

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday Afternoon, November 14, 1972

[The House met at 2:30 pm.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Agrimart Site

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, under Presenting Petitions, I would present:

To the Honourable the Legislature of Alberta, herein assembled:

The Petition of the undersigned humbly sheweth:

That the people of the Vista Heights area in the City of Calgary, in the Province of Alberta, request the Government of Alberta to prohibit all further action and planning of the Agrimart project in north east Calgary.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

Mr. Speaker, this petition contains 332 names and it is preambled by:

Whereas on or about April 19th, 1972, the Calgary Planning Commission approved the construction of a stockyard complex (Agrimart) in the vicinity of 32 Avenue and west of Barlow Trail N.E., Calgary, Alberta;

And whereas the residents of N.E. Calgary appealed the said decision to the Development Appeal Board of the City of Calgary and were denied a remedy of their grievance;

And whereas the matter is presently before the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of Alberta;

And whereas the Council of the City of Calgary, Alberta has advised the aggrieved residents of Calgary that it is unable to intervene on their behalf;

And whereas the Alberta Government has indicated that it is seeking alternate sites for the said stockyard complex (Agrimart);

Therefore, we the undersigned --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please! I don't believe it is within the contemplation of the rule that the petition should be read. It is only necessary for the hon. member to summarize the material allegations in the petition.

MR. HO LEM:

Yes, well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to file this petition, but as background information I would like to inform the hon. members of the House that I have another petition which was presented to the City of Calgary containing some 3,000 names. This would be available for inspection if the hon. members wish to see it. In addition to these 3,000 names, we have 15 letters from --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please! Possibly the hon. member could give the additional information if and when the petition is found to be in order and has been tabled. Then, under our rule, it will be open to debate. We shouldn't be covering the same material twice.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I therefore present this petition.

74-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 14th 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

I could say to the House, that later in the day and as soon as possible, hopefully before we meet tomorrow, I shall look over the petition and if it meets with the rules, I will ask to have it tabled.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in making this particular introduction to you and to the hon. members of the assembly. I think that in introducing this particular class I would have to say that they are indeed something special because of the interest they are showing in our proceedings here today, in spite of the fact that they can't hear the proceedings, and can only have knowledge of what is being said as the result of an interpreter interpreting to these young people. The visitors are a class from the School for the Deaf in Edmonton. They are 30 in number, accompanied by their group leader/teacher, Mrs. O'Donoghue, and by their driver. I would ask that they now stand in the gallery and be recognized by the assembly.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I am again happy to welcome a class from my constituency -- 30 Grade V students from the Delton Elementary School, accompanied by Mrs. Smith Robertson, their teacher. I do commend them for enriching their studies in Social Studies by watching our government in action. Could I ask them to please stand and be recognized by this assembly.?

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table a report called "The Man and Resources Program." This program is conducted under the directorship of the Canadian Council of Resource and Environmental Ministers, and this is the resume of the Alberta portion of the program.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I'm in a position now to table the answer to notice of Motion No. 218, and this has regard to the land tenure matter in the Grande Cache area.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the answer to Question 235 with regard to number of applications for loans before the Agricultural Development Fund.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the answers to Question 229 regarding the recent economic visit to Japan.

DR. HORNER:

Concurrent with that, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table one copy of the report of the Agricultural Task Force of the economic mission to Japan.

MR. WEBBY:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to table certain information that hon. members had requested during the debate on Bill No. 120. This is in regard to planned investment that will be transferred as of December 31, 1972.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Opposition House Leader, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill.

November 14, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

74-3

Select Committee - Communal Use of Land

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if I could address a question to the hon. Government House Leader. Is it the intention of the government to have the report issued by the Select Committee on Communal Use of Land debated in the legislature?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Not at this time, Mr. Speaker, insofar as Bill No. 119 provides ample opportunity for debating all aspects of that matter.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs said Bill No. 119 had nothing whatsoever to do with the report. Would it still be debatable during that bill?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I would think there would be no problem, Mr. Speaker, in hon. members alluding to the report during debate on the bill in either second reading or in committee, insofar as there is only one pertinent section.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, to the hon. chairman of the committee. Would it be possible to have the representations made to the Select Committee on Communal Use of Land tabled in the legislature, or made available to other members of the legislature?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. I believe this is covered in 171 of Beaudesne. I think perhaps there might be another method for getting in touch with the chairman with regard to tabling the material.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Agrimart Site

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Mr. Minister, with or without a petition, are you already close to solving the Agrimart problem in Calgary McCall riding?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we are. The government, in the last 10 days since it was requested to intervene by the City of Calgary, has been able to assemble what I think is an extremely attractive package based on the government's policy of decentralization and orderly metropolitan growth. This involves the provision of an attractive alternative serviced site for the Agrimart complex; the site has been placed before them, and they naturally want some time to consider it. As a matter of fact, officials of Agrimart are in Edmonton today and we expect ongoing discussions over the next few days to discuss that situation.

MR. FARRAN:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. How long had this problem been festering before you were asked to help?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I am not completely sure; I believe it has been in front of the city of Calgary in one way or another for about two years.

74-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 14th 1972

MR. FARRAN:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Did you receive a petition or any representation from the hon. Member for Calgary McCall before you took action?

MR. RUSSELL:

No, Mr. Speaker, we didn't.

MR. HO LEM:

Would the hon. minister inform the House whether I had discussed on several occasions this thing about the issue of the Agrimart -- have I discussed this with you before?

MR. RUSSELL:

No, Mr. Speaker, not to my knowledge he hadn't.

MR. HO LEM:

I would like to remind --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member surely cannot be asking for information which he has already in his own ken.

MR. HO LEM:

The statement by the hon. minister is in direct contravention to what really had happened. I think this should be borne out. I have talked to the minister on several occasions regarding this issue.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I don't like the insinuations that are being made here. I have had no correspondence, no phone call, no direct conversation with the hon. member. He did catch me about four days ago at the top of the stairs here; if that's a discussion then we had it. That's within the last four days.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary. Regarding the recent press conference between the representatives of this government as well as members of the City Council, I wonder why the residents of this area who are very much concerned, were not invited? Would the minister care to answer that question?

MR. RUSSELL:

Invited where, Mr. Speaker? There was a spokesman from the community association present at the conference.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary. Who was the official representative? Was he in fact the president of the Vista Heights Community Association?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the hon. member shouldn't ask questions unless he knows he's going to get a favourable answer, because I can't help him in this dilemma.

AN. HON. MEMBER:

He can never win.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. minister can tell us whether there is any indication at all from the Agrimart officials that they are interested in alternate proposals?

November 14, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

74-5

MR. RUSSELL:

Yes, of course, Mr. Speaker. There is substantive interest being shown.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary. Is it in writing?

MR. SPEAKER:

This will be the last supplementary on this point.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I can only say that the Agrimart bodies are present in this building right now to discuss very thoroughly the proposal that is in front of them, plus other associated matters. We are very pleased with the positive response they have given to our positive proposal.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Gas Policy

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Premier today. Is it the government's intention not to grant Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Ltd. of Toronto any further removal permits for additional supplies of natural gas unless the transmission company pays Alberta producers substantially more for the fuel?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, that question is something that will be dealt with on the position paper with regard to a new gas policy, and I will specifically have it responded to in the statement.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place.

Bankruptcy - Prefabricated Home Builders

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Attorney General. Has your department received any complaint by residents with regard to the builders of pre-fabricated homes who have accepted deposits and then gone out of business or gone into bankruptcy before completing the home?

MR. LEITCH:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Does the government at this time have any specific plans to deal with this problem?

MR. LEITCH:

We are, Mr. Speaker, looking into possible ways and means of curing the problem that the hon. member has raised.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the government considering as one of these options a system where the money would be kept in trust until such time as the home is either completed or at least, in the main, completed?

74-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 14th 1972

MR. LEITCH:

That is one of the possibilities, Mr. Speaker, that we have been considering, along with a number of other ones. I would hope we would find other possibilities that are equally as effective, or more effective, in curing the problem, because that kind of proposal not only interferes with the people who may do the customers harm, but it also interferes with those people who are carrying on a normal, proper business operation.

MR. NOTLEY:

One final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the Attorney General considered any changes in the procedures of the Companies Branch to ensure that people who have been involved in one bankruptcy after another are not easily able to set up another company to go into the same business that they have just gone out of under another name?

MR. LEITCH:

No, Mr. Speaker. It is something that may be worth considering, but my initial reaction to it is that it would be a very questionable practice to legislate against someone continuing in business or going into a new business, merely because he has a failure in the past. It may well be that, with that kind of an arrangement, you would again interfere with people who without any fault or wrongdoing on their own, have gotten into a position of bankruptcy.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View,

Government Pay Rates

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed either to the Minister of Public Works or to the Minister of Labour, I am not sure which. Could the minister clarify for me confusion which apparently exists surrounding the pay conditions for hourly wage employees, particularly tradesmen in the Department of Public Works? It has been suggested to me that their wage rate may have been cut.

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, I'll be happy to try and field this one, if you will allow me a moment because I think this is of great concern not only to all the people here in the legislature but to the public in general.

There is a great deal of confusion between what has happened to the salaried personnel, mostly in the employment of the Department of Public Works but in other departments as well, and the wage personnel. The salaried personnel -- all the jobs in the department were reclassified because of the change of concept as far as the type of work that they were doing, and it is now recognized that most of the work done in the department is maintenance work rather than construction work and, therefore, they were reclassified as maintenance electricians or plumbers, etc. This does not in any way downgrade their qualifications, but under this new classification a lower salary rate was set.

However, none of the salaried staff had their wages lowered to this new rate, but they were maintained on the same rate, and I was a little unhappy with the words used of 'freezing their salary', because this usually has an inference of freezing it down, whereas their salaries were frozen up and kept at the higher level that they were already being paid. In fact, in either October or December the salaried employees had an agreed increase.

When you come to the wage staff the policy was a little different here in that we developed a policy whereby people employed with the department for 18 months continuously were brought into a permanent status. This means that their fringe benefits were similar to those on permanent staff and of the 310 wage tradesmen involved in this change 184 of them received these fringe benefits of the permanent staff.

However, in order to bring this into line with the permanent staff, we couldn't give them all the fringe benefits and still pay them a higher rate. Their actual rate of pay was levelled off with that of the salaried staff at 93 per cent of the union rates. In some instances this did mean a downgrading of

November 14, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

74-7

salary from the 100 per cent to the 93 per cent. However, in exchange for this, they received considerable side benefits, and many of the staff who do not receive these benefits of the hourly staff, do not receive these fringe benefits, will, in the very near future, qualify for the 18 months qualification. It was felt that people who had worked for the department, even on a wage basis, should receive extra benefits if they had worked continuously for 18 months.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Public Works dealing with the reclassification of permanent salaried tradesmen. Did this reclassification come about as a result of negotiations between the CSA and the government, or did it come about as a result of a Ministerial Order?

DR. BACKUS:

This reclassification, the classification of salaried staff, is not in the terms of their negotiations. The classification of the staff is outside negotiations, and the reclassification or the determination of new classes was carried out as the result of a Ministerial Order.

MR. YOUNG:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the people who have been reclassified be eligible to participate in the collective bargaining union or are they already in the union? In other words, will their new wage rate at the next negotiation be established via the process of collective bargaining?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is asking about the permanent tradesmen, then, of course, this is through collective bargaining by the Civil Service Association and the Government of Alberta. In the case of wage tradesmen it will continue to be outside the agreement.

MR. YOUNG:

One further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. My understanding -- which I would like to have verified -- is that there was, in fact, a trade-off in return for the permanent status which was given to tradesmen at an earlier date; they accepted some fringe benefits in exchange for a slight reduction in hourly wage rate. Is that correct?

