.

The sometimes so-called "dispute" between the conservationists and the wildlife enthusiasts and others is not really as severe as it sometimes appears to be. I respect the view of the conservationists. I think it is necessary in our country to have people who perhaps are a little extreme, who want to conserve the beauties of our national parks. If there were no conservationists, possibly we would have no wilderness areas at all. Possibly there would be Coney Island development throughout our national parks.

I am not in favor of Coney Island development in our national parks and I am doubtful if any members of this Legislature are. But I am in favour of having sufficient development; restricted development, as this resolution says; in our national parks in order that the people of Canada and people from other parts of the world may enjoy the beauties of the national parks and still leave them unimpaired. I think the extent to which we want to go is the only real dispute between the conservationists and the rest of the people.

The conservationists fear that every time we add additional development, every time we add additional commercial development, every time we add additional housing or camping facilities to our national parks, that that is just one more encroachment. We never had a policy declared by the Canadian government, that I know of, indicating when this will end. Because, if it never ends, there will be a time some time in the future, probably not in our lifetime, but some time in the future, when there will be no more area in the national park that can be used as wilderness park, that can be used only for foot traffic, that will retain the beauties of the park unimpaired for generations yet unborn.

I believe that the conservationists have a point when they emphasize that it's necessary to know when this policy of development will end.

36-42

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

I don't think we've reached the point in our national parks in this province as yet, where we fear that we're going to have no wilderness areas, no undeveloped areas in the future. There is still ample time for us to set the outside boundaries of development, and I think that should be done. I think we owe that to the people of this country who believe that we are endangering the future of the national parks through the present day development, because each development is one more encroachment and there's no indication when the encroachment on the wilderness areas and the other areas will cease. I believe they have a very valid point in that regard.

However, I can't go along with the conservationist's extreme view that we have now reached that stage in our national parks when there should be no more campsites, no more motels, no more commercial developments of any kind. I personally believe in a portion of the development set out in the Lake Louise Village concept. Already the area that is partially developed in the Lower Village could be improved. Certainly by improving and developing the Lower Village it is not going to interfere with the beauties or the enjoyment of the National Park, except to add to the beauties and add to the facilities.

When you go to the Upper Village, it's another point that has to be considered very carefully. Is that just one more encroachment that will mean another encroachment and another encroachment, until we do finally have no national park left for the preservation of the parks as they are?

I believe that Canadians generally agree that there should always be part of the national parks retained in their wilderness areas so that future generations, whether it be 100 or 500 or 1,000 years from now, can go to our national parks and see a portion of the park as it existed from the beginning - a complete wilderness area. I believe that the concept, as set out by the Canadian government in their programs, is a concept of preserving portions of the national park unspoiled by human hands, untouched by human hands, and untouched by motor vehicles. I believe this is valid and I think this is sound. But to say that there must be no more campsites and no more trails and no more roads at this stage, I think, is being too extreme and is not satisfying, as many hon. members have said today, the needs of the Canadian people, or the needs of others.

The idea of ring roads around certain portions of the Banff National Park and other national parks, I think, is a sound concept. Because if those ring roads are not put there, hundreds of people, hundreds of Canadians, hundreds of people from other countries will not be able to enjoy those portions of the National Park. Only a small percentage will walk into the National Parks. Let's make sure that when we put our ring roads in, we reserve and preserve portions for the future, so that those who want to walk, those who want to see an unspoiled area of the national park, those who want to see an untouched area of the national park - untouched by human hands - will have the opportunity of doing so.

In the presentation that it was my pleasure to make on behalf of the previous government at the National Parks Hearing, which was also attended by the hon. Minister Without Portfolio in charge of Tourism in the province today, I tried to emphasize this concept and many people misunderstood.

To build ring roads does not mean that we want the entire park made into a Coney Island. We would be most adamant in opposing any such concept, but we do think there is a place for reasonable development of roads, for the increase in the number of campsites, for an increase in the number of hotel beds, and an increase in the number of eating places, facilities that the people require in order that more and more of our people may enjoy the national parks as they exist.

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-43

I can't follow the arguments of those who want to keep people out of the national parks, whether they are Canadians, or whether they are from Europe, Asia or the southern depths of Africa or South America; I just don't follow that concept. Surely, the parks are there, surely, millions of people can go through, enjoy the grandeur of the mountains and leave them unimpaired.

Leave them unimpaired! I think that is the objective. The more people who come to the national parks, the better I personally will like it. It is beauty that every living soul should enjoy, should have an opportunity of seeing. I wish more Albertans would have the opportunity, the economic chance of going to our national parks, that more Canadians, more Maritimers, more people from central Canada, would have the opportunity of seeing the grandeur and the beauty of our mountains and that scenery.

I think there is much to be said in favour of this resolution, in restricting recreational zones. This isn't saying it should become a Coney Island; it isn't saying that we are not going to leave unimpaired and unspoiled areas; it isn't saying that we are not going to leave wilderness areas, but it is really saying the reverse. We want these areas retained, unimpaired for future generations, but we also want sufficient facilities so that these wilderness areas and these areas unspoiled and untouched by human hands may be enjoyed by human beings. I think that is an important item.

There is another concept I would like to develop briefly in connection with this, too. I believe there is much to be said in the provincial government having some control within our national parks. There are different ways of doing it, and I am not sure which is the best of many ways or the better of any two ways. I think there is one suggestion that the campsites of Jasper and Banff be enlarged, and within that zoned area, we have all of the development, and leave everything else unimpaired. This may have possibilities, it may have ramifications that are not satisfactory, too. But it is a concept that is worth considering. I think it has some merit.

Another alternative suggestion is that there be a joint jurisdiction of national parks, whereby the Canadian government and the government of the province in which the national park is located, may have a board which will decide on future development. The interests of those closest to the park will be heard, and their day in court will be held. Also, in the national interest, we must hold the parks unimpaired.

I think this is possible. In our submission to the Canadian government, we suggested there be a joint board set up in connection with provincial parks as well.

I don't think we consider our national parks separately from our provincial parks. Many people say; "Do all the development in the provincial parks and absolutely no development in the national parks." This isn't sound. People still want to go to the national parks and they should have the opportunity of getting a bed without driving many, many hours through the night, as I have had to do, as perhaps many of the hon. members have had to do in the busy tourist season, because there just are not enough facilities to serve the demand. After having said that, I think there is also some real sense in saying; "Let's see how much development should take place in the national park, and how much should take place in provincial parks." So that when people come here from the Maritimes or Newfoundland, or USA or Europe or Asia or South America or Mexico, that we can say to them; "Here are our national parks and here are our provincial parks, and there are beauties in both of them." There are attractions, in both of them, distinctive attractions and I think that we would have an opportunity of getting more people into our provincial parks and keeping them in Alberta longer, as the hon.

36-44

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

Minister of Tourism is advocating, to keep them in Alberta longer, and I think this is a sound approach.

So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we don't throw out altogether the idea that the provincial government should have some say in connection with national parks within their boundaries. I remember speaking to two ministers in the Quebec government a number of years ago and when I asked them; "How come you don't have national parks in the Province of Quebec, they are all provincial parks?" -- and they have some beautiful provincial parks -- and the minister answered; "We want control, complete control, over any park within the Province of Quebec."

To a degree it made sense. It doesn't keep out anybody from British Columbia or Alberta, or Saskatchewan, but it's developed in accordance with the concept of the people of Quebec and, the minister said, "in the national interest".

Perhaps there's reason, as the hon. member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest said that we don't want to go all the way. Perhaps there's reason why the Canadian government would not want a national park to be completely under the jurisdiction of the provincial government. But I think there are really good grounds to get some say in the development of the national parks. And I would like to see the provincial government follow that concept through in an effort to do so.

There's just one other point I would like to mention in connection with this resolution. That is the idea of having development on the boundaries just outside the national parks. I hope we don't throw this idea out entirely. I believe there's a tremendous possibility in the Canmore area to develop dormitories and facilities that hundreds of people would use.

Some of the reasons why I advocate this are that - number one, taxation would come to the Province of Alberta under the present setup. I think the Province of Alberta deserves some of the revenue from the people who come from the United States to visit our national parks. And it would also build up a very excellent town in the Town of Canmore where there's a lot of beauty. Where there's the Three Sisters for instance, these could be advertised all over the world - you might have the bachelors coming in here by the thousands to see the Three Sisters who won't resist -- the Three Sisters of Canmore -- the beauties are there, just as good and just as nice as the beauties inside the park -- not quite as nice as the beauties of Drumheller, but almost -- but the beauties are there.

And, Mr. Speaker, I think we should be encouraging some of the development to take place on the boundaries. I think something similar could be done in connection with Jasper, in the Hinton Entrance areas where there is still a lot of potential for development, where people can then still go in and enjoy the national parks. I don't think that will satisfy some people who want to be right at the site of their skiing. I don't think we could carry their judgment on this type of thing. But there are a lot of people who go to the national parks not for skiing but for many, many other purposes who would like to live on the outside and be able to go in and out as they choose. I think it has merit.

In conclusion, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I support the resolution and I think it's well worth considering and well worth proceeding with in the way of discussions with the government of this country, the Canadian government.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I didn't think I was going to get on for a minute. I recognize that the hon. member is almost as windy as I am. To

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-45

begin with, Mr. Speaker, I don't see how anybody can vote against this resolution. This resolution is reason, it is a middle-of-the-road resolution, it says that we should consider approval of the concept of expanding recreational facilities in our national parks for Alberta families and visitors to our province, and to encourage the establishment of a restricted recreational zone within our parks.

We all agree, Mr. Speaker, but the real questions are what kind of facilities, when, and by whom. And the federal government of course answered this question, or attempted to answer this question when they put out their document with respect to the development within the park, and this document was referred to fairly extensively, but I would just like to make several very quick remarks in connection with this document.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

MR. YURKO:

First of all I would like to suggest that this document suffers from a number of deficiencies. It was established with very little consultation from the province. The Alberta contribution to this document was this little submission that the hon. Member for Drumheller was referring to. This was the total government input into a federal policy on the development of basically 10 per cent of Alberta.

MR. HENDERSON:

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister table the input of the present government?

MR. YURKO:

No, I have the floor and I don't have very much time. And, Mr. Speaker, I can't accept that --

MR. PAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I'm sure the hon. minister wants to be accurate. This was not the total input, there were also a number of oral conversations with ministers from the federal government, in Calgary, in Edmonton and in Ottawa.

MR. YURKO:

It has been difficult to find some record of those oral conversations, Mr. Speaker, perhaps there were some but they don't contribute much to the debate or the resolution of this problem.

The second thing I would like to suggest in connection with this document is that they haven't fully defined 'land use classifications'. They touch on it, they divide it into five areas; special, wilderness, recreation, natural environment, general outdoor recreation, and intensive use. But none of these classifications has been fully defined, or even partially defined.

In the area of intensive use, no one says whether it is recognized that a city of 100,000 people can be placed in that area, 10,000 people, 15,000 people, or 30,000 people. No one has given any indication what criteria would in fact be used to define the conditions with respect to intensive use of a portion of this park. No one has given any indication, very much indication, as to how you establish the parameter of general outdoor recreation

36-46

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

Now I can agree with some of the parameters established in this park in connection with such things as campsites. There has been a pretty good study in this regard, but in the area of intensive use, there is little to guide anyone in connection with this aspect of it, particularly with respect to its relationship to the borders and the rest of Alberta.

I would like to say one other thing, Mr. Speaker. The federal government hasn't attempted to establish what the people of Canada really want in connection with their parks. They haven't attempted to establish what the people of Alberta want in connection with the development of their parks. They haven't taken the poll of the people, they haven't taken a survey of the people. Their officials have blindly put this document together and tossed it out, and certain people, which included the hon. member, Mr. Taylor, made a little submission of this type. So I suggest to you that public hearings are in order and are certainly necessary in connection with any development, until a total approach to what the people of Canada and the people of Alberta want is made.

MR. HENDERSON:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. minister starting the federal election campaign by any chance? I wonder if he has some inside information on that subject.

MR. YURKO:

I just want to suggest that the federal government has given no indication of a time schedule of the development in connection with the federal parks at all -- and whether or not they envision this as a short term solution to the problem, a long term solution, or a short and long term solution to the problem.

Mr. Speaker, we all have viewpoints on these matters. It is difficult for two or three of us to agree. As a matter of fact, we recognize that we have people on the extreme left of the scale and on the extreme right of the scale, but most of us are right in the middle. And when we get the extreme left and the extreme right together it is amazing how fast they come to the middle, which is the rational viewpoint ...

MR. HENDERSON:

Which is the middle?

MR. YURKO:

A viewpoint in fact that we should enjoy our parks and we should have controlled development of our parks.

Now I want to suggest that the provincial government must base its stand, and its long-range stand, on certain government policies or along certain policies.

MR. TAYLOR:

When are we going to hear it?

MR. YURKO:

And some of the criteria that must be used in this regard are:

(1) A total management plan for the parks, that's the national parks, tied into development around the areas around the park, as well as tied into the provincial parks;

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-47

(2) the promotion of tourism and tourist potential on a planned and a programmed basis, and not on a haphazard, uncontrolled basis;

(3) a provincial input into all matters affecting national park development.

I want to suggest that we held a land-use seminar in connection with the government, and we asked if there was any type of liaison between the provincial government and the federal government with respect to the 10 per cent of the land in Alberta that was directly administered by the federal government, and I understand that there is no such liaison whatsoever.

I would also like to suggest that our policies must be based on the recognition that, in fact, our environment and our beauty of this province is our most valuable and lasting resource. Oil and energy resources are not our most lasting resource; our most lasting resource is the beauty of this province that has been willed to us and this, I suggest, must form part of our policy.

Before I quit so we can take a vote I want to suggest that I have written -- or wired -- the hon. Mr. Davis in connection with whether or not environmental impact studies were done on the Lake Louise Project; whether or not water quality studies were done in connection with the Lake Louise Project; whether or not any studies in connection with the effect of a city or the effect of a substantial number of people in an intensive use area had been studied. The information that I received is that the Department of the Environment has done no studies, and it is acting in an advisory capacity to the Department of Northern Development.

In light of this information I have to say, as a man charged for instigating policies associated with a rational development of the environment, that I for one can't accept the Lake Louise Project at this point in time. I believe it is premature, as it is presented to the people of Alberta today, in all its complexity. But I do suggest that this resolution is a very sound and practical resolution, and adopts the rational viewpoint, and brings together all the viewpoints of all the people of Alberta which have been expressed so well in the last several months, and I think we all should vote for it. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Question has been called. I wonder if the mover, the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, wants to make a comment before we vote?