DR. HOHOL:

That is correct, Mr. Speaker, and I think it's so important that we appreciate were talking about two groups of tradesmen. Up till today, we're talking about permanent tradesmen, within the collective bargaining unit, and bargained for by the Civil Service Association of Alberta. Part of their agreement was extensive fringe benefits, and 93 per cent of the wages of their trade in the private sector. The hourly rated tradesmen were clearly casual labour, and so they weren't collectively bargained for, and did not have fringe benefits. But because they could be released at any time, Mr. Speaker, the occupational hazard provided more wages for them -- in other words, compared to the 93 per cent, they got 100 per cent of the trade money, but no fringe benefits.

Now in trading off the fringe benefits for wages, the fringe benefits are in excess of 7 per cent, and the 7 per cent is the difference between the 100 per cent which the party received and the 93 per cent to which the collective bargaining unit was tied in the private sector. And this distinction is incredibly important.

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary Mr. Speaker, to the Minister. In the recent negotiations that have been carried on, will it be unnecessary now for some of the government employees to apply for supplementary allowances through welfare -- through Social Development departments -- in order to compensate for the low wages they've been paid? Do we still have some people getting government wages plus welfare benefits -- I mean from Social Development?

74-8

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 14th 1972

DR. HOHOL:

I can't answer that directly. It depends a good deal on what happens in the collective bargaining procedure itself and in the process between the two groups. I couldn't anticipate it.

While I'm on my feet, I do want to give the information that the casual tradesman definition is an important one. Some people who are casual tradesmen, or what we call wages tradesmen, were on work for several years, and there's nothing casual about this. And so we bought a definition then to the casual tradesman, by saying up to 18 months. Once he's over 18 months a decision has to be made. Either he's a permanent employee or he doesn't meet the standards of employment and is then dropped, to be again rehired for casual labour if this is necessary.

But you can't talk about casual labour as going on and on and on, so we felt we had to codify his position or drop him. And so we did what we did with the 93 per cent. We felt that these two approaches to employment were not reasonable, that we should negotiate our own wages to collective bargaining for permanent employees and define the casual worker at 18 months. In doing this, the workers agreed to buy 7 per cent plus benefits, for 7 per cent wages. This information is so important.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, and then may the hon. Member for Jasper Place ask the last supplementary?

MR. DIXON:

I'm quite concerned about these people on welfare and also working for the government. I was wondering what happens if a permanent employee tries for social allowance as well as his wages. What steps are taken to investigate his case other than through the welfare department?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I don't mind responding to that. My hope would be that if there is any government employee who, because of some disability in the home or who has an exceptionally large family or something like that and is working at a relatively minimal rate of pay, if he needed any help he would get it the same as any other citizen. But, if the hon. member thinks the practice of government employees receiving both ends is common in any way -- it hasn't come to my attention at any time that there are such cases -- I could certainly look into any ones that relate to this area.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question to the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister of Labour assure the House that none of the wages to casual tradesmen will be reduced below the 93 per cent of their former wage, and secondly in view of your statement about the 93 per cent formula for casual tradesmen, what is the position now of the government with respect to the 93 per cent formula for permanent tradesmen employed by the government?

DR. HOHOL:

Yes, on the first question, Mr. Speaker, without any question at all, there would be no reductions below the 93 per cent barring error, and if that were the case, then I would correct the error without any hesitation.

In the second case, and that is, of course, as I said on the floor, Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago, is a matter of negotiation. What happens to the 93 per cent is a negotiable kind of conclusion which will be reached between the Civil Service Association and this government. It could well be that they might negotiate upwards to 95, or 97, or even 100 or 102 per cent. It is conceivable, though not likely, that they could negotiate downwards. But that is not my experience in many years of experience in collective bargaining that any group loses its negotiated position with respect to wages, or hardly anything else. So I just want to emphasize, that is a matter of negotiation as it ought properly to be.

November 14, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

74-9

DR. BACKUS:

With regard to the permanent staff, the 93 per cent, of course, does disappear with regard to their tradesmen. They are now salaried on a basis of maintenance tradesmen, and they have a set salary. It is the salary that is negotiated, not the percentage.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place with a supplementary, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View with a question.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, my concluding supplementary. With respect to the 184 hourly-paid tradesmen who acquired permanent status, could the hon. minister indicate very briefly, the nature of the benefits which were acquired by the tradesmen in this development, and the nature of the government contribution toward those benefits?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't be exact in the monetary contribution of government, but this information I can always get for the hon. member, or anyone else who wants it. The fringe benefits improve the situation by including such things as group insurance, pensions, sick leave, and the usual benefits that go into collective bargaining. I can be specific by a memorandum or an answer for the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Elected Representatives on Payroll of Premier's Office

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. the Premier advise the House whether the government is considering the establishment of another government portfolio, or a Minister Without Portfolio?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, not at this time.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary. Would the hon. the Premier then advise the House whether any of the M.L.A.s are presently employed by the government in his office, or elsewhere on a part-time or permanent basis on a salary or wages?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure I fully understand that question. Perhaps the hon. member could be more explicit and I could follow him.

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, what I mean, Mr. Speaker, is -- I would like the hon. the Premier to advise the House whether any M.L.A.s on the government side are employed by the government either in the Premier's office or any other office on a part-time or full-time basis for salary or wages? Now, I could hardly be more explicit than that, but, what I am suggesting is perhaps some M.L.A. who is sitting in the House also has a job with the government for salary, over and above his indemnity, or any other allowance that all M.L.A.s get. Now, if I am still unclear --

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, certainly not to my knowledge. I think the hon. member made reference to the word 'salary' --

MR. LUDWIG:

-- and wages.

74-10

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 14th 1972

MR. LOUGHEED:

And wages, and as far as I'm concerned, the answer to that would be no, subject to correction in checking. There are, however, a number of M.L.A.s on the government side of the House who are doing special assignments for me, in addition to the task forces, which is a matter that has been before the House.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what I had in mind. If any of the government M.L.A.s are earning money from the government on whatever kind of purpose, whether it is a special assignment, average assignment, or regular assignment, I would like to know who, under what circumstances, and how much they're getting.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I thought I was clear. The answer is no, subject to checking.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, on the same vein, are there are federal members of parliament on the payroll of the Alberta government?

[Laughter]

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps I could raise it slightly differently. Are there any present members of the federal parliament who were on the government payroll immediately preceeding the election?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, if he's talking about the provincial government payroll, certainly not to my knowledge.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway.

Royal Life Saving Society

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth, and Recreation. Does the provincial government currently require Alberta lifeguards to meet Royal Life Saving Society standards?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, this is usually the regulation by the individual municipalities concerning their swimming pools. If it is a provincial swimming pool, it would then fall under the auspices of the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Is the government prepared to supply the Royal Life Saving Society with copies of the swimming pool operators' manual and swimming pool regulations that they have requested?

MR. YUEKO:

Mr. Speaker, my department puts out a great deal of literature, pamphlets, and so forth in many areas, including many regulations. The department asked me for a policy statement in regard to the issuing of certain regulations and pamphlets that were being requested in very large volumes. If my memory serves me correctly, this is what I asked the department to use as a guide. Where the request was for pamphlets or regulations which involved an expenditure by the government of \$25, then the department was to dispense these regulations or pamphlets. Where the request was for greater than \$25, then the organization or individual should be sent out a form requesting additional information with respect to use, its distribution, who would have access to it, and so forth. Then on the basis of this information, the department would make a decision as

November 14, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

74-11

to whether or not it would dispense, on a free basis, any additional information above the \$25 cost.

I think we must recognize that the requirement of information from the Department of the Environment on matters of the environment is indeed enormous. Some type of guideline is necessary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall.

Rural Radio Program

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister Without Portfolio in charge of Rural Development. Is it true, Mr. Minister, that you are involved in an innovative program of television communication each Saturday morning involving rural communities? I would like to know if this is true, in fact, and who else is involved, how long this has been going on, and what is the purpose?

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

Mr. Speaker, this is a radio program heard on CBX every Saturday morning at 9:15 until 10:00. The intent is to revitalize the struggling rural areas that are trying to slow down the increasing urbanization of Alberta. The follow-up will be a publication which will give more detail about the communities participating; it will also depict rural life styles and expose residential, agricultural, and industrial potentials in rural Alberta. Also in this publication will be included the aims, the objectives and the workings of The Agricultural Development Act and the Alberta Opportunity Fund.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the question that the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View asked me, after thinking about it further, I want to make it clear that the answer is an unequivocal no.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister in charge of Rural Development. Who pays for this program, and did the previous administration have such a program when they were in office?

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

Mr. Speaker, each town and village that participates pays its own way. The program started on the 7th of October and so far 12 communities have participated. To date, we have 36 communities that have enthusiastically responded their intent to participate. Such towns and villages -- just to name a few -- as Tofield, Vermilion, Forestburg, Wildwood, Daysland, have been on the air so far. As far as previous programs of this nature, I am not aware of them, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall, followed by the hon. Member for Drayton Valley.

Real Estate Registry

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Premier. Is the proposal by the Mayor of Calgary suggesting that a real estate registry be implemented for civic officials, elected and otherwise, contrary to your Bill of Rights?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would think not. Perhaps the hon. member might like to raise the question specifically in committee this evening under Bill No. 1, and we will deal with it and have a response to him.

74-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 14th 1972

MR. HO LEM:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will, but as a supplementary, is it the intention of the Alberta government to implement such a real estate registry for its officials?

MR. LOUGHEED:

I refer the question to the Attorney General.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I wasn't sure, in following the question, what the hon. member meant by a real estate registry system.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, it is, in short, a declaration of all real estate holdings, stocks, bonds, and so on, of the persons holding high elected offices in government, whether it be civic or provincial. It is a declaration of their interests and their holdings.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I am now getting the intent of the question. I think the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury asked a question along similar lines early in the session. I believe I answered him that the matter was under review by the government and we hoped to make a policy statement early in the spring session in 1973.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drayton Valley, followed by the hon. Opposition House Leader.

Recovery of Funds - Accident Victims

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Does the Department of Health and Social Development recover any funds which are expended on behalf of the people involved in automobile accidents which are consequently charged to Medicare? After litigation in the courts and settlement by insurance companies is complete, does Medicare or your department recover any of these funds from insurance companies?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, insofar as that relates to the operation of the Alberta Health Care Insurance Plan, it would be a question that would be answered by the hon. Miss Hunley. I certainly don't mind checking into the details and giving the hon. member a response to his question in the event that Miss Hunley isn't able to answer it today.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Opposition House Leader, followed by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

Freight Rates

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Industry and Transportation? In the temporary absence of the north end of the ARR, are the Peace River farmers receiving the ARR freight rate for grain shipped out?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, they are.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, is the hon. minister aware that the two cent extra for wheat is being paid by the Canadian Wheat Board?

November 14, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

74-13

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I am.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary. Is the hon. minister aware that the one cent extra on rape is being paid by the farmers in Peace River?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I'll defer that question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, we have assurance from the Wheat Board that the ARR rates will remain in effect in the Peace River area to the end of this crop year, and hopefully by then the railroad will be restored.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Is he in agreement with the stand taken by the hon. Robert Stanfield that freight rates should be frozen in Canada?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, this government's stand on transportation has been made fairly clear in the last two weeks in this legislature. For the first time a provincial government in Alberta is doing something about transportation and freight rates, something --

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary. I could understand the hon. minister being a bit gun shy, but he didn't answer my question. The hon. Robert Stanfield stated in Calgary that he will freeze freight rates. What is the minister's stand on the issue?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, again I will say very clearly that this government, for the first time in the history of Alberta, is doing something about freight rates. We have had freight rate commissions in Canada for a number of years. The previous government, of which my hon. friend was a member, had an opportunity to make presentations and adequately put forward the case for Alberta in relation to freight rates, but this is something they failed to do. That's the reason they're over there.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Deputy Premier be as definite in his statement that he made just a moment ago when he said the ARR would be restored by this fall? Was that a new policy statement by the government?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I could spend a couple of hours about the mess that they left the ARR in.