MR. SHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to thank all of those who contributed so usefully to this debate, and I am pleased that it is going to a question and I close debate on that basis.

[The motion was passed without further debate or dissent.]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It now being 5:30 p.m. I would rule that we adjourn until 8:00 p.m. tonight.

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

* * * * *

36-48

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

* * * * *

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

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS
(Committee of the Whole)

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for consideration of Bill No. 39, The Municipalities Assistance Amendment Act, 1972.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 8:01 p.m.]

* * * * *

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of the Whole Assembly will come to order.

Bill No. 39
The Municipalities Assistance Amendment Act, 1972

[All sections of the bill, the title and the preamble, were agreed to without debate.]

MR. RUSSELL:

I move that Bill No. 39 be reported.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise and report.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

* * * * *

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at 8:03 p.m.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration Bill No. 39, The Municipalities Assistance Amendment Act, 1972 and begs to report the same.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the report, does the House agree to receive the report?

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-49

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that you again leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply for consideration of the estimates. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 8:05 p.m.]

* * * * *

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Diachuk resumed the Chair]

Department of Industry and Commerce (cont.)

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of Supply will come to order.

Total Income Account

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. minister if he could advise on Order in Council 2125 dated December 15th, the sum of \$21,500 which was provided to carry out a transportation study. I was wondering if the hon. minister would tell us who received this contract and when it would be finished?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Chairman, the contract was LaBorde Simat. The contract was for an over-view of transportation problems affecting the province of Alberta in rail, air and highway, and part of that study has been completed. Approximately \$10,000 has been advanced and the rest of the study is yet to come.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Chairman, would the hon. minister advise as to whether or not he would regard this report as being of a confidential nature, or would he be able to table the part that he has received so far?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Chairman, we wouldn't want to table any part of the report, but when the report is completed and we've used it, it will be made information of the House.

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Chairman, could I direct a question to the minister? Would the transportation study also look into the Board of Transportation Commissions, with representation as it is in the rest of Canada for Alberta? Is the study going into that area, or just specifically Alberta?

36-50

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Member for Smoky River is asking about the Canadian Transport Commission...

MR. BARTON:

Right.

MR. PEACOCK:

Yes, we will be including them in our appraisal and study and determination of what the future representation might be, if it can be such that Albertans can be on the CTC. There is one Albertan on there now, by the name of Mr. LaBorde.

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Minister, but the actual Board of Transport Commission is located in Ottawa, and the communication out here is very limited. It should be changed every so often.

MR. PEACOCK:

We're certainly taking this under advisement. That's a good point.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. He mentioned a study in overall Alberta. Now is there any tie-in here to the study that's already underway at the national level, involving grain distribution and handling? Because there's an input there by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Highways into statistical information, and so on. Now, is there any tie-in here in these two?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Chairman, in order to answer the hon. member, I think that there are many studies going on. I think I announced in this House that the provinces of British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan, along with the facility handlers and the transportation companies are establishing the Pacific Transportation Council. They are, at the present time, making a physical assessment of the movement of product from Saskatchewan, Alberta and B.C. to the coast, and vice-versa, and that is to make a physical inventory. We have the Prairie Economic Council, which covers Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan, and they also have various studies in hand. We have studies within the province in the City of Calgary and the City of Edmonton in relation to air routes. There have been federal studies in relation to grain, grain handling, and grain movement, and co-ordination of these is being attempted. That's the reason for the LaBorde Simat report that we're having right now to co-ordinate all these reports and bring them into focus.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Minister, I was very interested in your executive report for 1972, and the predictions therein, among other things. I was wondering if there will be a follow-up to assess the accuracy of the predictions in this executive report?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Chairman, we attempt to evaluate all our predictions on a quarterly basis and then on a yearly basis.

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-51

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Minister, in the foreword, you indicate the objectives of the series of executive reports, and I was wondering -- considering this approach in economic planning -- will consideration be given in the future to expand the forecast periods to include longer terms of predictions, similar to those in the private sector?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. Member for Bow River, we are very limited in our research facilities and I don't say that with any apology because when we get into econometric and input and output tables, they are on a long-range basis, and they are very costly procedures. They weren't done in the previous government and we are just taking them under consideration now. Before those figures have any meaningful relationship to a forecast it takes some considerable time. I think that without actually getting into the reports themselves it is sufficient to say that certainly we will try to broaden our knowledge; we will try to work closer with the federal government on the statistics and the output that they have on economic forecasts. We will try to work closer with the private sector. It is our intent to do everything possible to get the best forecast that we can, and the most appropriate means that are available within the economic limits of our budget which you are going to permit us -- I hope, tonight -- to pass.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. minister, your report shows that over 600 executives of firms were polled. I was wondering if you could advise us, how did you choose the specific executives in each industry classification? For example, were you taking into consideration the size of the firms, or did you approach it on a random sampling basis or by some other method?

MR. PEACOCK:

I think they were taken with some degree of deliberation in size so that there would be a cross-sampling of everything from small to large.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, we have gone through two or three departments now. I believe that in the Department of Industry and Development it is probably worthwhile to do a brief review of the condition of industry, development, etc. as this government found it in this province.

The many claims made for recognition by the 'now' government I think are unfounded, unwarranted, and uncalled for, and in all likelihood will be unfulfilled unless there is some drastic change in thinking. They have a tendency to make rather far-fetched pronouncements as to what they are going to achieve, when they haven't even set --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Ludwig, there is a point of order. Yes, Mr. Gitter?

MR. GITTER:

I would hope at this time that the hon. member would direct his statements to the estimates and that we will not be getting into one of these harangues, and that we can proceed with the business of the House. If he has a point relating to the estimates, I am sure we are all interested in hearing it.

36-52

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, you will recall when I asked you at the beginning of the debate, that you would permit the same latitude on the total income account as you did at the beginning. I think the hon. member should be excused because he was not here when this was done, so I guess he should be permitted his interruption. When it comes to harangues, I believe that he is also a person -- I do not wish to be interrupted, Mr. Chairman -- he hasn't got a point of order, and he can't defeat me.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How do you know he hasn't a point of order?

MR. LUDWIG:

He hasn't said it. He got up and he didn't say Point of Order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Ludwig, and Mr. Gitter, I want to point out that several days ago I did indicate that before the total income account would be approved, we would be given a second opportunity for general discussion and further questions. I hope, Mr. Ludwig, you could speed it up and go ahead and continue doing it.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to expedite it providing the hon. members would sit down and keep quiet. I listened to their harangue --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

What is your point of order, Mr. Appleby?

MR. APPLEBY:

Would the hon. member who is speaking there turn his microphone so we can hear if it is anything worth listening to?

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I am sure he is anxious, and I will fill his ears for him by the time the night is over. Thank you. After listening to some of the gibberish from the other side, they should be entitled to have me reciprocate in kind at least.

As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, they have made some far-fetched pronouncements, and unless they start mistaking pronouncements for fulfilment, we ought to do a little review as to what has gone on and taken place in Alberta in the last 25 years. I say 25 years because really, we have had interruptions of the war and a very slow start in this province in 1935 when the whole economy of Canada was stagnant and there was no progress anywhere, but from 1947 to 1972 -- which is roughly 25 years -- there has been one of the most outstanding and exciting developments in this province industrially and otherwise, in fact, more so than in the rest of Canada.

We caught up -- we not only caught up to a lot of provinces who were far ahead of us but we outstripped them -- and when I get through reading some of the things that I have in mind here Mr. Speaker, the hon. members will be pleased to agree that there is lots to be grateful for and lots to be thankful for in this province. As I stated, Mr. Speaker, that pronouncement is not a fulfilment, and even though they have announced an ambitious program of \$50 million which has now been watered down to more loans, I must say that the behaviour of this government in some of their attitudes and their indecision will probably offset adversely the money which the hon.

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-53

minister has been boasting they will pump into rural development primarily. First of all in this province between 1950 and 1972 we grew in population by about 32,000 per year. That's an indication that there were things happening in this province, that there were advantages for the people to come here to settle down, to invest, and to help this province grow. We attracted professional people; we attracted skilled people; we attracted unskilled people from all over the world, who came here and settled down --

MR. PURDY:

Point of Order! Are we discussing the 1972-73 estimates or the estimates of the Department of Industry 45 years ago?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Thank you. Mr. Ludwig, continue.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, we attracted not only a lot of people from all over the world but a lot of the members opposite in here came here from elsewhere, and when you look at the first row of the government you will know that there was a lot of success -- both economically and otherwise -- room for self improvement, room for self establishment and a good place -- as some people said -- not only to live but to settle down and protect the estates that we have acquired. Now the hon. Deputy Premier -- who is seldom here these days, he doesn't want to hear what anybody else says after he has spoken his mind -- leaves until the time he has something else to say and sometimes you can't blame him -- [Interjections] -- when you hear him stand up and make pronouncements of what they will do, what they have done, but primarily when he waffles on any decision. I am beginning to think that the industry that has had faith in this province and that has come here and invested and expanded so rapidly is having second thoughts, because more and more they are beginning to realize that things have changed, and they are not going to know where they stand. I am referring primarily to those in primary industry. Even now they are in doubt as to what the Premier stands for. So far he has done more talking than action and they are a little leary of which way the government might jump -- if any way at all.

So far it hasn't been action that has frightened them or made them doubt, it's been talk. When the hon. Premier stands up and says there was no plan in Alberta for industrial development and no plan in Canada until he came up -- then he forgot to tell his plan. I think that that kind of a statement needs to be brought in line, needs to be exposed and I would like to take a few minutes, Mr. Chairman, to indicate that there has been a plan -- a very good plan, a plan that so many people liked, came here and stayed because of what they liked.

Firstly the plan for the development of Alberta commenced with a government whose word was bond. They came here and they trusted this government; they trusted this province. Everything you see about you, most of what you see about you by way of physical assets was produced and developed by private enterprise, and it wasn't because it was an advantage to come and build and develop in Alberta. Because Alberta, as you all know, was geographically handicapped. We had a small population; we had a population that was not trained and we had competition from other provinces that had these advantages, competition from industrialized provinces like Ontario with cheap transportation, good local markets and an advantage in international trade; competition from a province like British Columbia that had good transport facilities, good transportation for bringing materials in and out -- against all these odds -- and I'm saying that Alberta beat the odds under the Social Credit government and came up a winner.

36-54

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

I'm predicting, Mr. Chairman, that if the present government will be able -- with all their promises and borrowing and spending -- to continue the pace of development, the average pace of development that we had in the last 25 years, particularly in the last 10 years, they will be commended for having done a good job. But so far there have been many pronouncements and I don't want them to feel that their pronouncements are fulfilment. These cliches of 'new thrust' and 'new direction' have not been substantiated by anything that they intend to do by way of planning.

The plan that the Social Credit government had for building Alberta and making it a better place to live in was, among other things, the production of facilities for education, for training people, for producing skilled people of whom we were short. The hon. Minister of Advanced Education knows that this is so, and I'm sure that he will do well to emulate the programs of the last government, and keep Alberta on the road of progress we have enjoyed in the last 25 years. We built schools, we built hospitals, we built roads, we built institutions, we built all kind of public service buildings, provincial buildings, and to date they have been paid for.

From now on it's going to be a different kind of a ball game. The decline of the good things that happened under Social Credit are going to be gradually eroded under this government. They have already made their first steps. I'll just take one example of the museum in Calgary where an \$8 million gift which was trumpeted by this government is going to cost the people of this province at least \$20 million to repay. That is what I mean by the decline under this government. It has commenced already, and it will be accelerated as time goes by.

As I stated, we built all the tech. schools, the vocational schools, the universities, -- [Interjections]. Of course it is, but which province did better than Alberta? You know that, yes --

MR. BATHUK:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman. Would you be able to tell me whether there is any way to change the station on this thing? I would like to listen to something more interesting.

MR. LUDWIG:

If the hon. member --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Please continue Mr. Ludwig.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman I'll accommodate the hon. member -- he usually falls asleep when everybody else speaks -- I'll speak with a quieter tone, maybe that will help him. Goodnight!

Mr. Chairman, I didn't mind being heckled but I don't appreciate the hissing.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Ludwig, I'm not recognizing them, so please continue.

MR. LUDWIG:

As I stated, we built the finest universities; our vocational schools, our tech. schools are second to none. Our vocational colleges, our schools -- I doubt whether any province can come up with a better record per capita than Alberta.

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-55

You people trim the fat from the budget, and now you'll be spending much less, I suppose? The only fat you'll trim off will probably be in the one department that shouldn't be set up to begin with -- the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Permit me to go back into the trade and industry department. You --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Ludwig, I wonder if you could continue with your presentation and disregard the comments, because they are not addressing the Chair, and if you continue this way of debating then I will have to recognize Mr. Wilson who is waiting to speak again. Please continue.

MR. LUDWIG:

You know, Mr. Chairman, I don't appreciate the threat of what you're going to do to me -- it's up to you to stop the heckling -- not me.

AN. HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

But you are reacting, so please continue.

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes. You know, Mr. Chairman, when I talk about the great development that happened in Alberta in the last 25 years it's hard to convince the hon. members opposite because they can't see anybody doing anything good except what they're proposing. I'm just going to thumb through this magazine here, "Annual Report on Alberta". Most of them haven't seen it, and they wouldn't want to read it anyway, because it tells what a wonderful province this is and how dynamic it is. I'm saying that if they can keep up to what has happened they will be doing a tremendous job.

[Interjection]

It's quite a story, Mr. Chairman. When I hear the hon. minister say what a tremendous new thrust they're going to have and here is one page that says;

"Edmonton becomes new centre of the growing West. Edmonton is on the move; it is moving upward and outward at a rate that has made it one of Canada's fastest-growing metropolitan areas since the early 1960's; so it was again last year and so" . . . the record continues . . . "Edmonton establishes itself as the new centre for the growing west."

This was 1969 that this magazine was written and I would doubt if any hon. member here would want to take issue with the stand taken by this article. It says here,

"City building permits last year recorded a 14.3 per cent increase to a level of \$165 million. Approximately 49 per cent of this construction volume was residential, 30 per cent institutions, 19 per cent commercial."

It says here, "Industrial projects attracted \$99,556,000 in new capital investment; launching 59 new industrial plants within the city while throughout the metropolitan area a total of 112 new plants brought in \$726 million."