MR. CLARK:

Nobody mentioned the mess; we just mentioned the solution.

DR. HORNER:

The hon. member of course, being a former member who didn't really know what was going on in the whole ARR --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. minister's answers are obviously leading toward debate and if they persist in that direction the Chair will be powerless to stop like mannered questions from the other side.

74-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 14th 1972

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, you know they asked and they shall receive. On the other hand, if he wants a specific answer, the whole question of course of restoration of the A.R.R. is under consideration, as the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce has announced previously.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If we can get back to the question before the red herring came up. Will the hon. minister check on this one cent rate that the farmers claim they are paying themselves? In view of what the hon. the Deputy Premier said, I think it needs to be checked. And a second supplementary while I'm up. When the Canadian Wheat Board pays this, are not the western farmers of Alberta or Western Canada paying it? The railways apparently are giving nothing.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member isn't quite correct. The rest of the farmers are contributing to part of the cost of maintaining those freight rates at what we could call the ARR rates, but also the federal government is contributing through the temporary wheat reserves act because, if the hon. member will recall, we never did get a grain stabilization program out of the former government in Ottawa. So all of those matters are under consideration. We will check the question with regard to your premise that the farmers are paying one cent; our information from the Canadian Wheat Board was, that the ARR rates that were in effect previously remain in effect for the balance of this crop year which is till next August 1.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Crop Insurance

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the House Leader. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he is in a position today to indicate whether there will be an opportunity to debate the report of the Select Committee on Crop Insurance and weather modification, having regard to the fact that it is an interim report, but that the committee's work on crop insurance and other modifications has been completed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have just within the last half hour requested the Clerk Assistant to put a motion on the order paper to the effect that that interim report be received and I would anticipate it being called this Friday afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Were the areas -- he has gone; to the Attorney General then. Were the areas referred to by the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour, in his ministerial announcement on November 7th, regarding the Priority Employment Program, geographic or demographic or both?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to check the answer to that question and perhaps give it to the hon. member tomorrow.

November 14, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

74-15

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Cultural Heritage Policy

MR. SCHMID:

I would like to make an important announcement regarding Alberta's cultural heritage. Alberta's people are representative of many divergent cultural backgrounds, and this fact is recognized by the Government of Alberta. The government recognizes also that "every people has a characteristic culture of its own; and, ultimately, many cultures, evolving together, produce a distinct and new culture".

The government believes that Alberta should now carefully assess the riches of the cultural wealth of its peoples, and give direction to the full utilization of this human heritage.

Because our heritage is real, because it is the sum and substance of our social expression, reaching into the distant past, influencing our lives today, pre-shaping the lives of the children of tomorrow, the government convened a Cultural Heritage Conference in June of this year. Representatives of over fifty ethno-cultural groups attended and their concerns, hopes and aspirations were brought forward and discussed.

Some people live under the impression that diversity of language and cultural expressions divide and weaken. The declared intent of our cultural heritage policy is that our diversity of cultural riches shall be a binding tie of unity and an increasing source of pride to our people.

The more specific objectives to which our Cultural Heritage policy is to be directed are:

- (1) To give Albertans increasing pride and identity as a people.
- (2) To unite us in singular strength through understanding of our individual ethno-backgrounds, the sharing of our cultural diversity and richness, and appreciation of our evolving identity.
- (3) To preserve the cultural wealth of our past: the rites, arts, music, of our native peoples; the old-world contributions of our immigrant settlers; the songs, dances, social ways that each ethno-group brought by way of cultural dowry to this new land and which, in many cases, is becoming a common cultural mosaic, uniquely our own.
- (4) To stimulate the living arts -- painting, dancing, music, handicrafts, the human drama -- precisely because of our diversity of heritage background, and thus help Alberta's writers, musicians, dramatists, and dancers to national and international acceptance, appreciation and recognition.

At the previously announced Cultural Heritage Conference held in June, delegates passed many resolutions that would, in their implementation, affect many departments of government. Among those high on the priority list of delegates to the Cultural Heritage Conference were the following:

- (1) The establishment of a Cultural Heritage Council representative of all ethno-cultural groups in Alberta. This Council would consider and recommend programs for the development and preservation of our Cultural Heritage in Alberta.
- (2) The publication of a Cultural Heritage periodical to provide a medium for the exchange of information among the various ethno-cultural communities in Alberta and the government. It is proposed that, initially, this publication would be a bi-monthly magazine, drawing the attention of Albertans generally to the colour, drama, and richness of the cultural past, and providing a vehicle of communication among the various cultural groups of the province.
- (3) The establishment of an office within the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation to co-ordinate the development of ethno-cultural programs in Alberta.

The Government of Alberta has accepted these priority resolutions and declares them to be in effect as of this date.

It should be emphasized that this declaration of the government's position in regard to its cultural heritage is in keeping with the human freedom of its peoples, a fluid and free policy -- a springboard for natural development of the cultural richness of our people. The overall aim of this new culture heritage policy is to preserve that part of our cultural past worthy of preserving, enrich our cultural present and enhance Alberta's cultural tomorrow.

Gasoline Marketing

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make an announcement with respect to the recommendations contained in the report on gasoline marketing. In context to the oil industry, this report is commonly referred to as the McKenzie Report.

Subsequent to the completion of this report and its presentation to the former government, representations were made to my department by the Automotive Retailers Association of Alberta concerning standards of fairness in equity in service station leases, franchises and related agreements. In this connection we have, in consultation with the parties concerned (that is the intergrated oil companies as well as members of the ARÅ), developed guidelines that, if followed conscientiously, will essentially resolve the problems raised in that report.

I would further advise, Mr. Speaker, that my department is currently reviewing other specific recommendations in this report such as (a) pricing policies and (b) practices relating to the marketing of gasoline from the refinery to the consumer.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I anticipate that as a result of this review, and in consultation with these companies engaged in the marketing of gasoline, we will be able to make specific recommendations with respect to these areas of concern to all of us.

November 14, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

74-17

QUESTIONS

Economic Mission to Japan

229. Mr. Taylor asked the Government the following question which was answered by Mr. Peacock as indicated:

(1) What are the names and positions of the persons who went to Japan with the Alberta delegation, whose expenses were paid in whole, or in part, by the provincial government?

Answer Names of Mission Members, Their Title and Office:

P. Lougheed	Premier	Province of Alberta
Mrs. P. Lougheed	Wife of the Premier	of Alberta
H. Hobbs	Executive Secretary	to the Premier
Dr. Hugh M. Horner	Minister	Department of Agriculture
Mrs. H. Horner	Wife of the Deputy Premier	of Alberta

(Agriculture Industry Task Force)

Dr. G. Purnell	Deputy Minister	Department of Agriculture
H. J. Hargrave	Alta. Mrktg. Commissioner	Department of Agriculture
A.J.E. Child	President	Burns Food Ltd.
E. A. McKinnon	Rancher	
J. Channon	Chairman	Alberta Grain Commission
Sten Berg	Hog Producer	
J. K. Iwabuchi	President	I & S Produce Ltd.
H. H. Michael	President	Western Canadian Seed Processors Ltd.
P. P. Pawlowski	Manager	Alta. Honey Producers Cooperative Ltd.

(Resource Industry Task Force)

W. D. Dickie	Minister	Department of Mines and Minerals
W. J. M. Wenzel	Director	International Marketing
D. C. Jones	President	Hudson's Bay Oil and Gas Ltd.
J. H. Irving	President	Manalta Coal Ltd.
P. Cullimore	President	Luscar Ltd.
G. A. Van Wielingen	President	Sulpetro of Canada Ltd.
J. P. Gallagher	President	Dome Petroleum Ltd.
Dr. G. B. Nellon	Head, Geo. Div.	Research Council of Alberta

(Industry Development Task Force)

F. H. Peacock	Minister	Department of Industry and Commerce
R. G. McFarlane	Deputy Minister	Department of Industry and Commerce
A. Rytz	Sec. Manager	Alta. Forest Products Association
R. G. Steele	Dir. of Forestry	Department of Lands and Forests
G. J. Pollock	President	Mannix Co. Ltd.
J. Leinburd	President	Caravan Manufacturing Ltd.
H. McMahon	Retired	
R. D. Southern	President	ATCO Industries Ltd.
H. A. Irving	President	Irving Industries

(Investment and Finance Task Force)

A. F. Collins	Depty. Prov. Treasurer	Department of Treasury
D. H. Sheppard	Chief	Economic Research Branch, Dept. Ind. & Com
J. Reyda	President	Five Star Petroleum and Mines
R. Dalby	Vice President	Canadian Utilities

(Manpower, Education, Science, Research & Development Task Force)

Dr. A. E. Hohol	Minister	Department of Labour
Dr. E. J. Wiggins	Director Research	Research Council of Alberta

(Tourist Facility Development Task Force)

R. W. Dowling	Minister Without Portfolio	
D. A. Hayes	Executive Director	Alta. Government Travel Bureau
J. Cowie	Mission Co-ordinator	International Marketing Branch
Mrs. L. Salloum	Executive Assistant	Bureau of Public Affairs
D. Pettit	Information Service	Department of Agriculture
W. M. Hall	Regional Manager	Dept. of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Federal)

74-18

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 14th 1972

(2) How were the members of the group, whose expenses were paid in whole, or in part, chosen?

Answer The Japan Mission was composed of six special task forces each representing an economic sector of our Province, each led by a Cabinet Minister. The ministers, acting upon the advice of their departments, selected the members of their individual task force on the basis of:

- Ability of the individual to represent a specific industry rather than a particular company.
- Professional ability and experience
- Industry reputation

(3) What is the total cost to the Treasury of Alberta of the trip to Japan?

Answer The final account has yet to be completed, but the total direct cost to the Alberta Treasury of the Economic Mission to Japan will not exceed \$140,000; the above expenses include preparation of publicity backup for other trade missions and tourist promotion.

ALTHOUGH NOT SPECIFICALLY REQUESTED, THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION RELATED TO THE MISSION MAY BE OF INTEREST.

General Backup A comprehensive Japan Mission and Reference Report is in preparation and will be made available to Alberta's business community -- Target date for release is January 1973.

Mission members from industry were required to submit a position paper on the industry sector they were representing and following the Mission, all members submitted comprehensive reports on their meetings, discussions, findings and recommendations.

Cost Benefit In other words, we hired 20 top industry consultants for 10 days and paid them travel and accommodation only! Mission members worked from 7:15 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. and longer for most of the time. This was a working Mission. This is the most comprehensive and least expensive consultants' report ever received by this Government.

The Mission was important and a success in itself; however, of even greater significance is the follow-up to this Mission now underway.

Long term agreements for Alberta products are now being negotiated. This will have a significant effect upon the stability of a large part of our economy.

AGT Decentralization

233. Mr. Henderson asked the Government the following question:

Will the Minister explain, in the light of the government's stated policy of decentralization of public services, the centralization of AGT services which has or will result in reduction of AGT staff in the City of Wetaskiwin?

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that question stand until Thursday when the information will be available.

[The motion was carried without debate.]