This was in 1969 --

36-56

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

MR. COPITHORNE:

Read what it says --

MR. LUDWIG:

You can read. You had your time to talk -- do your own speech -- who's making the speech, you or I? I've got the floor -- I have more claim to tell you how to make a speech, because you haven't even made one yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Ludwig, would you please continue and either address your comments to the Chair and disregard the --

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, with deference to the Chair, I have enough trouble with them opposite without you interrupting me all the time.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I sincerely mean it, your colleague Mr. Wilson is waiting to speak so please continue.

MR. LUDWIG:

Well, Mr. Wilson will get up in due course -- there's lots of time -- what's the rush?

AN. HON. MEMBER:

We've got all night.

MR. LUDWIG:

"Plans outpaced: " another paragraph -- "Against this background city planners are this year reviewing 15-year development estimates prepared in 1964, many of which have now been outpaced."

I am reading this to stress to you that the progress in Alberta under this government was the envy of the rest of the provinces of Canada and here we have an hon. minister get up and make some claims to recognition that he will never fulfill, that he inherited the wilderness and he is going to get everything off the ground, and in a year we'll all be on easy street. I've got news for him, because he hasn't even decided what he is going to do.

Then it says here,

"As a further measure of general economic growth, five or six years ago Edmonton's tallest building was eight stories. Then in a furious high-rise spree the city acquired some 50 new buildings ranging between six and 20 stories."

Now they have all been topped by the 27-storey CN Tower and the 35-storey Chateau Lacombe, and since then all hon. members who have flown in and out of Calgary know that the -- I mean Edmonton -- the skyline of Edmonton has been changing annually. It's a beautiful sight -- it's the sight of a dynamic city and a dynamic province -- and all this without a speck of input by the Conservatives, either provincially or federally.

Another one here,

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-57

"Alberta Government Telephones is erecting a 33-storey building as part of the AGT Oxford Development. Another \$33 million twin-tower project."

This is just a brief review of the things that were happening, primarily under private enterprise and private investment, without too much government meddling or any preference of loans to people through government auspices because we were able to compete. And I am saying that this government has been able to beat the odds of competition and handicap of geographic location.

I don't want to feel that Edmonton was the only place there was action in this province, here's another one. "Calgary, has \$738 million of new projects planned underway," that is a good record to follow and try to keep up to, Mr. Minister. It says here, "Calgary should continue to attract more and more secondary industry and diversified industry, says Co-ordinator Ford." He adds that growth during the past ten years has been exceptional and this picture should continue. It mentions big new plants, and the largest new industry amount last year was a \$3 million concrete and steel pipe mill for Canada Iron Foundries. Construction will begin this summer in southeast Calgary, and it goes on and on. It goes on enumerating the tremendous influx of industry which was attracted to Alberta and developed, without all the wonderful things that the hon. minister is going to do for this province.

I want to get these facts on record, Mr. Chairman, because it's a good place for the hon. minister to begin from. He could stand up and admit that there was action in this province and there was a lot of it.

I'd now like to deal with a couple of points that the hon. minister has raised. One of them; he talks about doing something about the freight rates. It's a noble intention on his part. I must say that when the Conservatives held the federal government -- when they held office in Ottawa, there was not a stronger supporter in Western Canada for lower freight rates than John Deifenbaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, you can applaud all you like but he didn't manage to do anything for us in spite of an overwhelming Conservative majority. Somehow, either Ontario or Quebec -- or both of them put together -- decided that they were not going to subsidize Alberta and the west, and things will not be different from now on. I'm submitting that the hon. minister may be indulging in a lot of wishful thinking. We're behind him in anything that can be done to lower the freight rates or hold the line. But I'm submitting that he is going to have his biggest opposition from MP's down east -- and Conservative MP's at that. So it's good luck to the hon. minister, but I really don't think he has an idea where to begin to fight this thing. He might start with the Conservative MP's who have not been given much recognition in Alberta since the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs has become established. He feels that the MP's don't exist anymore. Well as far as some of our problems are concerned, they don't exist -- they haven't been able to help us.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How many MP's did your --

36-58

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

MR. LUDWIG:

Real Caoutte probably doesn't do as much talking but I think he's heard just as much as the Conservative MP from Western Canada.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Let's hear your federal voice!

MR. LUDWIG:

I hear the hon. members are getting sensitive, they even berate us for becoming involved in Medicare, and the hon. Deputy Premier couldn't find a Conservative MP who voted against it on third reading -- that's the sad story of our --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Ludwig, Medicare does not come under Industries and Commerce. Please.

MR. LUDWIG:

What does it come under?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A couple of departments we haven't got into yet.

MR. HYNDMAN:

He's being irrelevant again.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, once more the hon. third Deputy Premier is talking about relevance when today he made a mockery out of parliamentary rules by trying to debate against voting two motions at once. He's the last man to talk about relevance.

Mr. Chairman, in concluding my remarks, I believe that the hon. minister has received one or two items to reply to, I think that in concluding, one of the biggest dangers we face in Alberta for decline in economic development, is what has been stated by the hon. Premier -- the indecisions, the reputation of indecisions he has been able to establish in the short time in office; in not being able to get off the cross-roads -- he has arrived there, and it appears that he has difficulty in making a decision which may not be popular in all quarters. That has been an obvious weakness and is going to hurt us in business.

I think that I stated that the odds against success in Alberta, when you look back to 1947, are formidable. They were the highest odds faced by any province. We were geographically isolated, we had a small population, the freight rates coming and going were a handicap, and the competition in other parts of Canada was established long before we got going. There was little Canadian interest in investment in Alberta. They had other attractive places to invest. There was not only little interest in investing in Alberta, but few, if any, people knew about Alberta. Twenty-five years under Social Credit has made a tremendous and dramatic change. Once more, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. minister can emulate and follow -- and at least keep pace with -- what we have done in the last 25 years, he will be worthy of recognition when he steps down from office.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-59

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, will the hon. member permit a question? Would you permit a question?

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes.

MR. MINIELY:

You said that in 1947 there were very poor conditions in Alberta, and that since then, in the last 25 years, was when the boom really took place. When was oil discovered in Alberta?

MR. LUDWIG:

In 1947. Any more questions?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Deputy Premier.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, after that bunch of nonsense, and seeing as how we are quoting 1969 newspapers, just to make the record complete, I would like to quote one from 1969 also that has to do with this department. It's the --

MR. LUDWIG:

You're always negative.

DR. HORNER:

Well, we are being positive, hon. member, just hold on. This is the Alberta Industrial Review, a fairly independent magazine. They start out with this headline --

MR. LUDWIG:

What is the name?

DR. HORNER:

It is the Alberta Business Journal, March-April 1969. I think that is comparable to the papers the hon. member was quoting. It starts out with this line in this editorial, Mr. Chairman:

"Alberta needs a new Minister of Industry and Tourism."

It goes on, and I could read the whole thing if the hon. member wants but there are a couple of punch lines that I think are worthwhile. First of all:

"The Department needs a shake-up. Objectives must be redefined. Goals must be set, programs established, and a man found who can get the job done."

Then we go on, and the editor obviously knows that there is a fair amount of business activity taking place in that --

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, will the hon. minister permit a question?

DR. HORNER:

No, I am busy quoting about the hon. member.

36-60

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

MR. CHAIRMAN:

No, he has indicated no.

MR. LUDWIG:

Did you write the article? Who wrote it?

DR. HORNER:

Don Sylvester -- a very good supporter of the previous government.

MR. LUDWIG:

I doubt that very much.

DR. HORNER:

He got a lot of business from the previous government, printing nice little magazines and so on.

MR. LUDWIG:

He sounds like a defeated Conservative candidate.

DR. HORNER:

Well, it is Don Sylvester and I am sure he is well known to the hon. gentleman opposite. It goes on, Mr. Speaker, and he obviously says that things haven't, in fact, been happening in Alberta, all of which is not to say -- and I am quoting:

"There has not been healthy industrial growth in Alberta. There has, but in no large way. Is it due to the effort of the Department of Industry and Tourism? That in fact is the heart of the problem."

It ends up on this note, Mr. Chairman:

"As we all discover sooner or later, you never really know what can be done until you try. Up until now the provincial government hasn't really tried."

Mr. Chairman, we listened to a really political harangue by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View. It reminds me of Sir John A. Macdonald's famous quote in the Legislature. "The hon. gentleman may not have exhausted the subject, but he has certainly exhausted the House". For to continue in this partisan way, what he expects to accomplish by it, is beyond me. I would have thought that he would have joined with us in trying to develop industry in Alberta, particularly secondary industry. I would have thought that he would have joined with some of his colleagues in other areas of southern Alberta and in the north, who are trying desperately to get secondary industry established in their areas. I would have thought that he would have talked at least to the hon. Member for Lethbridge and got some insight into what, in fact, has happened down there in the last six months. I would have thought that he would have made a few inquiries on how the new Minister of Industry and Tourism was handling these kind of problems.

I heard an industrialist the other day who is going to spend a great deal of money in Alberta -- in southern Alberta, in Lethbridge -- walk out of his office and say "that's a refreshing experience for me. That's the first time I ever approached the government at either provincial or federal level that I have got some answers and got some action within two weeks." That's the kind of response we're getting from the Minister of Industry and Tourism. The hon. gentleman,

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-61

obviously, is again making one his famous speeches from ignorance, and he continues to make them in this Legislature. It doesn't really help the business of the House, whatsoever. He continues to ramble around and fight the election all over again. I'd suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if he really wants to be worthwhile that he be positive and look forward to four years from now, and he should start creating his image as a statesman.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to tell the hon. minister who just spoke that he's not obliged to believe what I say, but he should at least have enough intelligence to believe what he sees about him. How can you argue with a man who shuts his eyes and says, "We've inherited the wilderness and nothing happened till we got here." That's his speech.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Chairman, I'm still interested in the executive report for 1972, and have a few more questions in that regard. In lieu of the hon. minister's last answer to me, I wonder if I could have his undertaking that he would be willing to table, within the next week, a copy of the questionnaire that was used -- a blank copy, preferably. I would just be interested to note the make-up of the questions that were included in that questionnaire.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Chairman, we'd be pleased to do that.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Chairman, to the minister, in view of statements in the report regarding the uncertainties in the general business outlook being mostly political, what methods will your department employ to seek removal of these political uncertainties?

MR. PEACOCK:

I don't understand how he's talking about political uncertainties. I thought we had removed them.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Chairman, for the edification of the hon. Minister of Industry, in his report, on page 8, for example, there are some references made to political uncertainties, and also on page 2. These involve the co-operation of the federal government, and I was wondering if he and his colleagues are prepared to negotiate with the federal government to overcome these political uncertainties for the benefit of industry in Alberta.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Chairman, that's alluding to situations that any province has little control over. We're talking about political uncertainties in relation to the United States and Canadian relationship. While we have made numerous comments in this House, and I believe, outside this House, the fact is that we would like to have an office in Washington. We recognize that we have a big investment in our natural resources and our BTU's going into the United States. We'd like to have a direct line, or at least communication with our American friends. The fact remains that it's at a federal level and what we can do there is hope that the climate develops so that certain legislation like the Burke-Hartke laws and the DISC programs are rescinded. This is what we're referring to, and certainly will work towards, on a federal basis.

36-62

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Chairman, further on the executive report for the benefit of the many members opposite who, it appears, have not read it. This is a report that is used by business and industry to determine whether or not they are going to expand, whether they're going to venture into new businesses in Alberta, or, say, even other out-of-province businesses coming to Alberta. I think it is very important that regarding the predictions that are made and the suggestions that are made, we realize the background that goes into this report, to make sure that to the best of our ability we are giving out factual information gleaned from the best brains in the business. It appeared to me that this had been accomplished, and if it isn't my job to get up and ask, how am I going to know. I think that the hon. minister took most of my questions as being constructive, to determine the background for this report.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to recap the questions on which the hon. minister has agreed to supply answers and information at a later date, and hopefully, they will come within a week. First of all, he agreed to supply --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Excuse me, Mr. Wilson. Mr. Minister, do you want those handed to you in writing or are you going to remember them?

MR. PEACOCK:

I have a record of them, Mr. Chairman. If they are not forthcoming by then, the hon. member can correct me.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Chairman, before concluding my comments on the Department of Industry, I would like to refer to businessmen in government, and government personnel in business. Traditionally, the government's viewpoints on the difficulty of recruiting experienced businessmen into government service has been one of a lack of co-operation and interest. They say that businessmen are always grouching about being under-represented in government, but when it comes to the point, they refuse to accept government jobs. Businessmen complain about government's efforts to recruit representatives of business and government's inability to make proper use of those whom it does get. This is a real problem, and both sides have an equal interest in resolving it. Clearly, there is a need to enlist men and women of practical experience into the senior ranks of bureaucracy.

An executive who may be willing to contribute a few years to the public service will have to be assured that he will be given the responsibility that he is used to. He will also need reasonable assurance that he will be welcomed back into business with more and not less status after his government experience. These changes are necessary and will not come easily, which clearly indicates a need for good will on both sides.

In many instances, advisory boards are used to partially achieve this goal. Some of the comments in the hon. minister's report for 1972 allude to this problem. In an attempt to solve the problem and to promote public education as to the relationship between government and industry, I would like to make a suggestion for the hon. minister's consideration.

A commission on personnel interchange may well be the vehicle to help achieve these goals. Essentially the purpose would be to foster a better understanding, relationship and co-operative action between business and government by exchanging high talented, high-potential executives for one to two-year periods; to bring innovative and

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-63

effective management practices from one sector to the other, and to develop a cadre of business executives with government experience who could be called upon for high-appointive service in future years.

Specifically, the program should be open to mid-career executives who have a record of previous management abilities and on-the-job accomplishments, a history of increased responsibility in salary, high intellectual capacity and educational achievement, and are recognized as top executives having a broad capacity for leadership.

Salaries for inter-change executives should be paid by their host employer. Employees could go on a leave of absence for 12 to 24 months to work in the other sector. At the end of that period they could return to their sponsoring company or the provincial government. Naturally, close attention would have to be made in integrating people with positions. After making the political decision to proceed on such a program, industry would have to be counselled and encouraged to make nominations from within their ranks. It would have to be made clear that only top-calibre personnel are exchanged.

This is not exactly an original suggestion, but I feel much more can be done in this field. Many governments recruit from industry as your government is doing now, but there is very little flow from government to industry, and the appointments are not usually for specific periods of time, but rather on an expected permanent basis.

Mr. Chairman, while these comments are directed towards the government in general, I made them on this department estimate because of the business experience and background of the current Minister of Industry. He has come to government with diversified industrial knowledge and should be well qualified to implement such a progressive plan.

MR. FARRAN:

I would like to put a few direct questions to the hon. minister of Industry to confirm that his attitude is still as practical as it was a few years ago when we were both interested in promoting industry for the province of Alberta. Mr. Minister, I'd like to put these questions to you and to save the time of the House if you would follow the traditional marriage ceremony and answer 'I do' if you agree, and if you say, 'I don't,' then just elaborate.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Farran, I think it is unfair to pin the minister down ahead of time.

MR. FARRAN:

I may be presenting these in a very unorthodox way, but I think you will find them pertinent.

[Interruptions]

MR. YURKO:

The hon. minister indicated that he and I were often shoulder to shoulder and a member is trying to muscle in our act.

[Interruptions]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Please continue, Mr. Farran.

36-64

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Minister do you remember when we worked together to promote industry for Alberta several years ago when you were president of the Chamber of Commerce?

MR. YURKO:

I do.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Minister, do you remember when we made a long trip to Houston, at which time we improved the air link by changing the Customs checking facilities, and the connection to Denver, and attracted six new industries to Alberta by working through the chartered banks which had branches in Houston?

MR. PEACOCK:

I do.

MR. FARRAN:

Do you still subscribe to the theory that we used to subscribe to, that the best approach was the rifle approach with an elementary market study direct to an industry which might have an interest in Alberta, rather than wasting money on the shotgun approach, or broadcasting generally without a specific target in mind?

MR. PEACOCK:

I do.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Minister, do you also agree with me or still agree that our main hope in Alberta is for a diversification of the petrochemical industry?

MR. PEACOCK:

In part I do.

MR. FARRAN:

Are you allowed to qualify in a marriage ceremony, Mr. Chairman? Do you also agree that one of the most likely hopes for the diversification of industry and the providing of jobs and taxes, and so on, and an increased wealth to Alberta, is the tourist industry?

MR. PEACOCK:

I do.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the minister is extremely well qualified to conduct this department.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Any comments, Mr. Minister, before I pronounce industry and commerce?

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-65

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Chairman, just for the purposes of the record. I referred to the member for Smoky River when replying to Mr. Barton of Lesser Slave Lake, and I would like to make that correction.

I would like to take just one or two moments if I may, Mr. Chairman, to answer a few of the suggestions and comments that were made by the two previous members of the Opposition, in which they related to the situation in Alberta. I think that it has been very rightly said here tonight, that we are all here in this game together. I don't think there is anybody decrying what happened or what was in the past, or what hasn't happened in the past in regard to industry, but what is going to happen today and tomorrow is the important thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. PEACOCK:

We are talking in terms of situations that I can understand. We become a little edgy, particularly when the resource industries of this province have been so beneficial, and I might suggest the climate and the environment -- as far as the Province of Alberta is concerned -- was conducive to the development and the confidence of those people who came in and produced these products. I don't suggest for one moment however, that in taking on this office, that all of a sudden the programs that we have related here in the last three nights of estimates are the panacea to all the problems going to face Alberta in the diversification of its secondary industry.

I do suggest, however, that there are some ideas here that with the co-operation of all Albertans, I think we can build a broader and more diversified labour base, an opportunity for young Albertans -- whether they be coming out of universities, out of the technical schools, the high schools, or the grade schools. I think that this is what we're talking about, and along with my fellow minister, who is shoulder to shoulder with me, we will have quality of life at the same time as we develop these opportunities. These opportunities can only be afforded us if we do a few things that have not -- until this time -- been done. This is all we're saying, and it's just at a time and place in society. It isn't any reflection on any past government or any past people, but rather, at this time and place, we must take the opportunities that are afforded us, and I think the program that is presented to this House in regard to the industry and commerce estimates, will go a long way toward starting this program and helping us along the line of diversification that we're talking about. Thank you.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, whatsoever this Legislature has joined together let not the Canadian government put asunder.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, there are one or two questions I would like to ask the hon. minister. I was reading a report that he gave, back in December of last year, which I thought was a very good one, where he stated that he was going to contact the investment houses about changing their attitude towards investment in western Canada. And I wonder, at the same time as he answers this, if the government has given any consideration to expanding the Treasury Branches, as I think the Premier announced a short time ago, into the Bank of Western Canada or some similar institution? Of course what I have in mind is that we want to be careful if we turn it into a shareholder group -- this particular bank of ours -- because I think we should make sure that the shareholders are Albertans, or at least from the

36-66

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

western provinces. I was wondering if the hon. minister could outline some of his plans that he has, as far as encouraging the present investment houses to do more for the Alberta investor.

MR. MINIELY:

I think on the Treasury Branches, Mr. Chairman, that I should answer the hon. member's question. I think we made it very clear that our government recognizes that there is a shortage of private capital involved in the development of the Province of Alberta, and thus distinguishing private capital as opposed obviously to funds such as the Alberta Opportunity Fund. Now, we said during the election campaign, and we say now, that in the past the Treasury Branches have provided a useful vehicle for citizens of the Province of Alberta to deposit funds, and for these funds to be reloaned into industry and business in Alberta. However, this does not mean that there are no other alternatives, whether they be an alternative to the present system, or whether they be an addition to the Treasury Branch system, or any combination of factors that may be involved that our government should be looking at with respect even to improving and increasing the amount of private Alberta citizens' capital that is pooled for the purposes of developing industry and business in the Province of Alberta.

I think the question was addressed during the course of the Question Period regarding this, and we very clearly indicated at that time that the concept of a Bank of Alberta is simply one that, under the chairmanship of my colleague, the hon. Mr. Getty, and the Economic Planning Committee of Cabinet, we will be looking at. But it's very much in the embryo stage within the criteria I've indicated to you, which might be even an addition to the existing Treasury Branch system, or in fact, some combination -- and simply a matter of actually looking at the idea. It is certainly not that we don't recognize the overall problem posed and the usefulness the Treasury Branches have served up to the present time. I would say, I think -- if you read the article in the paper -- one of the comments I made was certainly that one of the concerns we would have to look at would be that the loaning policy of the institution should be geared to the needs of Alberta, and that we have to be satisfied in whatever review we make that the institution will be responsive to the industrial and business needs of Alberta -- corporate and individual business citizens.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Chairman, referring to my colleague's comments I would say this, we are working very aggressively towards that effective type of mercantile operation -- a banking operation in Alberta. We need it, there's no question about it. Historically Alberta hasn't got those pools of capital we require in the great expansion that we are looking forward to in the next few years.

But I would say one other thing. We are working very aggressively forward bringing investment programs into the Province of Alberta, and when I say investment programs I am talking about people who are in the underwriting business. We are in negotiations with several organizations right now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. DIXON:

One further question then to the hon. minister. I was wondering, Mr. Minister, the Japanese are apparently changing their ideas about investment. Rather than buying the product, they are investing money in the situations in the different countries

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-67

throughout the world. In particular, they mention Australia and Canada. I think I directed a question a couple of weeks ago to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals as far as the tar sands investment was concerned. You have even mentioned it in some of your own writeups regarding -- way off in the future -- maybe a car industry coming in here. I am wondering if you are actively considering any programs -- there must be many industries the Japanese people could invest in -- and I am wondering if there are any particular ones, other than the tar sands, that we're looking at?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member, I am sure, is aware that we are going on an expedition over to -- or a trade fair, I guess it's called -- over to Japan, in late August or early September, and in that project will be the people that will be rifling in to the areas to which we hope to attract Japanese interests in Alberta. We will also be looking at some of the capital resources of institutions over there.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Thank you.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, two questions to the hon. minister. The first one is, has any progress been made to locate additional farm implement manufacturers in Alberta? And the second one, I would ask that he recap the dealing with the \$50 million Alberta Opportunity Fund -- outline what new money has been put into it in the budget this year and what money from other programs has been transferred to it, and then additional monies to make up the \$50 million?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Chairman, in answer to the first question, yes, we are. We have as recently as last week interviewed two people who we are trying to encourage to develop and expand a farm machinery program in Alberta.

In answer to the second question, there's approximately -- well it is not approximate, there is actually \$15 million -- of new funds transferred into the Opportunity Fund of cash from the Treasury Department. There is a revolving fund of approximately \$12 million, and the balance will be taken up in the guarantees.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well. Agreed to the total income account?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

We can now pronounce Industry and Commerce.

Total income expenditure account agreed to \$5,892,000

MR. PEACOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

36-68

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

Department of the Attorney General

Agreed to without debate:

Appropriation 1201 Minister's Office \$ 30,500

Appropriation 1202 General Administration

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Chairman, my remarks on this are going to be very, very brief, primarily because the Attorney General Department this year is operating very much on a hold-the-line budget. The 1971-72 forecast calls for an expenditure of about \$29 million. The budget for the current estimates before the House total approximately \$33 million. So there is an increase of close to \$4 million. Of that \$4 million, \$1,200,000 approximately is made up of an increase in the contracts with the federal government for the RCMP, and the salary increases. The routine salary increases account for approximately another \$1 million of that \$4 million. The other major increases are items for about \$300,000 for the provincial judges, and there is a somewhat smaller item which will be the training program for the correctional officers in the correctional institutes -- which came about as a result of the agreement that was negotiated last September.

I should also draw to the hon. members' attention that while in some appropriations there seem to be some significant increases, in many cases they don't actually represent an increase, because in these estimates we are trying to include in each appropriation such things as materials, which in earlier estimates had come out of a general appropriation as opposed to the particular appropriation. And apart from that, Mr. Chairman, I'd be happy to answer any questions any of the hon. members may have on this or any of the other appropriations.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a few general observations with respect to these estimates. First of all I'm sorry that the hon. Attorney General didn't give us a little more lengthy discussion of the estimates. That, of course, is his prerogative, but I think there are a number of matters which have come to public attention in the last while and it would certainly have been useful, had he been able to advise the House in his introductory remarks, as to what course the government plans to follow.

The Matthews Report which was released several weeks ago, in my judgment poses a number of rather serious questions, Mr. Chairman, that we have to come to grips with in this Legislature. I think it's a pretty serious charge when we read in the report the assertion that our legal system is one of the most punitive in North America.

The increase in prison population, 71 per cent, cited by the Matthews Report -- certainly compares most unfavourably with increases in other provinces, and also the equally important fact, Mr. Chairman, that in five provinces the percentage actually dropped.

One of the proposals that the Matthews Report makes is a proposal which was contained in the McGrath Report of 1968 -- and that is the concept of a central registry. I really think that we have to take a pretty close look at this approach if we're going to deal effectively and efficiently with law enforcement. I think the arguments for some form of central registry are, in my view, quite persuasive, and the fact that this was first raised three and a half years ago in the McGrath Report, seems to me, Mr. Chairman, to show that the time for some form of action is long overdue. I'd like the Attorney General to advise the House what his specific position is with respect to this recommendation of a central registry.

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-69

Another point that I consider quite important, Mr. Chairman, is the whole matter of our magistrates in Alberta. I don't intend to cast any aspersions whatsoever on the integrity of these people -- in my judgment their integrity is beyond question. But I think that there is at least considerable argument that more demanding standards and better training should be required in the future. Future appointments should be based on legal training as a pre-requisite. I think it's also necessary to consider a substantially better salary to attract competent people. I say this without any apology, because when we are looking at people who will adjudicate the rights of individuals in our society, we should be seeking our very best minds for judges. This is no place to pinch pennies, Mr. Chairman, and I think that better salaries and working conditions, accompanied by a clear understanding that future appointments will be made on the basis of sufficient legal training, is in my view a course that is long overdue.

Another area that seems to me should be examined is the whole legal aid system in Alberta. The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury raised this during his budget speech a few weeks back. I can tell the House that from an experience with several constituents of mine, the present legal aid system is pretty unwieldy and that the wheels of justice, in this respect, grind very slowly, to put it mildly. While I don't pretend to be any expert on details of the legal aid system, I think that we have to explore ways and means of eliminating much of the waiting period, the red tape involved, the filling out of forms, and so on, because these regulations frequently act as a deterrent for those people who need legal aid from gaining it.

There was an act introduced a year ago which received a great deal of criticism -- a year ago, Mr. Chairman, in this House -- by the hon. members across the Floor, when they were in opposition. I am referring to the section 28 of The Police Act. This is the section which allows police chiefs to cite witnesses for contempt if they refuse to co-operate in an investigation of police misconduct -- to cite witnesses for contempt, providing they have the authorization of the Attorney General.

In my submission -- police chiefs, even with the permission of the Attorney General -- should not have the powers of magistrates or judges in our society. It is my view that section 28 of The Police Act should be repealed at this session, even before we have any general overhaul of The Police Act. I don't believe that this kind of power should be in the present act.

On a slightly different subject, a few weeks back in the question period, I believe it was the hon. Member for Strathcona who raised the example of a young man in his constituency who had become the victim of a fraud. As a consequence he had lost a motor vehicle that he had purchased inadvertently from someone who had stolen the car. I raise this because I think it deals directly with the role of the Crimes Compensation Board. I had a very similar case in my constituency. A young man last summer had purchased a car, but before doing so, he took all the prudent steps. He checked with the Motor Vehicles Branch and took the normal steps that an average prudent individual would take to make sure that he knew what he was getting into. But unfortunately, the car turned out to be stolen and the insurance company, which was an American company, sought to recover the car and this young man was out the \$2,000 which the car cost him.

I know that the initial reason behind the Crimes Compensation Commission was to compensate people who were victims of criminal assault. But I would like to suggest that we might well consider adding fraud to the purview of this Commission, because it seems to me particularly unfair that we do find examples all the time of people who are themselves the victims of fraud through no carelessness of their own. I think this perhaps is the difference

36-70

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

between someone who simply didn't take the normal steps to find out what he was getting into on one hand, in the case that the hon. Member for Strathcona cited, and the case of the young constituent that I referred to tonight.

I'd like to say just a word or two about the whole concept of plea bargaining. This is something which I have some qualms about. It seems to me that it creates the impression that justice is a bargain basement commodity. It tends to create the impression, Mr. Chairman, that the judicial system is rigged to the advantage of certain individuals. It opens the possibility, more important, that people will plead guilty on the assumption that they might as well accept the best deal possible. Now I know that the argument in favour of plea bargaining is the whole question of space and time in our judicial system, but I submit that the answer should be more judges and prosecutors, and not plea bargaining.