Agricultural Development Loans

235. The following questions, asked by Mr. Taylor on November 9th were answered by Dr. Horner as indicated:

(1) How many applications for loans for the purchase of land were received between April 1st and October 31st, 1972?

Answer 725 preliminary loan inquiries, rather than formal applications.

(2) How many of these were accepted and processed?

November 14, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

74-19

Answer 203 applications have been put before the Board of Directors of which 118 have been approved. The remaining ones will have been tabled for further information -- not really rejected.

(3) What is the total amount of money involved in these applications?

Answer Total dollars approved in direct loans -- \$2,240,411.
Dollars approved for guarantee -- \$1,359,250.

MOTIONS FOR RETURN

Therapeutic Abortions

231. Mr. Dixon proposed the following motion to this Assembly, seconded by Mr. Cooper.

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

1. The number of therapeutic abortions carried out in each Alberta hospital from September 1, 1971 to September 1, 1972.
2. The number of complaints the Minister or his department have received from Alberta hospital authorities and medical practitioners as outlined on the second page of The University of Alberta Hospital report which outlines major problems that have arisen because of the large increase of therapeutic abortions in Alberta hospitals.
3. The amount of money paid out to Alberta medical practitioners by Alberta Health Care covering therapeutic abortions from September 1, 1971 to September 1, 1972.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. member I would move Motion for Return No. 231 standing in the name of Mr. Dixon.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the absence of the hon. Member for Calgary Millican perhaps the hon. Opposition House Leader might want to let the matter stand over until Thursday. But I did want to make just the comment that I would be asking for changes in wording and dates; and subject to that, I believe on Thursday we can accept it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Do I take then that we have the consent of the government that Motion for Return No. 231 retain its place on the Order Paper until Thursday?

Communications Network

238. Mr. Wilson proposed the following motion to this Assembly, seconded by Mr. Cooper.

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

- (1) A facsimile of the contract between the Government of Alberta and Canada News-Wire.
- (2) A copy of the guidelines and controls pertaining to the venture that are not included in the contract.
- (3) Was the said contract tendered and, if so, list the other bidders?
- (4) What was the total cost of the teletype installations?
- (5) What offices were they installed in?
- (6) Who are the principals of Canada News-Wire?
- (7) List the users of Alberta Communications Network to date and the amount of time purchased.

74-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 14th 1972

Mr. Speaker, I have an objection to that motion. I would like to check one matter that the hon. member has raised to make sure that we are not in some way harming a competitive position of a company; he asked certain questions about costs. I don't think there will be any problem, but I raise that one reservation and I would otherwise accept the motion.

MR. SPEAKER:

Subject to the condition made by the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, are you ready for the question of Motion No. 238?

[The motion was carried.]

Confidential Documents

239. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the assembly, seconded by Mr. Wilson.

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

A copy of the directive issued by the Attorney General, as referred to on page 71-35 of Hansard, dealing with the question of confidential documents which are seized under a search warrant.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the return for the motion.

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Village Lake Louise

MR. SPEAKER:

Motion No. 1, moved by Mr. Notley, seconded by Mr. Wilson:

Be it resolved that this Legislative Assembly oppose the proposed Village Lake Louise project.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, regarding Motion No. 1, it would appear that this resolution is now redundant, and I'm wondering if the mover and the seconder -- with the approval of the House -- would now withdraw the motion?

MR. NOTLEY:

As mover of the motion, having read the hon. minister's remarks on May 29th, I think I can safely say that the missionary work done by myself and the hon. Member for Calgary Bow is well taken. There is no longer any need to debate the resolution and I certainly agree that it could be withdrawn.

MR. WILSON:

I am in complete agreement with the hon. member on this issue.

MR. SPEAKER:

According to the rule, if there's the unanimous consent of the House, the motion may be withdrawn.

MR. HENDERSON:

I must say, Mr. Speaker, --

MR. SPEAKER:

I should say for the record that there is not unanimous consent.

MR. HENDERSON:

I must say, Mr. Speaker, it's somewhat of an unexpected pleasure. I presume that the government doesn't want to get around to debating the next

November 14, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

74-21

motion, whatever it is, so that's why they want to go through with this exercise.

Nonetheless, I have a few words I would like to present to the members of the House relating to the question of development of national parks to which, in principle, this resolution pertains.

Primarily, Mr. Speaker, it relates to the rather apparent contradiction of the government in its public policy towards development of national parks in the province and its policy on tourism. On the one hand, we have witnessed the government saying it does not favour the development of Village Lake Louise, and the federal government has subsequently withdrawn the proposal from the public.

I don't particularly quarrel, Mr. Speaker, with the position that the provincial government has taken on the matter. It's a matter of record. However, I do suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I'm somewhat concerned in light of the increasing demand we witness within the province for these facilities, that we have the provincial government pursuing very aggressively an advertising campaign throughout Western Canada and certain parts of the States, and I think in Eastern Canada, to promote tourism into Alberta and primarily into the national parks.

Now I well appreciate there are certain benefits that occur indirectly to the citizens of Alberta in the realm of tourism, but I suggest that a lot of the benefits resulting from an advertising policy on tourism really accrue primarily to the business interest in the national parks. And I think there's growing concern among the citizens of this province relative to the fact that the services available to them in the parks -- particularly in the realm of skiing, which Village Lake Louise was primarily concerned with -- are being rapidly priced beyond the range of the average citizen in the province.

We are all familiar with one of the ski lodges in Banff Park which last winter raised its rates for one of its ski packages close to 50 per cent. I think we should look with some alarm on the uncontrolled advertising trying to attract people into the province to use our recreational facilities, when in so doing we are depriving people and making it more expensive -- and I think the word 'depriving' is applicable when one gets down to a certain level of economic benefits that people enjoy -- we're depriving some of our own citizens from the opportunity of using these facilities at reasonable cost.

I can't help but think that the government, in taking the position it did on Lake Louise, should really be examining the extent to which it should be pursuing aggressively the advertising campaign in the realm of winter tourism to bring additional tourists into the province, placing increasingly greater demand on the facilities available, and making it even more difficult for citizens of the province to enjoy these facilities which lie at our doorstep. Certainly I think I have to suggest that the people in the Province of Alberta should not see these facilities being priced beyond their reach as a result of a tourism policy.

I think we are all aware of the action in the Province of Manitoba in the last year where due to the tremendous demand the public is making, both from within the province and from without the province regarding their park facilities, that they have abandoned any efforts in that province to attract any more tourists into the province during the summertime with a view to using their parks, because the citizens of Manitoba themselves increasingly find that the facilities are basically not available to them.

I think it is regrettable, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. minister responsible for this subject has chosen to be absent on such an important afternoon, particularly in view of the fact that his colleagues attach so much importance to this motion, but the minister himself has seen fit not to be here. I note some bit of contradiction in their particular action in this regard --

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I think there are maybe three assumptions that one could make with regard to the absence of the minister. Mr. Dowling, I know, intended to be here. He was called out for a moment and should be back momentarily.

MR. HENDERSON:

I hope, Mr. Speaker, he gets back before the debate is over.

I had a certain amount of information that I had gathered to use in this debate, Mr. Speaker, and I must confess that the action in pursuing the

74-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 14th 1972

resolution somewhat caught me by surprise. I was planning on saving it for the winter session, when it probably would have been even more relevant insofar as winter recreational facilities in the province are concerned. But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, in summary, once again, while I don't quarrel necessarily with the action the government is taking on Village Lake Louise, I nonetheless find an increasing contradiction in their aggressive advertising campaign relating to attracting additional tourists into the province in the wintertime to use facilities in the national parks which are increasingly loaded and, in so doing, driving up the prices charged for the use of these facilities in the parks, and making them less accessible to the citizens of the Province of Alberta.

I would hope, therefore, that the government is in the process of reviewing its advertising policy with a view to determining whether it is really heading in a direction that is in the best interests, in the long run, of the citizens of the Province of Alberta. Or failing that, if they intend to pursue the policy as aggressively as they are, whether they have some plans afoot to assure the citizens of Alberta that a tourism policy of attracting people into this country from the United States and Eastern Canada is not going to deny citizens of Alberta the right of at least equal, if not prior, right of access to utilization of our national park skiing facilities.

MR. KOZIAK:

The haste of both the mover and the seconder of the motion, the attempts to withdraw the motion, and then the comments made in that attempt, in which I thought they were being a little over-generous to themselves in the results, and their feeling of the importance of their contribution to the government's decision, prompts me to rise in my place and move an amendment to the motion.

Mr. Speaker, I have in the required number of copies in writing, an amendment to the motion which is moved by myself, seconded by the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight, Cal Lee. And the amendment is that the motion be amended by deleting the word 'oppose' and by inserting in its place the words 'commend the Government of Alberta for the manner in which it handled', so that the motion will now read, Mr. Speaker:

Be it resolved that, this Legislative Assembly commend the Government of Alberta for the manner in which it handled the proposed Village Lake Louise project.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed. Question!

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that hon. members on both sides of the House are anxious to get to the question, and in all likelihood we can expect a unanimous vote, but just in case the events of the past summer have dimmed the memories of the hon. gentlemen, I would like to refer them to the issue of Hansard, Monday May 29th, 1972 and commend them to the reading that appears on pages 9 to 12 of that issue and, in particular, the quotation in Hansard of the letter which was written by the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs to the hon. Jean Chretien. In the second paragraph of that letter he states, "When Prime Minister Trudeau visited Edmonton recently, he stated that the Alberta government's response to the Village Lake Louise proposal would be a major factor in the federal decision whether or not to proceed with this controversial project."

Mr. Speaker, the Alberta government's response, as set out in that letter, was a studied response, a well-reasoned response, and one which was accepted without question by the federal government in deciding not to proceed with the Lake Louise project. Mr. Speaker, need I say more?

MR. DRAIN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm overwhelmed by the 'ego-trip' indulged in by the hon. member.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Careful!

November 14, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

74-23

MR. DRAIN:

Here is a government which I view with sorrow; a government that hides its head under the bed like the old maid that expects the bogeyman to come through the door. I have listened in this legislature to the hon. Minister of Tourism talking about the potential for tourism from Japan and mentioning that if there was a place for 1,800 Japanese skiers, the opportunity would present itself to bring these into Alberta, and thereby to enrich the economy of the province. My personal feelings on this particular subject are that this particular development was killed by bigotry, negativism, and small-mindedness. So we on this side, Mr. Speaker, sincerely deplore the niggardly narrow-minded viewpoint that this government has shown on this resolution.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. DRAIN:

I hope these brief remarks that I have now made will be taken to heart by the hon. members; that they will start to think positively; that they will think of the interests and the well-being of the Province of Alberta. Unquestionably, there is a dire need for winter recreational facilities. Possibly the package of Village Lake Louise and the concept therein did not totally fit this, but it was not right or proper that this should be burned in ignorance and with lack of consideration, without a substitute, without any effort shown in another manner, to fill a need that was very, very important. I therefore express my disappointment on the ultimate outcome of this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Highwood followed by the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, because this is on the amendment it will be fairly short. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this resolution or decision by the government as according to the amended resolution has dealt Alberta tourism a rather serious and adverse blow, because the decision prevents some development of Lake Louise. It is unfortunate that we had to wipe out the entire proposal in order to rectify some of the shortcomings that were involved in it. I think that there are a lot of aspects of this situation where the government will be able to take some credit, but they will also be in the position where they will have to take some blame.

I'm not sure how much credit can be taken from the letter which was read by the mover of the amendment, because, as I recall the hon. Jean Chretien, in his remarks concerning the letter, stated that he didn't know whether the government was for or against Village Lake Louise when he read the letter. I suppose, depending on which viewpoint you want to take, whether you get credit or blame for the decision that was made, there was not much doubt that the federal government made the decision. But whether the provincial government can take much credit for helping to make that decision is questionable.

Mr. Speaker, when we wipe out a situation of this nature, we deal a blow to private enterprise, because the situation called for private enterprise putting into effect the Village Lake Louise project. When private enterprise is discouraged, then it means that if there are to be facilities in the future, then they will have to be put in by the public. Public facilities have been in the national parks for some time, but they haven't been nearly adequate for the situation. Private enterprise has been looking after some of the recreational facilities, but they needed some accommodation, and the only way that accommodation can be provided is by people who have money -- the kind of money that is required for risk capital -- and it is only people, or firms, or corporations, or businesses or institutions like Imperial Oil, who have the kind of money that is required to risk this type of situation.

What we want in Alberta is the kind of recreational facilities and accommodation that will provide accommodation the year around. We are able to get skiers by the thousands for a few weekends in the year, but the problem lies in the fact that a few weekends do not pay for the accommodations. What we need is some kind of attraction that will bring people the year around to use these facilities so that the facilities can be paid for.

The proposition that was in hand -- while I admit, Mr. Speaker, not totally acceptable -- did have many very admirable features about it and would have done the very thing that we needed in Alberta to attract more tourists. So I suggest that it was not to the advantage of Alberta, nor to the national parks, to completely wipe out Village Lake Louise. There is no way that I could vote for an amendment that would commend the government for a wonderful job, for it wasn't all that wonderful in the eyes of the people who needed the facilities.

Maybe I should suggest at this point that there was a fear on the part of some people that the accommodation would be beyond the reach of some. All over the world we have tourist accommodations that are beyond the reach of the ordinary person, but it is because of these types of accommodation that people who are less prosperous have the privilege of enjoying tourism to a certain extent. While certain aspects of Village Lake Louise might have been developed to the point where it wouldn't be possible for everyone to enjoy them, there would be accompanying facilities made possible as a result of that, which would provide for others, which will not be made possible unless large expenditures of public funds are put out.

So I suggest that by killing the goose that laid the golden egg, we also destroyed the egg that would be of benefit to all people. As I said before, it is an area for private enterprise, and it needs to be encouraged.

There is another aspect of it, Mr. Speaker, that concerns me a great deal, and no one is more concerned about the preservation and conservation of the ecology than I am. I am made aware of it every day in the constituency that I represent, which borders on the edge of a large city where not hundreds, but thousands of people every weekend the year around tend to overflow the country and have an adverse effect upon the ecology and I know what happens if they are not kept within certain boundaries. But that is the privilege, prerogative, power, and authority of the governments when they permit the facilities that were suggested by Village Lake Louise to keep the people within certain areas, lots of times this type of development of facility means simply that the people are kept within certain bounds instead of being permitted to wander all over and destroy the ecology.

When I think of the amount of national parks in the province of Alberta -- thousands upon thousands of square miles of national parks in Alberta and Village Lake Louise involved only a few acres -- I cannot see that we would be justified in arguing so strongly about the great destruction of ecology.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that there were many people who made the suggestion that we might go outside of the park and make such a development in the Canmore Corridor or some other similar area and leave the national parks untouched. If its going to be bad for the ecology of the national parks, it's going to do exactly the same thing to the ecology of Alberta, the portion of the province outside the national park. I think this is a backward way of thinking. If we had only a small amount of national park in Alberta, then I would say by all means, maybe we need this type of accommodation outside the park and leave the park untouched, but when we have the thousands upon thousands of square miles of national park in Alberta, then I say, let's preserve Alberta ecology and use up a little bit of the national park ecology if it's necessary for this type of development.

Once again I want to repeat that I wasn't in favour of that particular development per se, but I definitely believe that we needed the facility and that we need something to attract people, tourists to Alberta for all seasons of the year, not just for winter skiing or for summer swimming and hiking, but particularly in the shoulder seasons. This kind of a facility would attract, to the same extent that The Banff School of Fine Arts does, people at all times of the year.

I think that it was a retrogressive step that was taken when the whole thing was wiped out. Mr. Speaker, I had some reservations about the proposed Village Lake Louise but in the interests of the tourists and in the interests of tourism as an industry, and also in regard to the conservation and the preservation of the ecology in Alberta, I think that we should not have prohibited, or permitted to have had prohibited, the entire development. I think that some portion of it should have been developed in order that we might have had the benefits of better facilities. Therefore, I am not in favour of commending the government for doing a wonderful job, because I don't think that they did it actually; Mr. Chretien did it on his own because he didn't know what the government had said, and secondly, if the government was very specific about it and had said definitely "wipe it out", this also would have been in error.

November 14, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

74-25

MR. FARRAN:

Speaking to the amendment, Mr. Speaker, I feel quite confident that the majority of the members will commend the government for its actions over Village Lake Louise. The majority voice will obviously realize that a good job was done. The Village Lake Louise project was too grandiose, it wasn't designed to fit in with the national parks setting, it encroached too much on the mountains beyond the river valley, and it generally was inadequately researched. I think the most important part of the government's submission to the federal government was the advice that better research should be done on the ecological background, and zoning be carried out in the park.

I also commend the government on their parallel policy of promoting tourism in Alberta, the hope of providing jobs through this very obvious and very important industry. What I couldn't understand was the logic of the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc who prized himself on being such a hard headed businessman, and could yet make the strange statement that the increase in the price of day ski tickets was due to the influx of tourists. Of course, the hon. Member for Highwood had a better understanding of economics on this point --

MR. HENDERSON:

The hon. Member is saying --

MR. FARRAN:

I still have the floor.

MR. HENDERSON:

The hon. member is saying things I didn't say.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. Member for North Hill please resume his seat while the point of privilege is being stated.

MR. HENDERSON:

I made no mention of ski tow tickets, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is saying something I didn't say, if he would care to check Hansard. He has arrived at a conclusion which isn't supported by what I said.

MR. FARRAN:

I have a point, Mr. Speaker. I think everybody on this side of the House anyway, was listening. He certainly did say that the rates for ski tickets were going up because of the influx of tourists.

MR. HENDERSON:

Read Hansard.

MR. FARRAN:

Well, this is what I understood him to say, and if he did say it, this is the answer that was given to him already by the hon. Member for Highwood. The hon. Member for Highwood was completely correct, that these ski facilities cannot be financed by weekend skiers alone; if you can bring in tourists from outside to use them during the weekdays, when they are pretty well empty, then of course the economics are improved. Perhaps I mis-heard, but I am astonished that that sort of thinking should emanate from the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc.

MR. HENDERSON:

May I ask a question? Is he familiar with the increase in the Sunshine Ski Lodge rates of last winter?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has the prerogative to decide whether he wishes to allow the question or to answer it.

74-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 14th 1972

MR. FARRAN:

No, I don't. I know the rates for Lake Louise have gone up, Mr. Speaker, and that they published supporting figures as to why. They only get 1500 skiers a day for each day during a weekend and they need a 1000 a day during the week on the average. They can't make it pay on the current rate.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. Minister speaking to the amendment?

MR. YURKO:

In regard to the statement made by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest; when he referred to "bigotism and small-mindedness and narrow-mindedness", I am sure that he was referring to the initial mover and seconder of the motion.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, that is unparliamentary, and the hon. member should withdraw it.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the words aren't mine. They are words of the --

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has merely redirected the missile at another target.

MR. HENDERSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker -- but at specific individuals. I think the hon. member should withdraw his remarks. To stand up and infer that the mover and seconder are bigoted and narrow-minded; I suggest is unparliamentary and not in keeping with the conduct of this House.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, if I might continue, I wish to make some fairly constructive remarks in this area.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I did not refer to any member in the legislature as being bigoted and narrow-minded; I referred to a viewpoint that was bigoted and narrow-minded, so the ultimate result is slightly different, but the colour remains the same.

MR. YURKO:

And the viewpoint the hon. member referred to was that of those who were violently against this project. Those people who put this resolution on the Order Paper put it very specifically -- "be it resolved that this Legislative Assembly oppose the proposed Lake Louise Project." So it is obvious from the remarks the hon. member made, that he was directing his remarks to the two people involved in this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly the hon. minister might wish to explain that he does not intend any reflections on the movers or the seconders of the motion.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't intend any reflections upon those that need additional education.

November 14, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

74-27

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's explanation is, to say the least, rather grudging. Perhaps he might put it in broader terms.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, if this discussion continues I'm afraid I shall forget what I had to say in a constructive way.

MR. SPEAKER:

This discussion is with regard to the point of privilege and it hasn't been forgotten.

MR. YURKO:

I didn't hear your last remark, Mr. Speaker, did you suggest that it was forgotten?

MR. SPEAKER:

As I understand it, the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc has raised a point of privilege with regard to a reflection made concerning the mover and seconder of the original motion, to the effect that they were -- I have forgotten what the adjectives were, I didn't note them down -- I am suggesting the hon. minister might wish to explain that he did not intend to reflect unfavourably on the hon. members, the mover and the seconder, in a personal way.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I think first of all I would like to suggest that when a member reflects on a point of privilege, he reflects on the matter that affects him directly. In this regard I don't believe that my remarks affected the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc. But in respect --

MR. HENDERSON:

On a point of privilege, or on a point of order, the contention of the member is not right. The Chair realizes that and I think should explain to the minister the rules of the Legislative Assembly, which his honourable colleague, the Deputy Premier, is so fond of talking about.

MR. SPEAKER:

The incident is perhaps being blown out of all proportion and is taking far too much time, but there is no question that it is more gracious for another member to raise the point of privilege on behalf of one of his colleagues, than for the member to raise it himself.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker,, if the remarks I made in regard to those made by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest did in fact touch on the sensibilities of some of the members in the House, I wish to apologize in this respect.

MR. HENDERSON:

Now apologize to the Chair.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, if I might be permitted to make some constructive remarks with respect to this amended resolution. I had the opportunity to discuss this matter, along with other matters, with the hon. Jean Chretien after he had made his decision in this regard. I would like to suggest two things he alluded to indicated the government's action in this respect was certainly right and that, in fact, the manner in which the Alberta Government handled this particular matter was certainly beyond criticism and very complimentary to the government of the Province of Alberta.

MR. TAYLOR:

I love me, I love myself.

74-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 14th 1972

MR. YURKO:

I would like first of all to indicate that, contrary to the remarks made by some members, Mr. Chretien did indicate that in fact the provincial government's very reasoned and considered stand on the issue, played a very important part in the decision made by the federal government.

I would also like to suggest that the second thing he indicated was the fact that the concept as presented by the principles of that proposal went far beyond what the federal government anticipated initially, and that from this standpoint that was pretty well reflected in the fact that there just simply wasn't enough information to go ahead at this time with a concept of this magnitude so that in this respect the provincial government's stand and resolution of this problem was certainly adequate and commendable.

Furthermore, in discussing the matter with them, and I wasn't the only one -- a number of other ministers were involved -- there were some lessons to be learned from this particular experience which were discussed at some length. One of the lessons we learned was, first of all, that there was a dire need for consultation between the federal government and the provincial government, prior consultation before any project of this magnitude in a national park could have been put before the people so that, in fact, some pre-examination of the people's wishes would have gone on. It was recognized that, in fact, this wasn't done in this particular case, and this, of course, points up to the real need of a Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs and the enormous role that it does have to play in this type of thing. He recognized that far more co-operation was necessary, and I can assure the hon. members that through the efforts of the hon. member in regard to this portfolio far more co-operation will occur in this area.