I want to make very brief reference to the case that I have asked a question about several times in the question period. I'm not going to deal with the particulars that are before the court, but I do think that the seizure of the files of Dr. Craig raises an important civil liberties question. It seems to me that the confidentiality of files, especially the doctor-patient relationship files, are at stake here. None of us want personal information seized, but I think, Mr. Chairman, this is especially true when it involves patients being treated for drug addiction. Such action, in my view, could set back a meaningful program of treatment for drug addicts in Alberta. The Attorney General must tell the House whether the files were seized with his authorization, or if they weren't. If they were, then he should defend his action. If not, he should explain on whose authority the police acted. Again, I don't wish to take this any farther, because to do so would be to get into an area that is presently before the court. But I think there is a civil liberties matter which must be raised and must be examined carefully.

In general, then, Mr. Chairman, I realize that we have a new minister and that it is going to take a certain amount of time to change the direction of this department. But I do think that it's very important we recognize that equality before the law and the providing to all our people, wherever they live, of equal access to due course of law is something which is very, very important; and I submit that our legal system needs to be overhauled. Reports like the Matthews report, or for that matter, the McGrath report of three years ago, show that in many ways we have tended to overlook the importance of maintaining the rights of the individual to full recourse through our legal system. As a consequence, I believe that this department should not be dealt with quickly. I think that when you consider the liberty of Albertans is really under the purview of this department, we should examine it very closely and consider the merits of each estimate very carefully.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Attorney General, do you want to comment on that?

MR. LEITCH:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to the hon. member's comments, and I'll take them in the order in which he made them. In dealing firstly with the Matthews report, I agree with the hon. member that the accusations made in that report are cause for very serious concern. He has asked for some comment by me on it, and I think my position can be stated in the simplest form in this way.

That report does deal with a situation that existed in 1969, and the first thing I wanted to assess was whether that situation prevails today, because I was aware that in 1969 very significant changes were made in the practice in Alberta, of charging people

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-71

with, particularly, intoxication offenses. Just recently, I have obtained some information which is not yet complete; I have not yet completely analyzed it, but it indicates that there was a drop in the summary conviction offences; that is, the number of people who appeared in the correctional institutes on summary convictions were 10,500 in 1969, and they dropped in 1971 to about 5,500. So there was about a 50 per cent drop in the number of people who went to the correctional institutes between 1969 and 1971 on the summary conviction offences. I should say that we record admissions to the correctional institutes, and when we have 10,500 in a year there are fewer people than that who go to the correctional institutes, because one person may be admitted two or three times. We keep track of the admissions as opposed to the actual number of people.

There has also been a drop in the number of people in our institutions between 1969 and 1971, so the first thing we are trying to assess at the moment is whether the things said in that report as to the situation in 1969 are true for 1972. The preliminary figures I have gotten, which were just recently received, indicate there has been a very fundamental change in the number of people who are now coming to our correctional institutes over the number who were coming in 1969. Now, that only gets us part way home, because to relate our position to the rest of Canada, which is what that report does, we need to know whether there have been changes made in the other provinces comparable to those made in Alberta during the same period. That we are now checking on.

In short, to sum it up in a couple of sentences, after we have done this preliminary work, if the indications are that Alberta is in 1972 as seriously out of step with the rest of Canada as that report indicated it was in 1969, then I think we do have a serious situation, and one about which something must be quickly done. But I think that until we have made that kind of preliminary analysis, it is premature for me to comment on what we should be doing as a result of the Mathews report.

I may say, Mr. Chairman, it would have been very easy when the Matthews report came out to simply say, "Now that the report is out, we should have a royal commission, or judicial inquiry or something of that nature into it", but that seems to me to be not discharging the responsibility of the government. If you do that, first of all, the thing gets put in limbo for a while, until the inquiry has been completed, or until the commission has held its hearings. And in addition, those things are expensive. While I say that would have been a simple way to deal with it, I think doing it in that fashion would not have been carrying out the responsibilities of government. I think our responsibility is first to make a preliminary assessment as to whether the things that are referred to in that report exist today, and if they do, we then get on to correcting them.

The next point the hon. member raised was the question of a central registry. That is something we simply haven't yet had the time to make an assessment on. I am aware of the recommendations in both the reports he refers to. I think that is something we are going to have to take a very close look at, and we are. But at this moment we haven't reached decisions on what should be done about it, and if we should have one -- the type, and so on.

The third point the hon. member raised was the magistrates who are now called Provincial Judges. I share with him the view that they ought to be as highly trained, the most skilled people we can get. The practice in the past -- I think I am correct in this -- over the past few years has been to appoint provincial judges who have legal training. Certainly, that is my intention. Wherever possible, we should appoint provincial judges with a legal background.

36-72

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

In the past there has been some difficulty in getting people with legal backgrounds in the outlying areas, and I am hopeful that we will be able to cure that. I was pleased to hear his comments about not being niggardly with their pay. As I mentioned in my opening remarks, there is a figure close to \$300,000 in this estimate which represents an increase in the salary for our provincial judges. It's approximately a 25 per cent increase. We're not as high as the highest provinces in Canada but we would be among the highest for provincial judges. He commented on legal aid saying that he thought the procedure was cumbersome and that it ought to be examined very closely.

On that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make two points. Number one, legal aid in its present form is a relatively new program. We have had a system of legal aid in Alberta for a number of years but the current program is a relatively new one and, like any other new program, it has a shape-up period. It's going to take a little while until you can work out the kinks in it, and it seems to me, making radical changes in it at the present time is a little premature. We are keeping a close eye on it and I am hopeful that in those areas where it is not functioning the way it should, we will be able to make the appropriate changes. But perhaps the most important reason for not altering materially the legal aid scheme at this time is that we are not aware of the federal government's involvements. They have said that they are thinking of introducing a federal legal aid scheme. A few months ago, just after the new minister of justice was appointed, I met him in Ottawa and spoke to him about it. He had only been in office a few days and couldn't discuss it in any great detail. At that time it was their clear intention to become involved, in one way or another, in a federal legal aid program, and the indication was that that was likely to occur very quickly. And again I think that we will want to marry the two legal aid plans and until we know the extent of the federal government's involvement, I think it would be premature to make radical changes in our own plan.

In respect to his comments about The Police Act, and in particular, Section No. 28 of The Police Act, that poses some of the same difficulties that we have had with legal aid. The act is a new one, it came into force less than a year ago, and while the hon. members referred to Section No. 28 and feel that some changes should be made there, in my view there are a number of areas of The Police Act in which it is likely that we will want to make a change. I felt that it was important to let that act operate for a little while until we could learn more about its weaknesses and until we could learn the areas in which changes needed to be made, and as I have indicated both in the House as well as out of it, I propose during the summer to review the operation of The Police Act with the senior members of the police forces in the province, the police commissions and the other people in the provinces who have some experience or capacity to offer advice in this area. The changes in The Police Act which were made last year brought about a good deal of uncertainty and unrest, and in my judgment, it would have been a mistake to start again amending The Police Act within a few months after it came into force and to continue that unrest or uncertainty. It is a much better course to leave it sit for at least a year, or perhaps a little better, rather than make a change every time the legislature sits. One comprehensive change can cover all those areas in which experience of a year or so has indicated change is necessary.

With respect to the comments about the victims of fraud and the Crimes Compensation Board, Mr. Chairman, the question of compensating people for property losses as a result of crime is a very, very difficult and complex one. We can all call to mind -- I'm sure anyone who has any experience with law or with civil cases or any appreciable experience with people generally, can quickly call to mind -- any number of cases where you can have nothing but sympathy for the people who have suffered a loss. Very frequently this occurs without any fault on their part. And you can pick out very easily a

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-73

particular property loss and argue very convincingly that that particular type of property loss ought to be treated the same way as a personal injury.

As the hon. members in the House know now under The Crimes Compensation Board we compensate those people who have suffered a personal injury resulting in a financial loss -- doctors' bills, lost wages, and things of that nature -- as a result of a crime. But we don't include any property losses. That is a very broad field. I think, before one enters into that field, we want to review it very, very carefully. We are going to have some very difficult decisions to make about what kinds of property loss are you going to cover.

The hon. member speaks of covering a fraud loss. But what about a theft loss? It's pretty hard to say to the person who has lost a car as a result of fraud, after he's done everything a reasonable person might do to ensure that he gets good title, that he can get paid under the Crimes Compensation Board, and the person who has taken all the conceivable steps he might reasonably be expected to take to guard himself against the theft of a car and he loses it by theft, that he shouldn't get compensated. Then you take the people who lose money by fraud in a company, say, where the officers of the company make off with the assets. Those can be very, very substantial losses, and it's pretty hard to say to the person who has lost his money because he owns shares in a company where the officers have made off the assets, without any fault on his part -- he's taken all the precautions he could take against such a theft -- to say to that person 'you can't be compensated', whereas someone else who failed to get a title to a car, because of fraud, should be compensated.

When we get into talking about compensation for property losses we're talking about huge, huge sums of money, regardless of what area we go into. So if we're going to cut that down to a reasonable sum of money we would have to have very restrictive, confining rules. I suggest to the hon. members of the House, it's going to be very hard to draw up those rules and convince the people who fall outside of them that you are treating them fairly. So this is not at all an easy field to get into, nor an easy field to provide answers to, and I think the evidence of that is that I can't call to mind places which have any sort of a comprehensible scheme in that area.

Another thing, too, that distinguishes a property loss from personal injury that people generally quickly call to mind, is that they are conscious of the need to insure themselves against a property loss -- against fire, against theft and even against fraud. But they are not so conscious of the need to insure themselves against getting hit over the head. That isn't something that the average person thinks is necessary. There's a sound argument that he isn't addressing himself, his mind to that need, whereas when you come to property I think it's much easier to say that people automatically address their minds to the question of protecting themselves by insurance against that kind of loss. So I say to the hon. member, while the question is worth thinking about, it's not something we'd reject out of hand; it's something we have an open mind about. Here is an area where the problems are not so simple to solve as might at first rush appear.

On plea bargaining I would like to say a word or two about that. First of all I think it is grossly misunderstood by those people who make comments about it. I deplore the practice of actual plea bargaining, if by that the hon. member means someone coming down and making a deal whereby he pleads guilty to a charge in exchange for a specified sentence, or something of that nature. But that isn't what happens in most of the cases that most people think of, what they regard as plea bargaining.

36-74

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

Let me take a typical example. Let's pick a car accident where the driver has driven through a stop sign and has been speeding; he is impaired; he's involved in an accident which causes death. He does all of those three things at the same time as the accident occurs. Now when the police investigate that they have a choice of what to do. They may simply pick the major charge which would be causing death by criminal negligence and not charge on the other ones. If the evidence was extremely strong, that's likely what the police would do -- simply lay the one charge of causing death by criminal negligence. They would then proceed with that charge and if there was a conviction that would be the end of the matter. Sometimes they're not at all sure that they're going to get a conviction on that charge. The question then arises -- and it's a difficult one -- as to whether they should charge with the major offence -- death by criminal negligence -- and forget about all of the others. If you do that it creates a very bad image of the judicial system because all this is known to the public generally. The fellow was drunk; he went through the stop sign; he was speeding; and here he got off scot-free. Now if that happens, the public -- and I think justifiably so -- is very upset about the judicial system. It's clear he was guilty of all of these things and yet nothing happened. They think the police are incompetent, the courts are incompetent, the Attorney General's Department is incompetent. So quite often in a case like that the police may charge with causing death with criminal negligence with impaired driving, generally not with the minor motor vehicle offences of speeding or going through a stop sign. And then the accused is facing a charge of criminal negligence plus a charge of impaired driving. At that point he shows up and says, "Well, I'm prepared to plead guilty to the criminal negligence -- will the other one be dropped?" And the officers of the Crown agree to that. They agree to it because that's what they would have done in the first place if they had been sure of getting a conviction. So it's not plea bargaining in the sense that a deal is made.

Another typical example is receiving stolen property and theft. The police may well charge with both charges because they don't know whether there is going to be a conviction on any one of them -- so, again, they lay charges for all the offenses that appear to have been committed. But if they were sure of one case going through the courts and sure of there being a conviction, they wouldn't bother laying charges for the other offence because justice would have been served by the person who committed the offence, having gone to court and having been dealt with. So, again, the fellow who has been charged with these several charges, which really relate to the same offence, will come to the Crown Prosecutor and say, "I'm prepared to plead guilty to one of them -- what will happen to the others?" And quite often the Crown Prosecutor and the police are quite happy to drop the other charges and accept only the guilty plea.

Again you get the case, which quite often occurs, where the police will charge with the serious offence, the criminal negligence -- going back to my car accident example -- and with impaired driving. This is done by a policeman. He swears out the information. By the time it reaches the Crown Prosecutor's desk -- and he's the lawyer -- he looks at the evidence. He is a lawyer and has a much better understanding naturally than the policeman about the likelihood of there being a conviction on the evidence that's available. The lawyer looks at the evidence and says: "I think it is very unlikely there will be a conviction for criminal negligence." At this point the accused may indicate that he would be happy to plead guilty to the impaired driving charge if the criminal negligence charge is dropped. Well, again, the police and the Crown Prosecutors are faced with the problem of going through two trials in which there may not be convictions, and exchanging that uncertainty for a conviction for the lesser offence.

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-75

Now the hon. member says that this is done to save time, that he was under the impression that plea bargaining was something that was entered into by police and Crown Prosecutors for the purpose of saving time and expense. I suggest to the hon. member that that isn't so at all, in the kind of cases that I'm outlining, because this situation occurs time after time after time and really has nothing to do with the saving of time and expense, although obviously if you're faced with a decision as a Crown Prosecutor whether to proceed with lengthy uncertain trials, you feel, and I think justifiably so, that justice is much better served if there is a conviction, even though it may be on the lesser offence. So, while the question of plea bargaining, and certainly the worst aspects of it, are things that concern me, I do say that when people speak of plea bargaining most of the time they really don't understand what's been happening or why.

The hon. member again raises the question of seizure of files. I've said a number of times why that matter shouldn't be debated because it is now before the courts and any discussion about what the police did or didn't do, and why, seems to me might well lead to unfairness to the accused as well as unfairness to the Crown insofar as the trial is concerned, and it is important we don't prejudice the fair trial of the action by discussion before the trial takes place. However he did ask a specific question as to whether I was consulted with respect to that seizure and whether it was a police seizure, and I should outline what is the general practice that prevails in many of the areas in the province. The police quite often do these things on their own in the sense that they form the opinion on whether a charge should be laid, and then lay it. If they feel there should be a search warrant obtained, in order to gather evidence that might be relevant to the charge, they'll make the application for the search warrant. On other occasions, and the more complex cases, they will ask members of the Attorney General's Department, the Crown Prosecutor for advice as to what should be done.