A second realization was very important, and that was the need for an overall policy of recreation development in the eastern slopes of the Rocky Mountains, not only the parks, but those areas of Alberta that are just as amenable to recreation development. And in this regard I would just like to tell the House that the government, as a result, has programmed some very extensive hearings with respect to land use and recreational development in the eastern slopes of the Rocky Mountains, starting some time in March. Again, one of the main reasons for this, is, of course, that we have now learned that there are certain procedures and certain ways of handling the matter and getting public approval of major projects of this sort. Because if they are not done in the proper way in respect to environmental matters, economic matters, and tourism matters, then the same kind of violent reaction can be precipitated as was, in fact, precipitated during the Lake Louise project. This never does any project good; invariably it does the project a lot of harm.

I would also like to say that in regard to the hearings which are being organized through the conservation authority and which are being helped by many departments of government, particularly the Department of Lands and Forests and Dr. Warrack, we have made a decision to invite the federal government to participate actively in those hearings, so that they might have a member of their government sitting with us, and in this way we hope to soften, or not merely soften but condition the public in regard to the need of major recreational centres, not only with the park, but along the entire eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that's all I intended to say and I hope it was something constructive in regard to this amended resolution, but again I say I think the government is certainly right in proposing the type of amendment it did, because, in fact, it did handle this problem in a most expeditious and correct way.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, after hearing the hon. minister laud himself and his government as to the tremendous and bold leadership that they provided in this matter, I would like to remind them that when the issue first came to the attention of the public, the press and the opposition did everything they could to push some of the ministers off the fence in this issue, and they didn't really show any leadership. In fact, it was obvious that there was lack of leadership in this issue until they had sent some of their political people through the province to determine which way the wind was blowing, and then they finally sniffed this out, and, as usual as is the character of this government now, seek the popular solution. About the only thing certain about this whole thing as far as the government is concerned, is that no matter how foolish a pronouncement one of the ministers may make, or the hon. the Premier, on this issue, they can be certain that everybody on that side will vote unanimously to

November 14, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

74-29

support that statement. That is about the only thing certain about the whole issue.

They did not display leadership; they did not show where they stood. In fact, it was obvious that some of the ministers were very much in favour of the Village Lake Louise development. Yes, the hon. member, Mr. Peacock, who has certainly the courage of his convictions; and I'm not so sure the hon. minister, Mr. Dowling was not seriously of the opinion that if we need more tourists, we need a place to put them up. And I believe that he must have entertained views that --

MR. KING:

Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. LUDWIG:

No; I will wait until I'm finished, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member who just rose has not been asking questions; he has merely been interrupting people, and he knows the rules prohibit that, Mr. Speaker. Yes, and as one minister once said, nothing interrupts like an interruption.

So in dealing with this issue, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer back to the fact that there was a complete absence of leadership. The press certainly did a tremendous job in pulling some of the ministers off the fence, and the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs was accused of sitting on the fence and having each ear to the ground on each side of the fence -- that is quite a stunt but the Conservatives are getting good at that. The matter of -- I almost made an unparliamentary statement, Mr. Speaker --

MR. HYNDMAN:

That's not unusual.

MR. LUDWIG:

But it's never too late to retract so I don't have to apologize, it's just my thinking -- you'll never know now.

So that is the position that the Conservative government -- the Tory government -- found itself in. They were taken off the hook by the Liberals. All of a sudden they started applauding and jumping up and down in joy that the government did what we told them to do. They told them what to do after it was done and they got the wind of it -- so they said, well they made a good decision. And I think that one cannot help but be skeptical about their kind of attitude towards this thing because their approach was, to say the least, purely and simply political. And as I stated, it was so obvious that they were sniffing around the whole province to see which way the wind blew. In Calgary they were uncertain which way to go, but in Edmonton they knew which way to go because they didn't care what happened in the south -- Lake Louise anyway -- so they were against it.

Perhaps they can justify the fact that over 90 per cent of the parks in this province are wilderness areas and will always be, no matter what anybody does. Most of them are inaccessible and man can't do much about it. So the hue and cry that perhaps we will desecrate the scenery -- we will desecrate a fraction of one per cent of the total acreage of the park -- was not supported by most of the ministers.

It is always interesting to see how this government, which has lost considerable yardage during this session, is so anxious to get credit for whatever they can, any little thing -- let's stand up and cheer for ourselves because we made such a tremendously bold decision. Notwithstanding the fact that there are a lot of very important human interest and human decisions to be made, which they are studying, they are sending their bird dogs all over the province to see which way the wind blows to make a popular decision. There is a grave difference, Mr. Speaker, between finding out what is the popular thing to do, and standing up and telling the people that we stand up for a certain principle; we display leadership like the image of leadership that they did try to create, and that we will call it the way we think is good, and not go around finding out what some little group says here and some little group says there, putting it all together and after many weeks of harassment and bugging and badgering by the press --

74-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 14th 1972

AN HON. MEMBER:

And the opposition.

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, and the opposition. Then they state, well, we're together now; we're going to stand or fall on this; we've made a decision. But they didn't make the decision until it was obvious which way the thing was going to go.

I'm of the opinion also, Mr. Speaker -- and I'm not saying this out of rumour, but there is some evidence to show this -- that some of the hon. ministers at least were hoping that the Liberals would go the other way and they could have their political advantages and the facilities which this province needs. I don't think anybody who has ever stepped into the boundaries of the park in the last year would deny the fact that we need some facilities; we need more facilities than we have, otherwise our tourist business in the parks, which is a major portion of our tourist business, will peak and will decline. People have to stay some place and if they can't find parking space in parks, then they can't simply sleep on the grass. So eventually we will have reached a point of no return where the tourist will have to by-pass the crowded facilities.

So let's not talk and laud ourselves about how great a job we did. What are the alternatives? There are no alternatives, that is the strength of leadership. Most people didn't agree with the whole Lake Louise project. Some liked parts of it, some liked other parts of it, but not too many. Very few of us on this side agreed with the whole thing but I don't think anyone would say that none of it was any good. But the test of leadership isn't to say, "Ah ha, we did a good job", or, "We knocked this thing down and it is buried now; we don't have to face the public because we don't have to make the decision, except that we would like to get the credit for the way it went."

The alternative isn't a challenge for the government -- I'm saying that they won't rise to the challenge because they haven't got that kind of leadership -- it is what to do now and where to bolster and foster our tourist business. We all like to brag about the way things were rising and tourism was increasing and how much money it brings into this province. But we're going to do nothing about it. When a private enterprise has any kind of program, well if it is politically popular, let's knock it flat. The tourists will drive through and spend a few bucks and go to British Columbia, Saskatchewan, or elsewhere to the north, but not in the parks.

MR. FOSTER:

Are you trying to say something?

MR. LUDWIG:

Pardon?

MR. FOSTER:

Are you trying to say something?

MR. LUDWIG:

I thought you learned a lesson to keep quiet when somebody else is talking, but you haven't obviously. We'll come around to you again.

Mr. Speaker, the issue in this whole motion now is where is the leadership on the other side? I'm saying that they haven't displayed any yet and this is one time where they're really lacking. The alternatives are non-existent but let's come over and we'll pat you on the back for the wonderful job that you did in providing no leadership; sitting on the fence hoping to come out of this smelling like a rose. I have news for you, the people still want an answer and I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members opposite are going to provide it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[The amendment was carried; the resolution as amended was carried.]

November 14, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

74-31

Edmonton-Calgary Dayliner

Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the assembly, seconded by Mr. Taylor:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT, this Assembly request the Government to make strong representations to the Canadian Transport Commission urging that the CPR dayliner, which runs daily between Calgary and Edmonton, be required to stop at all centres subject to flag stops when passengers wish to use the same.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to move Motion No. 2 on the Order Paper, might I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I discussed with the Speaker this morning a minor change in the wording of this particular motion. The reason for the change, Mr. Speaker, is that since this motion was placed on the Order Paper almost a year ago now, there have been some changes in the situation as far as the dayliner is concerned. The hon. Minister of Transportation says that shows action. I'm not sure whether the action -- I'm pleased to recommend that, because the last time I checked with the hon. minister on Orders of the Day, the government had made no representation on that matter.

I could go one step further and say that I have recommended it to the Canadian Transport Commission, but I wouldn't want to give any member the impression, of course, that I am taking credit for the fact that the Dayliner now stops at Wetaskiwin and Innisfail and Olds. So it's for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I am asking for a slight change in the wording of the motion. Is it appropriate at this time, Mr. Speaker, for you to read the revised motion and then ask for unanimous consent that I can carry on with the presentation of the motion?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Members of the assembly, the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury has presented the following draft, and I have given a copy of it to the Government House Leader;

Be it resolved that this Assembly request the government to make strong representations to the Canadian Transport Commission urging that the quality of passenger service on the C.P.R. dayliner which runs daily between Calgary and Edmonton be improved.

Do we have unanimous consent for this resolution to be debated in this form?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, my sincere thanks to the members of the assembly.

As I said earlier, when the motion was placed on the Order Paper, there was considerable discussion that the dayliner service -- which at that time ran from Calgary to Edmonton and stopped at Red Deer -- would be discontinued. In fact, there was at one time discussion publicly, by officials of the C.P.R., that they would make application to the Transport Commission that, in fact, this would be done. It was at that time that the motion was placed on the Order Paper.

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that with the dayliner, those circumstances -- leaving Calgary, stopping in Red Deer, and then coming to Edmonton to the North Side Station, Edmonton -- certainly caused a great deal of inconvenience to people who lived in central Alberta, other than at Red Deer. I'm sure all hon. members are aware that the towns and cities between Calgary and Edmonton were established many years ago along the rail line itself with no passenger service. Then, with a very much changed, and I would say reduced, freight service along the C.P.R. line from Calgary to Edmonton, it became quite clear that the future of passenger service and freight service, as it affected the various towns in the area, was really open to question.

Then I suppose the other thing that has happened in the course of the last year, that affects at least some of the centres between Calgary and Edmonton, is the Canada Grains Council Report where they talked of cheaper and more efficient ways of bringing grain from farmers' combines into export position.

I'm sure all members of the assembly are familiar with at least the initial recommendations. As far as my own particular area is concerned, it calls for the elimination of elevators at Didsbury and Carstairs, a small terminal at Crossfield, the elimination of the line from Crossfield west to the Cremona area. So with these events taking place in the past year, it was with a considerable amount of pleasure that, I am sure, all of us received word that the dayliner, as of the end of October of this year, would commence making stops at Wetaskiwin, Innisfail, and Olds, in addition to its stop at Red Deer. To say the least, this is a marked improvement in the service that has been serving the area recently.

Following the announcement, I had the opportunity to discuss this question of the dayliner with officials of the C.P.R. in Calgary. I think it's fair to say that they are not wildly enthusiastic about passenger service between Calgary and Edmonton, but nevertheless, they were ready to admit that of the total deficit which the C.P.R. picks up on this passenger service between Calgary and Edmonton, 80 per cent of that deficit is picked up by the Canadian Transport Commission, and 20 per cent is picked up by the C.P.R.

When the responsible officials in the C.P.R. pointed out the very poor use that had been made of the service, I pointed out to them that on many occasions the train was a great amount of time late, and that the service which was provided on the train did little to encourage people to make use of the particular service. I must say that in fairness to the officials of the C.P.R., that they have to be concerned about competition -- competition from the bus line and certainly from the airline -- and they expressed considerable concern the question that they be subject to a flag stop at every station between Calgary and Edmonton. So as a result of that discussion, and I ask members for a change in the motion.

MR. STROMBERG:

How did you arrive in Edmonton this morning, by car or by train?