In this particular instance, there was a discussion between the police and a member of the Attorney General's Department, the Crown Prosecutor, as to obtaining the search warrant. But I should point out a search warrant is not obtained by the Attorney General's Department; it's not really obtained by the police except in the sense that they apply to the court for it. The search warrant is a warrant issued by the court, and it's only issued after the applicant has been able to make out a case, which the court feels, justifies the issuing of a search warrant. And thereafter the search warrant provides that the documents or pieces of evidence, or whatever they may be, referred to in the search warrant, shall be brought before the court. So these aren't seized by a policeman in the sense that he holds them, or by the Attorney General's Department in the sense that we hold them -- they are seized pursuant to a court order and remain under the control of the court. It may be that they are physically within someone else's custody, but they are merely in the policeman's custody as an agent of the court. The documents remain under the control of the court. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Yes, Mr. Attorney General, in the first place I'd like to say that unlike the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I'm not one who would chastise or reprimand anyone for giving a short talk; it's usually the other way when I start getting upset, so I appreciate your brief remarks to start off with.

The remarks that I have are very short and very local, but they may apply to other centres as well. It's regarding the court facilities, the shared court facilities with the Attorney General's Department in the province, like for instance -- and I'm going to be very specific -- with Lethbridge. Now, at the police station, just to recap, the police station in Lethbridge was built 'way back in

36-76

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

about 1949, and then it had quite an extensive addition put on, to the tune of about a quarter of a million dollars, just ten years ago, in '62 or '63. At that time the government of this province gave a grant of \$64,000, I believe. This grant, it would appear, was intended to provide facilities for the Attorney General's Department, the Mounted Police, and various facilities in perpetuity. I realize the fact that that was given ten years ago and nothing has been done since that time. It is not really our problem, but nevertheless maybe it is time we took a look at the whole situation. These facilities that we provide there are used now by RCMP prisoners, and municipal prisoners from the surrounding area -- there is Taber, there is Cardston, there is Picture Butte, there is Magrath, and all the district points around there -- come into Lethbridge, and the local RCMP use the court on regular days as well. We just can't help but wonder whether this \$64,000 we received ten years ago is still supposed to be paying for the use of our facilities.

Just to give you a little idea as to what we are providing there, there is the court room itself which is about 60 by 70 in diameter; there are six offices that are provided; there are all the restroom facilities for the public and for the private use of the trial judge and his secretary, plus other staff. There are parking places for six cars, plus an adequate storage place in the basement that we provide. For all of these facilities we receive no remuneration at all from the province. It is still contingent on this \$64,000 grant that was paid ten years ago. I acknowledge that they have the use of an annual negotiated amount that the province shares for maintainance and janitorial service. But there is really nothing to pay rent in there and we think that the \$64,000 has long ago been used up. Even if we would use a very modest rental figure -- and we're certainly willing to co-operate and not try to make money on the province -- but at the same time we don't think we should really lose that much. Even if you would use the modest figure of say \$3.50 per square foot, which I acknowledge is very modest for even a place like Lethbridge, that would give us \$12,000 or \$13,000 per year. So I think that for the investment that was made by the province ten years ago of \$64,000 they really got their money's worth.

My question then is, where in the appropriations, if anywhere, could I find what monies are set aside, first for the janitorial and the maintainance provisions for these facilities -- which, like I say, is negotiated every year -- and had you given any serious thought to paying some sort of rent or some fee to the City of Lethbridge for the facilities that we provide there?

MR. LEITCH:

The question of janitorial services and things of that nature fall within the estimates of the Minister of Public Works.

MR. GRUENWALD:

That is not your department at all?

MR. LEITCH:

No. I have had one or two very brief discussions with my department personnel regarding the situation in Lethbridge. I really am not well enough informed on it to enter into any debate with you about it. It has come up since I came into the office, and I recall there is some difficulty over the future plans in Lethbridge, and some difficulty over acquisition of land. Beyond that I can't really answer your questions.

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-77

MR. GRUENWALD:

In that regard, I think the long-range plans and hopes and aspirations are that there would be new courtroom facilities built at a new location, but we are certainly sure that that isn't going to happen in the next year or so. Certainly representation will be made to your department in that regard. Nevertheless, this is getting to be quite a deficit situation, as far as we are concerned, for the rental and the space that we do provide, because it is quite a cost element. We feel quite justified in asking that some compensation be made to our police department -- which is the city actually -- for the space provided to accommodate the facilities and the types of services given that I outlined -- the RCMP, the travelling judge, the six office spaces, and this type of thing.

MR. LEITCH:

I am perfectly happy to review it at any time with the officials of the City of Lethbridge. I would expect we could work out something that would be equitable to the city and to the province. As I say, beyond that at this moment, I can't go.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Specifically, then, there's not an appropriation for that right now?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Gruenwald, I think the hon. Minister of Public Works wanted to aid that a bit.

DR. BACKUS:

If I may speak on that, normally the building of courthouses and the leasing, renting, payment of rents, caretaking all come under my department. I can say that at the present time, my department is working with, I think, great co-operation from the City of Lethbridge in trying to fit in with their plans in this respect. Although, when we come to the budget of the Department of Public Works, there won't be a large item in this year's budget toward construction of courthouses and so on in Lethbridge, there is a planning aspect to this which we are working on at the moment. I've met with your representatives from Lethbridge; we've had good discussion on it, and I think you'll find we do co-operate very much on this.

MR. GRUENWALD:

I just wanted to observe then, that the capital project that you were talking about, the building, that's one thing. It is the maintenance of it that I was also concerned about -- the rental really, so that seems to satisfy me at this point.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Farran and then Mr. Ludwig.

MR. FARRAN:

My remarks also arise from local experience on the Calgary Police Commission, and I understand the form is to raise these general points at this time in the debate and then to proceed in as expeditious a manner as possible with the actual estimates themselves.

So, I've got five points and I will give a heading to each one, so that the Attorney General perhaps could make notes -- [Interjection]. No, no, I don't. I also appreciate that it's improper for a private member to suggest that there should be any increase in a budget, but I do raise these points as possible new

36-78

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

directions for consideration for next year. I also confess that I'm not completely clear, despite having been on a police commission for many years, as to whether these fall within the aegis of the Attorney General or are really a federal responsibility.

The first one concerns Small Debts Court. It's the general impression in Calgary, anyway, that the small debts courts are overloaded with work and that there could be an expansion of the small debts court network. The need for them arises from two specific areas, in my opinion. One is from the Landlords and Tenants Advisory Board. These are rather toothless bodies that were set up by the last government to adjudicate disputes between landlords and tenants. They have done a remarkably good job of mediation, but of course they have no judicial powers. Most of their work concerns adjudication of disputes over damage deposits and the only way these problems can be finally resolved, if they can't be done by gentle persuasion and arbitration, is through the Small Debts Court. There have been suggestions that these Landlords and Tenants Advisory Boards be given the powers of the Small Debts Court to impose whatever decision they come to for these small items that are involved, often less than \$100.

The next area of needs for Small Debts Court is, I believe, in the area of the great accumulation of bad debts under Medicare, which are now reaching alarming proportions. As was raised in the House the other day, some 140 cases have been brought to trial in the Small Debts Court, but this is only a drop in the bucket, and I believe if any serious attempt is going to be made to reduce the bad debt load of the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission, there must be more facilities for these minor trials in the Small Debts Court. That's number one.

Number two is coroner's inquests. It was drawn to the attention of the last two police commissions on which I sat that there were a large number of deaths in unusual circumstances which weren't investigated by coroners. Many lawyers have a deep suspicion of coroners' courts because they feel that they are perhaps only semi-qualified -- and rather a sort of an appendage on the general judicial system. However, they do serve a great purpose in recommendations which may give cause to preventative action to stop future deaths of a similar nature, especially deaths that arise out of traffic accidents, where perhaps a recommendation for the change in the alignment of a road or the synchronization of lights, that sort of thing, which might be made to avoid a future death.

I would believe that if the function of a coroner is to be expanded to a point where all deaths in unusual circumstances are investigated by a coroner's court, we will either need more coroners or the present coroners will need more remuneration.

The third point concerns maintenance orders and restraining orders. The fact that up to 35 per cent of the welfare rolls consist of deserted wives and families, is well known to everyone. It is also a commonly-held opinion that perhaps the errant husband should pay at least as much of the shot for the maintenance of his family as he can afford. Yet we are repeatedly told that after a maintenance order has been issued by a judge the wandering husband who deserted his wife and family can escape to another jurisdiction and avoid the impact of the maintenance order. I suggest that perhaps the maintenance order agreements with at least adjoining provinces should be overhauled so that a husband who takes off to Manitoba or British Columbia can still be brought under the proper jurisdiction of the law and pay whatever he can afford towards the maintenance of his family.

Restraining orders are slightly different but they are a constant irritation to local police forces, in that they are freely issued by judges and very difficult to enforce. I don't know if the

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-79

hon. Attorney General can do anything to make the policeman's lot a little lighter in the enforcement of restraining orders. They are usually issued in a case where there has been a breakdown of marital relationships, and perhaps a husband still insists on visiting a wife who is suing for divorce, or who has been judicially separated, something like that. All the policeman can do is to act on receipt of a complaint and warn the party who is intruding to stay away. But that is about as much as they can do.

The fourth item is The Police Act. I know that the revisions to The Police Act largely arose from what I believe was a rather temporary condition that prevailed in the police commissions in Calgary, caused largely by a clash of personalities. But, I think the great weakness in this Police Act, which was enforced on the local authorities by the previous government, is that at least paper control of these municipal police forces has been removed from local jurisdiction, which in a way is a contravention of the policies of local autonomy on which the present government was elected. Although the paper control may not be exercised in any arbitrary or totalitarian manner, it largely depends on the understanding of the attorney general of the day. There is a complication of supply. These local police forces depend entirely on the local council for their supply. If there is any friction whatsoever between the police commission and the local council the problems of supply are magnified.

The high cost of running a police force in a city area represents a big burden on the mill rate. If there is not complete understanding by the police commission -- and there is not likely to be complete understanding unless there is a majority, or close to a majority, of either city-elected or city-appointed officials -- there is a great possibility that some time in the near future, the lines of supply to these police forces will break down, especially if their compulsory arbitration on wage disputes remain in the area of 10 per cent or 11 per cent a year.

A fifth point is that the bogus athletic clubs, which under previous jurisdictions were given licenses, were in fact, professional gambling clubs in disguise. It is easy for some of these organizations to pull the wool over the eyes of distant authorities when there is no reference to the local police force. There was one case in Calgary that was reported in the newspapers in the last two weeks, of an ethnic club, a Calgary Greek club, receiving two successive grants from the federal government for ethnic social purposes, and in fact, they were hauled up in the courts for running an illegal professional gambling dive. This sort of thing can go on, so I suggest that all these licences for so-called athletic clubs be reviewed with the advice of local police forces.

MR. LEITCH:

The hon. member suggested that those items be kept in mind for next year, and I can assure him that they will be, and in particular, the question of maintenance and restraining orders. There is presently underway a study that I believe is nearing completion, by the Institute of Law Research and Reform, dealing with the whole field of family law, family courts and things of that nature. It was started initially by a lawyer in Edmonton, working with a committee of the Law Society. I read the report when he completed it; it was an excellent one. It's a very complex field, and particularly the business of collecting the money. As an individual it was requiring too much of his time and his report, when he completed it, was then turned over to the Institute for further study, and they are now working on it. I don't have an estimate of the time when that's available, but it should be fairly soon.

36-80

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

With respect to your comments on the coroners, I am not sure I entirely agree. I have had considerable experience in front of coroners, and while there may in the past have not been enough inquests with respect to suspicious deaths, my feeling has been -- and again I am open-minded about this and subject to argument, to changing my mind -- but certainly my feelings in practising law were that there were far too many inquests in routine traffic accidents. Everyone had known what had happened, that one car had crossed the centre line and collided with another car. As a result of that unfortunate accident someone had died and it always seemed to me rather futile to go through a lengthy and reasonably expensive coroner's inquest to answer the questions, which are how, where, and when the person died, which were fairly obvious to everyone. Really, all they amounted to was a civil trial, because everyone involved who had an interest in the litigation that would come out of the accident arrived at the inquest and conducted discoveries. And again, in traffic accidents I know that coroners' juries can and have and do make valid recommendations on safety matters. It seems to me in the traffic cases we have a body of experts on safety in the province, both within and without the government, which can be resorted to with much less difficulty and expense than the coroner's jury. There are other areas where their recommendations about safety are very valuable and might be one of the few sources where you could obtain them, but that is not so in the case of traffic accidents.

The athletic club -- I am aware of the problem -- and you commented on some charges that were recently laid, and that is an area that we are reviewing along with all of the areas of gambling within the province, in which there are now some very major problems, such as lotteries and gambling affairs, and things of that nature. My department has been working on that and we will continue to work on it, and hopefully be able to come up with a form of licensing and control of a few of the practices that are harmful in those areas.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to outline a situation to the hon. minister and then ask him two or three questions regarding it. The reason I raise it now is because this particular thing happened and I had some constituents who were more than passingly upset. It really revolves around the winding up of an estate, and I'm told the work of winding up the estate was quite simple. When the people involved -- they were a farm family -- got the bill from the lawyer they felt the bill was considerably out of line. After quite a bit of scurrying around we made arrangements for them to meet with the Clerk of the Court in Calgary and the bill was taxed. With due respect to the procedure that took place, the question that really seemed uppermost in the mind of the gentleman who was doing the reviewing of the bill was not, in fact, about how much work was done, but really the amount that was charged less than the maximum fee? I'd like the hon. Attorney General to comment on that area, because I found this very difficult to understand.

Following up from that, I would like some indication from him as to who sets the maximum fees or the tariffs. When, in fact, has this been done last? And then I have some difficulty -- with all due respect to the gentleman who sits to my left and to the members of the legal profession across the way -- in understanding a situation where the person who is making the judgment on whether the bill is reasonable or not is, in fact, a member of the same profession. I had . . . [Interjections] . . . Well then I would be pleased to be straightend out, but I sat in on the first meeting of this, and the gentleman is at Calgary, I regret to tell you this -- he is a member of the legal profession. So I would like some direction and some indication from the hon. Attorney General with regard to this situation, because I don't raise it in a frivolous manner at all. It's a matter of a particular situation that happened, and the people

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-81

involved asked specifically that I raise the matter at this particular time.

MR. LEITCH:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure the hon. member appreciates that I can hardly be expected to comment on the attitude of this particular taxing officer.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman, if I left that impression, I'm sorry. That wasn't my intention that I expected you to be accountable for his attitude at this time.

MR. LEITCH:

I'll treat those comments, then as introductory to his questions.