MR. CLARK:

By car, but I would be pleased to advise the hon. member that the last two weekends I have arrived in Edmonton by train. I might encourage other members to use the train, although members of the legislature using the CPR or the CNR isn't a great source of revenue, because as the hon. member knows, we all have passes, so it does little to help the deficit as far as the citizens of Canada are concerned or the CPR.

Now to get back to the matter at hand. On the question of urging the province to use its good auspices to have the Transport Commission improve the services, I think there are three very good reasons why we should do this.

Initially, all members of this assembly, on several occasions last session and this session, have committed ourselves to a move towards decentralization in this province. We have the Industrial Opportunity Fund. We have had a number of speeches by members on both sides of the House urging that there be greater decentralization in this province. I believe for those places close to Edmonton and close to Calgary -- in the Calgary-Edmonton corridor -- that a reasonable train service can be of some assistance to these particular centres, not only as far as senior citizens are concerned but certainly for people who wish to go to the larger centres for shopping. I would also remind the members that surveys done by the province indicate that the area with the greatest rate of growth in the province in recent times has, in fact, been the Calgary-Edmonton corridor.

It isn't very far down the road when we must look seriously at some sort of rapid service between at least Red Deer and Calgary and Red Deer and Edmonton. There are a number of people right at this time who drive from as far north as Bowden and Olds to Calgary every day for work. I am sure the same thing is true when we get some distance south of Edmonton; people driving to the City of Edmonton. I am not suggesting that the hon. Minister of Advanced Education drives from Red Deer; this is one of the occasions he and I will agree upon.

I am not suggesting at this time that we are asking the government to push for the establishment of a rapid train service between Red Deer and Calgary and Red Deer and Edmonton, but I would hope that members of the assembly would keep in mind that before very long I think this kind of rapid service going between Red Deer and Calgary and Red Deer and Edmonton in the morning, and returning in the evening, is at least a very real possibility that we should consider. Because if we can work out this kind of a solution which the people in the area can make use of, they can get to the major cities for their employment and back

November 14, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

74-33

in the evening. This can make it much more attractive for these people to live in the smaller centres some distance from our two large urban centres in this particular province.

I would also urge the hon. members to keep in mind that with the rapid development of the Calgary-Edmonton corridor, with the emphasis that all members of this assembly have placed on the need for decentralization in the province outside the two large urban centres, it is appropriate at this time that we can dispatch this motion quickly and that we can ask the government through the minister to use its good offices to do what we can to improve the quality of passenger service at this time.

One more reason for the need to constantly work at improving the quality of the service is that if we go to sleep at the switch and let the passenger service from Calgary to Edmonton, by way of the dayliner, be taken off, it will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to have that kind of service ever started again.

So, Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks, my rather brief remarks, by urging the members to support this motion because it is a move in the area of decentralization, because, I believe, it is in keeping with the rapid development of the area known as the Calgary-Edmonton corridor, and certainly because, not very far in the future, we can look to a rapid early morning train, I think, to Calgary and Edmonton from Red Deer, returning to that particular centre in the evening. This truly would provide a real service to the people between Calgary and Edmonton and it truly would make it possible, I believe, for many more people to live in those areas and yet seek employment in the two large urban centres. So I would urge the members to support this resolution. Thank you.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to enter this debate, at the offset I would like to make one suggestion to the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury. If he presented this question on the Order Paper so stated because he thought the dayliner was going to be discontinued, I would assure him that on May 31, 1971 the Province of Alberta was assured that the dayliner system would continue between Calgary and Edmonton.

If it was because there were stops that were required to make the system more adequate and to serve a need that exists between the two communities of Calgary and Edmonton, particularly those areas some distance from the communities, starting at, possibly, Didsbury, and moving through Olds, Innisfail, Red Deer, Lacombe, Ponoka, Wetaskiwin, and Edmonton, our department, along with the government of Edmonton and Calgary, made many presentations to the CTC to review this operation and effectively put in more stops. The result of that was, of course, the Wetaskiwin, Olds, Innisfail service -- the reduction of the service from north Edmonton to south Edmonton which saved the CTC some \$50,000 a year so that the dayliner doesn't go across to the north side.

I think the problem is very important, and while nobody can question the value of services in regard to the citizens of Alberta, whether it be train, rail, road, or air, sometimes politically we can make so much fuss over something that we lose sight of some of the bigger objectives we are attempting to accomplish. I refer, of course, to the fact that now we have service in Wetaskiwin, Olds, Innisfail, and Red Deer as stops on the dayliner, if the citizens of those communities are desirous of the continuation of that service they will use it. The indication of whether that service should be continued will be on its usage. Because if it is not, as the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury stated, the taxpayers of this country are going to pick up 80 per cent of the cost or loss.

When we consider that there are some ten buses and some four airbuses both ways, and also an interim stop, third-level carrier moving between these two cities along with other charter facilities, the question of passenger service between these communities becomes one of whether the citizens between the two relative communities of Calgary and Edmonton will use this service sufficiently to warrant its continuation, or to warrant the consideration of further servicing the towns that it presently doesn't service by not stopping there.

Therefore, I come back to the comment I made of stating that I think, very often, maybe it is the elementary process, but it seems to me that we can spend a considerable length of time on this particular service when possibly we should be looking to CTC for some of the bigger problems confronting Alberta and confronting this province in regard to transportation, and particularly rail transportation.

We can't on one hand look at the modification of services and the recognition that new modes of transportation will be effectively used in this province in order to make us competitive, or at least put our produce and our citizens into the marketplace on a competitive basis. Without recognizing that one of our responsibilities, surely, is to make the Canadian Transport Commission aware of the public interest we have out here in moving passengers and freight on a basis relevant to the services we require as a province to be part of the Federation of Canada. Of course, what we are saying here is that if there are services that are afforded, but there are services that no other service can render, except rail, then this is where we think the emphasis should be.

So in closing my comments in regard to the dayliner service between Calgary and Edmonton, may I say that we have accomplished in the last year an opportunity for the people of Olds, Innisfail, Wetaskiwin and Red Deer to identify and determine whether a further or extended service should be maintained on that dayliner. From their reaction we will be able to extend any efforts and energies further in order to improve these services.

DR. McCORMON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of the resolution. There has been a gradual withdrawal of passenger services over the last 15 years along the Calgary-Edmonton line. I know personally in Ponoka 10 years ago we had a station with all the facilities that went with that station. That was removed, and then we had the train stopped; gradually that was removed, and now we have the train roaring through town every day. It makes no difference whether the train roars through, or an airplane roars overhead, there is no service, as far as the town and community itself is concerned, from this.

There is another way of looking at this as far as service to people is concerned. Each stop along this way -- Wetaskiwin, Leduc, Ponoka, Lacombe -- represents service to 10,000 to 15,000 people. On the overall picture, the population along this main corridor between Calgary and Edmonton runs in the neighbourhood of 100,000 to 150,000 people. With only two or three stops or no stops at all, this is a withdrawal of services to a very large proportion of our rural population.

I honestly believe that this train should be run as a requirement of service. We have had no complaints from the CPR on the thousands of cars of grain, livestock, and so on, shipped east and west from this central area. We have had no complaints of the thousands of cars of combines, tractors, machinery and so on, we have shipped from the east to the west. This is a paying proposition for the railroad. But the moment that there is a bit of a loss anywhere along the line, they claim withdrawal of service.

There is another point which has a moral aspect to this too. Each town has a large area of real estate surrounding the central rail section. This, I know was incorporated when the railroad was brought in, but the towns were built around the railroads. In the last 10 years there has been business development along these areas of real estate -- shopping centres, business enterprises and so on -- probably the best and most valuable area in each town along the line, including Calgary and Edmonton. There is never any mention of this, but the first time the train loses a bit of money for dayline service, they want to withdraw service. We have no service in Ponoka at all. The train goes through. It doesn't stop to pick up and let off passengers. Actually this is no service whatever as far as the community is concerned.

There is another point; we have a mental hospital with 600 to 700 patients whom people come and visit. There is no method -- particularly for the older people, friends, relatives and so on -- of rail transportation to Ponoka during the year. If you want to get on the train, you go to Wetaskiwin or Red Deer. One is 22 miles away and the other is 35, so there is absolutely no service as far as dayliners is concerned at all. I do believe that this is a two-way sword business. The railways are prepared to take a lot, I feel they should be prepared to give a little. Thanks very much.

MR. FARRAN:

I'd like to rise on a point of privilege. Earlier this afternoon the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc claimed that I had misquoted him and said he would abide by Hansard. I'd like to read what he said from Hansard. Is that in order?

November 14, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

74-35

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That is with regard to the previous debate, would it --

MR. FARRAN:

It's in regard to the point of privilege, it doesn't matter when it takes place. I believe the rules say they should be brought to your attention at the earliest possible moment.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Go ahead.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to hear it because it was not my intention to say what the member inferred I did say, and if it's in Hansard, I'd like to hear it. So I would hope the House would permit it.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, he referred to the subject I was talking about and the wording I talked about, on three different occasions. He said "I nonetheless find an increasing contradiction in their aggressive advertising campaign, relating to attracting additional tourists into the province in the winter time, to use facilities in the national parks which are increasingly loaded, and in so doing driving up the prices of the charge for the use of these facilities in the parks, and making them less accessible to the citizens of the province of Alberta." That was on one occasion and --

MR. HENDERSON:

Could we stop a minute on that point? The question of fares isn't in there. We were talking about total facilities, and when we're talking facilities I hope the hon. member appreciates that fares are only one part of the service that relates to the overall business of skiing in the park.

MR. FARRAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker --

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Would the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill also refer to what Hansard that is -- what date that is?

MR. FARRAN:

It's today, it's earlier this afternoon. Just an hour ago. If he says the facilities didn't include the lifts then I'll give you the other quotations and you'll understand why I was led to believe that this was what he was referring to. In another place he said, "Particularly in the realm of skiing, which Village Lake Louise is primarily concerned with, are being rapidly priced beyond the range of the average citizen in the province." Well, we all know there's no big hotel open in the winter in Village Lake Louise if that's what he's talking about. And the day lodge there is only for day skiers. On another occasion in his speech he said, "A tourism policy of attracting people into this country from the United States and eastern Canada are [sic] not going to deny citizens of Alberta the right of at least equal if not prior right of access to utilization of our national parks skiing facilities." I think I have made the point.

MR. HENDERSON:

I think, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should read in Hansard that the point I was challenging him on (if he'd care to read his own remarks) was that I had specifically singled out fares as the basis of my comments in questioning the government's tourism policy. At no time in my remarks, in what he quoted, did he mention fares. If he'd read the exchange that took place on fares, on his remarks, he would find that it was fares specifically that he was talking about, that I said I'd made no reference to. I suggest that what he has just read into the record, from Hansard substantiates that my contention was correct: he was misquoting me.

74-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 14th 1972

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Any further debate on Motion No. 2?

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, maybe I can participate now on the debate on Motion No. 2. I think the interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, about the history of passenger service, relating to the CPR -- and about all the debates and arguments before the Board of Commissioners that have taken place in this country in recent years, (primarily aimed at alleviating the CPR from the responsibility to provide passenger services across Canada) -- is to go back and examine the original statute in the parliament of Canada, under which CPR was given the franchise to build the railway. Mr. Speaker, it was also granted several millions of acres of land and the mineral rights to several millions of acres of land.