He asked the question as to who set the fees in respect to services performed by lawyers on estate matters. It's my memory -- and I'll check this -- that that was set the last time; a few years ago after consultation with the then administration. So it was reviewed -- in fact, I recall being a member of the benchers at that time when a committee of the benchers was reviewing it with the then government -- and the fees or schedule of fees based on a percentage were approved, as I recall it, by the government at that time and then became part of the tariff of fees which was followed by the legal profession in estate matters. I think that review was probably three or four years ago.

MR. LUDWIG:

1967 was the last one - not the probate one.

MR. LEITCH:

It seems to me the probate ones were dealt with a year or so after the general tariff. As a result of changes in federal legislation with respect to succession duties and so on there may be a reason -- because it may alter the work to be done on estates -- to have that again reviewed and that's something I'll certainly consider.

The last point is that it's a member of the profession who reviews the account. That's a difficult question. It is a government employee who does the reviewing -- it's the clerk of the court -- he is a lawyer in a number of cases, but certainly not in all. The advantage of there being a lawyer, of course, is that he understands what was done and what might have been done. It's always a little difficult for someone who isn't a lawyer, who hasn't done this kind of work, to appreciate what has been done. So I think there are two sides to this coin. If a lawyer does it he may be the very person who can tell that the account is too high because there wasn't very much work to do, so it's not always a disadvantage. In fact the only disadvantage in my experience, is the point you raised, that there may be a feeling that because a lawyer is doing it, and he is a member of the same profession as the one who is submitting the bill, that all is not as it should be. My experience and practice has been that that isn't so. I think if one took the accounts where we have had clerks who are lawyers and took the accounts where we had clerks taxing them who aren't lawyers, you wouldn't find any appreciable distinction between the two. I don't think, in fact, there is anything to be concerned about, but the appearance you have raised is something that is worth considering.

36-82

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

MR. CLARK:

One supplementary, Mr. Chairman, to the Attorney General. Are you, or is the government, giving any consideration to a review of the tariffs at this particular time (and I appreciate this is done with the members of the legal profession -- the benchers) Secondly do you know of any jurisdictions in Canada where in fact this matter of the appeal is done by a committee of, perhaps, two or three people, maybe one person being from -- shall we use that broad general term -- the public at large?

MR. LEITCH:

In answer to your first question, I recall some discussion with the Law Society about a review; I hadn't planned to raise it with them, but now that the point has been raised I will again get in touch with them and find out where that is.

To answer the second part of your question. I am not aware of any jurisdictions in which they do this by committee. I think the practice followed here is pretty well standard, but to be sure of that I would have to check.

MR. CLARK:

I will check back with the people involved, because they were rather adamant in informing me that the practice of a committee with one person being a non-employee of the government and being outside the profession is followed in a number of states.

MR. LEITCH:

In the U.S.?

MR. CLARK:

Yes, in the U.S.

MR. LEITCH:

Well, they have a substantially different system there. I was thinking more of the English system and the Canadian system. It may well be that they do it in the United States.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, a couple of questions which fall directly under General Administration. There is an increase of staff of about 25 under General Administration. I wonder if the hon. the Attorney General could explain which of the specific references under this vote have been increased? Was it a general increase in all sections, or any particular section which is new or may have been expanded?

MR. LEITCH:

That increase flows from the fact that 30 people were transferred into this appropriation from other appropriations so that it's not an increase in staff, it's a movement from one appropriation to the other.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I'm concerned about the matter of a courthouse, the extension of the size of the courthouse in Calgary. This matter was raised quite often when we were in government. There were various reasons -- one of which was money; the Attorney General's department had a very large budget last year and I believe that the case from Calgary was well made that it was time that the extension was provided for. I would like to urge the hon. Attorney General to give consideration to start planning, if this hasn't been done --

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-83

perhaps it has been done, and then I would appreciate being informed -- but to start planning putting additional stories on the main courthouse in Calgary. It takes time to plan, it takes time to design, but there is no doubt that the situation has not improved from last year; it has become, if anything, a little more congested, particularly so because a lot of legal aid cases -- we find that a lot of the criminal trials go to Supreme Court which at one time may not have. This may have aggravated the problem a bit, but nevertheless with the passage of time, with the growth of the cities, perhaps with the increased number of judges, and maybe a future intended increase, there is a legitimate complaint and a legitimate need to extend the space in the courthouse in Calgary. I believe that they have been very co-operative, but when you go there now -- and I know the hon. Attorney General has been a very active courtroom lawyer -- that he would agree that there is a legitimate need here that, perhaps, ought to be given the priority that it deserves. I'd like the hon. Attorney General to comment on this.

MR. LEITCH:

Well that's a very valid question, Mr. Chairman. There is in the budget of the Minister of Public Works, an item for planning an addition to the Calgary courthouse, and within my department I've asked them to do an analysis of the space needs for the courthouse in Calgary, and to keep in mind that we are now building there a remand centre, and to consider the possibility of some service going into the remand centre for awhile because we're going to have extra space there. I don't think it's very likely that we'll be able to do that, but that's just one of the possibilities we're considering. So putting it in a sentence, we do have funds in the Public Works budget to start planning additions there, and we're doing an analysis of how much space they'll need and how quickly.

MR. LUDWIG:

To follow-up, could the hon. minister advise whether it's intended that this will be started this year?

MR. LEITCH:

Well, the analysis is going on now and, as I say there is an item in the Public Works budget to start the planning of the addition. So that will be going on this year -- the planning.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the hon. Minister of Public Works can tell us whether it's intended perhaps to engage an architect this year, professional consultants, to start planning; would it be done this year?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Chairman, we have set aside a figure of \$10,000 to plan and commence, which would entail the engaging of an architect and a certain amount of preliminary planning and preparation this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Koziak? I have you on the list, Mr. Drain.

MR. KOZIAK:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, first of all just a few comments on the Public Trustee's office and the Land Titles offices, and I think perhaps the courts as well. I don't know how or whether or not this could be done in future estimates, but it would be of interest in looking at these estimates if the

36-84

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

revenues from these sources could also be shown. I know that the details of income in the budget address indicate that the revenues from the Land Titles offices are in the neighbourhood of \$3,825,000, and that, I would imagine, would be for the two Land Titles offices combined. It would be interesting to have these figures so that we could compare the outlays for these very same functions with the incomes from those functions, because I think they are separate and distinct. The same applies to the Securities Commission and the Companies Branch. Each of these have revenue sources which are distinct.

I agree, Mr. Minister, with your comments in response to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Notley, on the Crimes Compensation Board. It would be almost an impossibility to extend compensation for the victims of crime to areas where personal property and fraud are involved, because this happens daily, and the amounts would be enormous; many of these amounts are covered by insurance. However, inasmuch as the comment was raised in relation to a problem that I had raised earlier in this House, I should perhaps put forth what I think would be a proper solution to the problem, not perhaps so much to -- well it wouldn't of course compensate the people who have now been hurt by the wrong doings of certain people, but it might prevent the same thing from happening in the future.

We have in this province what is known as a Torrens system for land titles and the holding of property; this would be real property. And the Torrens system permits you to search titles and assure yourself that the person that you are dealing with in regard to the purchase of, or charging, or loaning of money against, in regards to a particular parcel of real property in the province -- you can assure yourself that that person is the rightful owner, and has the power to deal with that particular piece of property.

In this day and age, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, a lot of people find that their largest investment happens to be in a motor vehicle. If they were to take inventory of all their assets, they would find that most of the money which they have is tied up in a motor vehicle. Yet the system for checking title on a motor vehicle is very slap-happy -- if I may say that. I can take any vehicle that belongs to any of the members in this House and register that vehicle in my name, obtain a licence plate from the Department of Highways for that vehicle in my name, and no question is asked. There is no requirement that the owner -- the present registered owner -- sign a bill of sale and that this bill of sale be filed with the Motor Vehicles Branch before a new Certificate of Registration is issued. This is an area where I think that your department, and in conjunction with the Department of Highways, can perhaps look into establishing a central registry system within the Department of Highways for motor vehicles, so that when I search a registration, I can rely on that search and be assured that I am dealing with the rightful owner.

There is another area, Mr. Minister, that causes me some concern. I have spoken to one provincial judge in this regard and that is the practice -- I don't know if it exists in the Calgary provincial judges' courts, but it does exist here in Edmonton in the provincial judges' court -- that is the practice of placing before one provincial judge all of the -- if I may call it -- all of the original pleas that come up, say for one week, or perhaps for a designated period of time. So that what happens in effect is that one provincial judge, say on Monday morning, is faced with what could be in the vicinity of 90 to 125 appearances, a good number of them original appearances. Some of these appearances will involve a remand; some of them will involve a plea of guilty or not guilty -- the not guilty pleas will involve the transferring of jurisdiction to another magistrate -- but the plea of guilty will involve, quite often, the function of sentencing. The comments that I received from the provincial judge with whom I discussed this, is that in no way

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-85

can a provincial judge properly approach the matter of sentencing with this volume of cases before him on one particular day. I think it is important that your department, sir, look into this, because the provincial judges' court is really the window to the populous. This is where the people usually come in contact with the operation of justice in our province, at the provincial judges' court level. If they are badly impressed with the way justice is administered at that level, it can do nothing but harm to the whole system of justice in this province, and the approach that the citizens of the Province of Alberta have towards our judicial system. Anything that can be done which can improve this, and can improve the citizen's feeling that justice is, in fact, being done in a proper manner will, of course, place us in good stead with all of the citizens of this province.

I suggest, Mr. Minister, that there be sufficient provincial judges appointed, of proper calibre, to handle all the cases that come before them, so that they are able to handle them in a manner in which they can properly assess themselves of the circumstances and the facts, particularly when imposing a sentence and imposing a fine. I feel, Mr. Minister, that that is not being done adequately when the whole load of cases is being placed before one provincial judge on one particular day.

Further to that, we have a situation, when this practice is followed, of a courtroom full of people with tens and tens of people overflowing into the hallways, waiting to be heard. They are all summonsed to appear at 9:00 or 9:30 and find that they might not be heard until 11:30, 12:00, 1:00, 2:00 in the afternoon. If the whole case load were distributed amongst all the provincial judges, this would, of course, improve the situation for the citizens who have to make their appearance, and if the practice could be followed of, perhaps, allocating specific times for appearances, so that the summons could indicate that your appearance was at 10:00, 10:15, 11:00, 11:15, again, this could require some administration, however, from the point of view of the citizen, I feel that that would be a step in the right direction.

Of course, it's a ridiculous situation to walk into a courtroom, Mr. Minister, and see 30 or 40 members of the legal profession sitting in a row doing nothing but twiddling their thumbs, waiting for their turn to be called, charging their clients \$30 to \$40 an hour in large cases, and of course greatly reduced fees in cases paid by legal aid. But I think we all appreciate that if you're well trained to do a particular job, it's a waste of your time and a waste of your training if you are sitting around doing nothing because of a particular system that requires queuing, requires you to be present at 9:30 in the morning and requires you to sit through a whole system of pleas -- guilty pleas and not guilty pleas -- until perhaps the late afternoon. I think that that is another area that should be looked at. Perhaps if the way in which cases are docketed were looked at, three distinct areas could well be served, to the benefit of all.

I have a comment on the Debtors' Assistance Board, and its relationship to the system of legal aid. At one time I understood that the practice was followed that where a foreclosure action was commenced in one of the courts in the Province of Alberta, a copy of the statement of claim would immediately be sent to the Debtors' Assistance Board. Now, my understanding is that this procedure is no longer being followed, perhaps because of the fact that for a while during our inflationary era -- during the era in which people had money -- foreclosures were few and far between. However, I understand that there are approximately 150 farm foreclosures taking place in the Peace River area of this province, and we're back into an era where foreclosure is affecting a lot of people adversely.

36-86

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

Now, I think that if we could follow that procedure whereby the moment a statement of claim is issued in a foreclosure action, a copy is then turned over by the clerk of the court to the person in charge of the Debtors' Assistance Board. A letter could then go out to the defendant indicating that this is what has happened, because sometimes these legal documents and statements of claim are framed in such a fashion that nobody can understand them. A simple letter to the debtor saying, "this is what's happening. Action has been issued, your house or your farm is being foreclosed. If you don't do this, this, and this, you're going to lose it." Such information right at the outset would be of great value to the person who finds himself in this position -- an unenviable position.

The second area in which the Debtors' Assistance Board could assist in some of these foreclosures would be in the area of providing counsel. I think it's axiomatic that in most cases where the debtor is not paying, he is more than likely in dire financial straits, so that obtaining legal counsel becomes indeed a barrier. As a matter of fact, probably if he had the money he would pay it to the creditor to avoid the foreclosure action, rather than retaining legal counsel. So people find themselves in a position where they can't obtain counsel because they have no source of funds, the very reason for their predicament. Perhaps the Debtors' Assistance Board, when receiving these statements of claim could interview the person who is being foreclosed to see if, in fact, it is a proper case for legal aid, and then recommend legal aid in proper cases. Because these people have property it may, of course, be necessary for the Debtors' Assistance Board to take some form of security so there may be some repayment in the future when times improve. However, there are people -- and especially in the farm areas, the Peace River areas -- as I understand it, there are 150 people who find themselves in this predicament, where legal counsel at the right moment might be of great assistance.

I agree with your comments, Mr. Minister, in connection with plea bargaining. My feeling on this particular subject is that more often than not it arises where the defendant has been overcharged, and I don't mean in the credit sense. He has been charged with an offence which he really hasn't committed. He is guilty of a crime, he is guilty of an offence, but he is charged with something greater than he is in fact guilty of. The plea bargaining -- if you want to call it that -- takes place when he finally enters a plea to the crime which he is in fact guilty of, and the crime which he was not guilty of, that charge is withdrawn. To suggest that plea bargaining under such circumstances is something wrong is, I think, commensurate with the idea that because a person is charged he is automatically guilty, because that is in fact what such a suggestion could mean.

A common example of this can be given, to put this in proper perspective. In the winter in this province quite often people misjudge distances, quite often travel perhaps a little too closely, perhaps a little too quickly for the circumstances. You have a rash of rear-end collisions. Not being at the scene at the very time of the collision the peace officer who issues the complaint or who determines that there is an offence committed, usually chooses the offence under The Highway Traffic Act, of careless driving. Careless driving under The Highway Traffic Act is probably from the point of view of the driver, one of the most dangerous offences to be convicted of because it affects insurance rates more drastically than any other offence under The Highway Traffic Act. So what invariably happens is when the case comes before the courts, as the hon. minister has pointed out, the Crown is quite cognizant of the fact that the careless driving charge cannot be supported. However, a charge of following too close can be laid in its place which is a lesser offence, carries with it a lesser fine and lesser effect as far as insurance is concerned. A guilty plea is quite often entered to that in exchange for withdrawal of the careless driving charge.

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-87

In that sense, justice is truly served because the offence charged and the punishment imposed are commensurate with the crime committed.

I had a comment to make, but perhaps . . . they keep passing me notes saying, "Don't do it, Julie," so I won't.

MR. LEITCH:

I would like to respond to one or two of the items the hon. member raised. The first one was the question of showing the income with the expenses, particularly with such things as land titles, securities, and so on. The income from those areas is dealt with by the hon. Provincial Treasurer. But the point you have raised is one that has given me considerable concern since coming into office, and that is simply this -- The Land Titles office, The Companies Branch, the Central Registry, and several other areas in my department really are services. And I have been concerned that the revenue from those services paid for the services. They should pay for them and I would think the principle ought to be that they should not do more than pay for them. But, under the existing accounting procedures it is extremely difficult to ascertain exactly what it costs to provide those services. That is an area that we are looking at and it is one that we are going to spend a great deal more time on.

When you get to the Securities Commission you have a problem because part -- and in some other areas in my department you have a similar problem -- part of what the Securities Commission does is a general policing function which applies for the protection of all of the people of the province, and is somewhat similar to the regular police force function; whereas another part of the Securities Commission's work, such as providing prospectuses and so on, is really a service, so that merely adds to the complications of sorting out the income paid for the service. But that's an area we are looking into.

The points you made about the central registry being something comparable to the Torrens system, and those about the Debtors' Assistance Board are valid, and are ones we will give some consideration to.

Your comments about the provincial judges, I am in complete agreement with. I don't think there is any member of this profession who has practised before in the lower criminal court level -- and all of us have at one stage or another during our time at the bar -- who hasn't been upset. There is no doubt that that is the place where the vast majority of the public comes in contact with the judicial system, and unless it not only functions fairly, but appears to function fairly, it leaves a very bad impression. The points you have mentioned are among several that I propose to review with the provincial judges. Incidentally I am meeting with them in a week or so at their annual meeting, and there are a number of things that need improvement to accomplish the purpose that I think should be accomplished by the provincial government -- by the criminal courts particularly -- when dealing with the minor offences.

MR. DRAIN:

I'd like to bring a matter to the attention of the hon. Attorney General, and this comes out of representations that have been made to me in my particular area. Geographically, of course, we are located very close to British Columbia, hence any changes in regulations in British Columbia have the impact of being known and in many cases have an effect on our area, since most people do business both in the Province of British Columbia, and that of Alberta. This has to do with the matter of the Small Claims or Small Debts Act, something that has been mentioned by the hon. member for Calgary North Hill. That is in the matter of processing a debt. Here again, my area of

36-88

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

understanding in these particular legal procedures is frankly very obscure, but I believe it works something like this. There is a judgment obtained through a provincial judge, and then to service this, the processing of servicing has to go, or be done, through the legal profession. And in many cases the costs are very high in relation to the particular debt that has to be collected. So on April 2, 1971, the section was added to the British Columbia Small Claims Act, being Chapter No. 359 of the Revised Statutes of the Province of British Columbia.

"Wherein a judge, or registrar, or deputy registrar may issue a garnisheeing order in a case in which a garnisheeing order may be issued under the attachment of The Debts Act unless inconsistent within this act."

In other words, the judge may direct the direct collection of this particular account. So this certainly is something that would appear to me to be reasonable and certainly it should not be objected to too strenuously by the legal profession insofar, I would think, that most of these are nuisance claims, relatively. So I am wondering whether the hon. Attorney General would take under consideration an amendment such as they have in the Province of British Columbia in the matter of these small debts.

MR. LEITCH:

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, we'll take that under consideration. I'm satisfied I can assure the hon. member that the legal profession wouldn't mind because, as he says, a garnishee summons fall into the category of nuisance work, generally speaking. The one area that would give me some concern is that garnishees are rather a drastic step in the legal process, and we have a great number of safeguards with respect to the issuing of garnishee summons. In fact, just a few years back, the law was changed to prevent them from being issued until a judgment had been obtained, except in very unusual cases. So there might be some difficulties there. But certainly the point will be considered.

MR. DRAIN:

A supplementary. Maybe I was wrong in emphasizing garnishees. The servicing of judgments, this is the point. In other words the judge can direct the payment, so in other words you eliminate the ultimate step which we have to take in the Province of Alberta. This is what I was thinking of.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Chairman, we'll consider it.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, owing to the lateness of the hour I have about four subjects. I think I'll just place them more or less into questions to the hon. Attorney General in order to save some time.

The one that we're particularly interested in -- the hon. Member for Calgary North touched on it -- was the investigation under The Coroners Act. I have had some complaints, and I'm sure the Attorney General has, particularly with supposed suicides, and we have had some suspicion that they weren't exactly suicides. There may have been foul play. This is where the general public in particular have approached me, more concerned with suicides than with the automobile accident deaths. I was wondering if there was going to be a review in that particular field. I realize there are some problems, because many times the families do not wish to push the case because they say it's an open and shut case and it's just going to bring about a lot of unnecessary publicity. But there are one or two cases where the

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-89

family was interested, as well as some outside individuals, that an inquest be held, and there was concern expressed.

The other thing I would like to touch on too, Mr. Chairman, is the good work that is done, particularly in the Calgary office of the Debtors' Assistance Board. I think that they do excellent work. The hon. member, Mr. Koziak, brought up the point of some of the forms. There is a particular form that I think works a hardship on a person who is going through this Debtors' Assistance Board; I think it's a minor one but it can cause major embarrassment. It's a case of where a man under the Debtors' Assistance Board may have paid four bills of the five he owed but he still owes one more. However, the circular goes out, in effect saying that he hasn't paid off all his accounts yet. And they go out, say, to the four he has paid off, and this reflects back to the Credit Bureau. They eventually find out that he's paid three of the four debts outstanding. I had one man in particular, a couple of weeks ago, who ran into this problem and he was put in an embarrassing position because they said he still owed these particular debts, but I think if they had come out and said he only owed the one debt it would have made it easier for him and saved him the embarrassment. It's just a case of forms in that respect, and could be straightened out quite easily.

The other case I have in mind, and I'd like the hon. minister's comments on this, is the case brought about by the furore that was caused by the patient who was released from Ponoka and apparently went back to the town of Magrath and a gentleman was killed there shortly after this man was released. Then an argument came about between the Attorney General's department and the director of the hospital in Ponoka. The director at the hospital at Ponoka maintains they are operating a hospital there and not a jail. I was wondering if the Attorney General and his government were giving any thought to maybe setting up a separate institution for people who are committed there because of a criminal act, or those who are left there at the will of the Lieutenant Governor in the case of a serious offence. I was just wondering, because it does cause uneasiness for people who have patients in there for the illness of mental health and who have committed no crime at all -- and some of the relatives do sometimes wonder why we cannot have a separate institution. Even if they had it on the same grounds but in a separate building which would be considered a jail in that sense. I understand too, of course, when a person is suffering with mental illness, regardless of whether he has committed a crime or not, he needs treatment, but it does cause some concern. I would like the Attorney General to give us a few highlights of what he is considering in this field because I know that he is taking into consideration the Magrath incident that I mentioned before.

I would also like to touch briefly, Mr. Chairman, on the Alberta Crime Compensation Board and to comment to the Attorney General that I think the board gives excellent service, but I wonder if it isn't time that we review this act. It has only been in for a short period of time -- as a matter of fact it came into force on October 1, 1969 -- and the act provides compensation where a person is injured or killed as a result of an act or omission by another person in Alberta, within the description of any of the criminal offences set out in schedules I and II of the act, or where the person was endeavouring to arrest any person, or preserve the peace, or assist a police officer. My concern is, as you go over the report, a great number of the cases involve arguments in beer parlours and taverns. I wonder if this was the intent of the act when it was originally set up. It's a good act. In particular, I think someone should be compensated if he goes to the aid of a police officer, or if he goes to the aid of a victim and he himself, when he is trying to help the victim, is injured.

I'd also comment on the cost of operating the scheme and ask one question. The three board members apparently were paid a total of

36-90

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

nearly \$20,000 and there was \$71,000 given out in awards, so the administration would run around \$20,000. Dr. Florence Brent, who I think is an excellent person, is executive-secretary -- we're in an ideal situation with a medical officer and a lawyer serving on this board -- and I imagine her wages are paid by your department, Mr. Minister, rather than through the board. So the cost of the administration of this act, I would say, is running in the neighbourhood of probably \$40,000 or \$50,000.

I wondered if the hon. minister is going to consider reviewing some of the cases that are coming before the board, because a lot of them involve family arguments or arguments in beer parlours, and I am just wondering if we can justify taking taxpayers' money to compensate people who get into this type of action rather than a true criminal case where somebody is holding up a bank and somebody tries to prevent them from doing this, and he is injured. Of course, I know whether a fellow is injured in a beer parlour or whether he's injured out on the street in some other case, naturally he should have a claim. But it does cause some concern as you go through it, and it seems to me that a lot of compensation and a lot of time is taken up by the board on these cases which involve arguments in beer parlours. And so, Mr. Minister, with those few remarks I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Minister.

MR. LEITCH:

Responding to the hon. member's first comment about inquests, that is an area that I'm reviewing. It's a very, very difficult one because it's hard to find anything that's more charged with emotion than a death where there is a question of suicide, foul play, or things of that nature -- and there is always family involved. So it's something that's very, very difficult to deal with. But certainly my approach to it is that if there is the slightest suggestion of foul play there should be all of the usual steps taken to investigate, which would involve an inquest.

With respect to his comment on the circular from the Debtors' Assistance Board, that is something I'll look into.

Turning now to the Magrath case which involved -- or more accurately -- which raised the question of detaining people who are mentally ill and who are a threat, I can say unequivocally that in my opinion the mentally ill who have propensities to harm themselves or others, constitute a far, far greater threat to the public at large than do the people in our correctional institutions.... And I'm very, very concerned about our having a secure place for those people. It should be secure and it should also provide a facility for treatment. And with that in mind we have been holding discussions with my colleague, the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development, and we are discussing the ways and means of providing that kind of a facility within the Province of Alberta. There is a question of whether it should be one central facility, and that poses the problem, of course, of friends and relatives of the people having to come long distances. It may be important medically that the people there, as part of their treatment program, be visited by their friends and relatives. If you have only the one institution it means that for many patients those people are going to have to come very long distances. Again, providing that kind of facility in a number of places in the province is very expensive. That is something that we are actively reviewing at the moment and our objective is to provide a secure facility, one where the proper kind of treatment is readily available.

April 25th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-91

With respect to the Crimes Compensation Board, it's true that alcohol plays a very prominent role in the large percentage of cases. But my memory is that the act also enables the board to take into account the conduct of the injured person in arriving at the amount of compensation. So it would seem to me that the only way in which you could justifiably remove any cases from the jurisdiction of the board is to -- and I don't think you can remove it on the basis that alcohol is the cause of the crime because it doesn't matter whether you're hit by a drunk or a sober person, you receive the same injury. I think the issue is that if you have been drinking and as a result of the drinking have gotten yourself into a position by provoking another customer or something, that you had an assault committed upon you, that may well be a proper matter to be considered in determining the compensation. But my recollection is that it is now considered by the board in determining whether the person is entitled to compensation and in fact I think they take into account contributory negligence in determining whether he is entitled to compensation. Subject to that, I'd want to again check that and be sure, but I think that's now the situation.

The administrative cost is high in comparison with the amount paid out, but I think there are two reasons for that. Number one, for some of the cases that go back some time, I think there is a restriction on the amount the board can pay out. I expect, as is shown in the estimates here, that the payments from the board will go up considerably in the coming year.

The second factor is that the cost of administration of the judicial system, which is what the Crimes Compensation Board is, is always going to be relatively high. Because if you are having a judicial hearing it must be done thoroughly and slowly and by trained and skilled people to arrive at the decision-making process, and that just necessarily involves expense. The alternative -- I think the only way one could reduce the administrative expense is to put an individual in there making administrative decisions in much the way as we make administrative decisions in all the other departments of government. But for my part I wouldn't think that would be an acceptable way to handle this kind of case because it does depend on the hearing of evidence and assessment of whether the injury flowed from a crime. The board does have to scrutinize a great many of these cases where the evidence that the injury flowed from a crime is very questionable. Often these crimes are committed with no one around for example, and that takes very close scrutiny by the board to make up its mind. So while the administrative cost is high in relation to the amount paid out, I think there are two reasons for that. Number one, the nature of the claim that they are now dealing with, but more important, the fact that it functions as a judicial body, and therefore functions slowly and expensively.

MR. DIXON:

Just a couple of other short points, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. minister. I agree with him fully as far as there being a board to investigate and to make awards rather than an individual administrator. I was quite impressed with Dr. Florence Brent and with the work she is doing. I think that if Alberta wants to establish another first -- we were one of the first to establish an ombudsman -- maybe she would make an excellent 'ombudswoman'. I think she would be an excellent candidate for that job.

The other thing I would like to mention, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. minister is that if the Attorney General decides that after reviewing the Dr. Matthews report, and other problems that have been brought to his attention regarding justice (such as was brought in last week with the provincial judge in Calgary regarding some of the back-up in cases, although in a magistrate's court I don't think there are a great many cases backed up like there would be in the other courts) I was wondering, though, if he did decide to have an

36-92

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 25th 1972

investigation, would he give consideration to setting up a legislative committee to look into the work of our courts in Alberta, and in particular our magistrate's court? Because as the hon. Attorney General has mentioned himself tonight, the only court that over 90 per cent of our people in Alberta ever have anything to do with is usually the magistrate's court. So it is very close to the people, and the Legislature being about as close as you can get, I think it would be a good thing to have a legislative committee investigate these particular charges.

MR. LEITCH:

I will consider that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I wonder if, at this time of night, we would consider reporting to the Speaker? Yes, Mr. Minister?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I was just going to make a speech, Mr. Chairman. No, I would move. . .[laughter]. . .Mr. Chairman, I would move that the Committee rise and report progress and beg leave to sit again.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

That is agreed, very well. I would have disappointed the minister because I have a list of about four other people ahead of him.

[Mr. Diachuk left the Chair at 11:03 p.m.]

* * * * *

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at 11:03 p.m.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain estimates, reports some progress, and begs leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[The House rose at 11:05 pm.]