I don't have the agreement with me in the House, but as I recall the Act stated very specifically that these lands and mineral rights were granted to the CPR as a subsidy in perpetuity in return for the CPR providing passenger service to the citizens of Canada. And if one chooses to make a study of the situation, he would find that practically everything that the CPR was committed to do under the act, one way or another they have gotten out from underneath it. They have taken all the mineral rights, and all the land rights that relate to their operations that was the subsidy for the operation of the railroad. They set them aside under CP investment, so anything that is making money through CPR operations, has been removed from the question of railroads. And under the railroads, all we hear about is the losing propositions. The point seems to have been forgotten in the last 100 years, and I guess, maybe it's not surprising

I think it probably isn't surprising also to point out that the CPR has had a lot more continuity and management than has the Government of Canada. They have very successfully been able to manoeuvre business interest to the point where they have separated all their profitable operations that relate to the exploitation of the millions of acres of mineral rights, million acres of surface rights that they were given under the original charter. And all that is left is the railroads, which are a losing proposition, and then we hear that the passenger service is the greatest money loser of all the railroad services in Canada.

As I say, when one reads the act, I'm appalled at the fact that the Parliament of Canada has allowed the CPR to get away with this, because the original objective of the subsidy, to provide these services in perpetuity to the people of Canada has been basically and completely ignored. And it has been proved by the Department of Transport, Board of Transport Commissioners, it has been condoned by the parliaments of Canada.

I presume there is a lot of legal argument one could get into, but if one goes back and reads the original statute, and examines the record, he can't avoid the conclusion that the CPR with very few exceptions, has managed to manoeuvre itself out from underneath every obligation of any financial consequence that was imposed upon it in the original charter, and has been able to take full advantage of anything that was a money-making proposition relating to the subsidies in the form of land and mineral rights that they were granted.

So far as the dayliner to Calgary is concerned, I certainly hope the provincial government does make strong representations to the federal government on the matter. I think the service is absolutely appalling. The only time in the 10 years or more that I've been in this legislature, I used the railway pass to make a trip to Calgary on the dayliner was one day, about three years ago when the weather wasn't conducive to flying, nor was it conducive to driving over the road. And I have to say quite frankly that the CPR would have to pay me to use the dayliner again. I've never seen such a disgraceful passenger service on any train in my life before. I don't propose to be an expert on trains, but it was absolutely disgraceful.

I concluded, Mr. Speaker, that it was obviously, and could only be, the policy of the CPR to deliberately discourage people from using the service. That's the only way I could conclude that they could have such an intolerable situation so far as the state of repair, the condition of the unit itself, the dayliner itself. They obviously were not out to encourage anybody to use the railroad service, the dayliner service. They were out to discourage anyone from using it, and I say very seriously, notwithstanding the past, the CPR -- the calibre of the service they operated on at that time -- would have to pay me to take it again. Needless to say I haven't been on it since then because I

November 14, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

74-37

haven't seen any offers from them that would attract me to use the facility. But if the government is prepared to endorse or accept this resolution, I hope they would also make very strong representations to the federal government as to the calibre of the service that's on there. I would remind them at that time of making such a representation of the original commitment, of the undertaking, on the part of the CPR, to maintain passenger services in perpetuity in return for the subsidy of millions of acres of land and mineral rights which were granted to them at the time their charter was issued.

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

[The motion was carried.]

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, are we going to call the next motion?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

We're waiting for the Clerk to come back in.

Power Grid System

Mr. Moore proposed the following motion to the assembly, seconded by Mr. J. Miller:

Be it resolved that, the Alberta Government investigate the feasibility of a provincially-owned and controlled electric power grid system.

Debate adjourned by Mr. Hinman.

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Speaker, this motion says, "Be it resolved that the Alberta Government investigate the feasibility of a provincially-owned and controlled electric power grid system."

The word 'feasibility' has, of course, two connotations; one is "can it be done?", the other, "is it wise to be done?", and that usually is measured in terms of the financial return which one might expect. Now, if it is a matter of government doing, it is always feasible in the sense that it can be done. We could certainly establish such a grid. It is also feasible if you wish to subsidize it, if you are not too concerned about the benefits, either financial or otherwise, which it might bring about.

In my view there would be two or three reasons for such a grid. One would be if electricity was new to the province, if we were just starting; if we had areas newly developing where you could not expect private industry to serve the people because it would not pay, then perhaps the province might wish to set up such a grid. If it were a new product; if we were going to export this power, for instance -- as we intended to export the gas in the province -- and you wanted to get it altogether from all sources so that every producer had a share in the market, I can understand the necessity, or at least the feasibility, of such a grid. If we had a surplus of power in some areas and we had a shortage of power in others, the government might want such a grid to move the surplus to a shortage area rather than to encourage someone else to go into the power business, which is, after all, a utility. If it wants to make unnecessary new generating facilities and the only way to do it is to have a grid so that we tie-in those which currently exist, that might be another reason for having such a power grid.

But I submit that in this particular case none of these reasons apply. In the first place we have electric service all over this province, and I think comparable to any that anybody has in any country anywhere. It has been done by private industry and to a very great extent they've obviated the need of a grid to look after emergencies -- one source of power might blow out by simply the voluntary hooking-in of sources of supply which we have all over this province.

If we're going to talk about feasibility, we have to sort of take it for granted that if such a resolution as this were passed, the decision of the government would be that we will establish such a grid if it is feasible. I submit that perhaps that is a pretty premature thing at this moment.

You could, of course, build new transmission lines, and in some areas this might be worthwhile, providing you had a great market. The other solution, of course, if the government didn't really want to run it itself, might be to sponsor some kind of a co-operative grid so that those people currently having transmission lines and provincial lines could operate such a grid themselves.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is not a need for a grid. Today Alberta is covered very admirably and we can transfer surplus electricity quite readily, and we can look after emergencies. If there happens to be an area where this is not true, it would not require the establishment of a new grid to make it possible.

I submit that to date we are not prepared to export a lot of electrical energy. I hope the time might come when we are, and when it does come it may be that we need to look at a gathering system for very high tension, very high voltage electricity which might be transferred. Establishing such a line may, in effect, be better done by something like Alberta Gas Trunk or indeed, if that is preferable, by a government gathering system, in which I would hope the government might be prepared to sell shares to give to our people some chance of an investment in a field where the profits are guaranteed, even though they may not be high.

I submit, then Mr. Speaker, that this would be just another case of an expensive study which is bound to end up gathering dust somewhere. We have had numerous examples under every government we have ever had in this province, of attacking problems by turning them over to some commission, or some commissioned body to make studies. The results have not very often been any more than the dust gathering I mentioned.

I submit that I would oppose this resolution because there is not a need for it. The feasibility of it has little to do with the province, in that it can be done by private enterprise if it is feasible in the sense that it would be a paying proposition. Such a study would only be an expenditure of the people's money. As I interpret it at this moment, the government has no intention of going into the transmission of electricity over a government-owned grid. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the resolution and I urge the other members of this assembly to consider carefully before they approve.

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, before the debate is closed on this I would just like to make a few remarks. I think the hon. Member for Cardston has misconstrued the intention of the original resolution of the hon. Member for Smoky River, when he put it in last March, and that was that there is a problem in the two franchised areas in Alberta, in that the area that is serviced by what is now known as Alberta Power has higher rates than the franchised area serviced by Calgary Power.

First of all, there is that differentiation in rates; then there is also a differentiation in rates because of the fact that there are 13 municipalities that are also in the distribution of electrical energy within the province. Then there are some 386 REA's that are also in the distribution of electrical power. What the hon. member pointed out is that with such a provincial system, or a provincial grid you might say -- it would run north to south -- the grid would, in effect, be the purchaser of electrical power from the generating firms. The generating firms are Alberta Power, Calgary Power, City of Lethbridge, City of Medicine Hat, and the City of Edmonton. The provincial grid system would then sell it to the municipalities and the REA's that distribute the electrical energy to their consumers and to industries. By this method, there would be some method whereby the higher costs in northern Alberta could be offset and help industrial development and also keep the price of electrical energy down to the consumers in the northern areas.

A further background on electric energy within the province, Mr. Speaker, is that subsequent to the Energy Resources Conservation Board's approval of Sundance 3 and 4, they have made a certain recommendation in there that the private utility companies and the municipal utilities that generate the electrical power should form an electrical utility planning council, so there could be brought on stream every one, two, three, four and five years -- whatever the figure is -- economic units that would help to reduce the cost of electrical energy throughout the province.

For instance, when they approve Sundance 3 and 4, 750 megowatts of electrical energy will be coming on stream in 1976 and 1977. Now, when they come on stream there could possibly be a sharp increase of excess capacity, and if there is an excess capacity then someone is paying for it. Their suggestion

November 14, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

74-39

that there be a planning council was such that if there is this excess capacity, maybe the generating firm, being Alberta Power in the northern sector, could acquire the reserve excess power from Calgary Power until they could bring on a larger and more economic unit. By so doing, this electric utility planning council could, in effect, provide for the long term and what is most beneficial for all Albertans, electrical rate-wise. The companies and the municipalities did, in fact, set up a planning council and have now started to work on some long-range planning requirements for the province.

But that still doesn't get into the basic problem of how to get the higher generation costs that are equated with Alberta Power down to the level of the service area of Calgary Power. Calgary Power services roughly two-thirds of the consumers and the electrical energy load in Alberta. Alberta Power may be at a distinct disadvantage in the future unless there can be some other economies achieved. One advantage may be that with the development of the tar sands in northern Alberta, in Fort McMurray, this in turn can make possible some larger, more economic units for Alberta Power, which may, in fact, help to reduce their rates to the consumers.

Also when this specific resolution was placed on the order paper last March, there were a number of problems that were in the way of such a provincial grid system being developed, and one of them had to do with the various agreements and acts that Calgary Power operated under, because under the total confines was the fact that no part of an undertaking could be acquired by the province without taking over the whole.

Subsequently then, the province has been able to bring Calgary Power under the provisions of The Alberta Water Resources Act and take out those clauses that stated that the province would have to take over the whole of the system. At today's date, the province may acquire any part or portion of the services of Calgary Power that they may wish. The price that would have to be paid would be subject to The Public Utilities Board Act which states reproduction costs, less depreciation. At today's date the grid system as envisioned by the hon. member, can in fact, be set up. Now whether it is feasible or not is another alternative.

I would like to just point out one other fact that may be of some benefit to help to reduce the rates in the northern system if such a grid system were developed. That would be that under The Utility Income Tax Rebate Act, each private utility income tax is rebated after three years by the federal government, and in fact there is a 95 per cent rebate that flow back to the consumer after three years. If you look at your electrical bill at the end of every month, there is a small item of tax rebate. If the province were able to persuade the federal government to reduce that time lag down from three years to two years, there could be a sum of money that would be available for possibly acquiring the system, or used to reduce the rates in northern Alberta.

I just raise it as an interesting concept because it is one that the province is negotiating with Ottawa, and has placed on record that they would like to see this three-year time lag reduced down to two years. The reason of course, for The Utility Income Tax Rebate Act, that came into being, is that Alberta is one of the few provinces that has private utilities in operation, that do generate a profit as opposed to those provinces that have a public system. Under a public system there is no corporation income tax. So, with The Utility Income Tax Rebate Act, income tax wise, the two power companies and their customers in Alberta, are treated no differently, taxation-wise, than customers in provinces that own a public system.

So this is some of the information I think, that the members may appreciate in taking a look at this resolution, and I would think that they probably will generate a little further debate on the resolution before a vote is taken on it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would entertain a question? I would just like to be sure of my interpretation of the minister's remarks. Did the minister mean to infer, in his question about co-ordination development of additional generating capacity, that there is unnecessary generating capability developed either within the last decade or being developed now, that is not required taking into account the fact that the power demand is expanding every 10 years. It relates to the question of co-ordination that he brought into the debate on the resolution. It seemed to imply that there was no co-ordination in that aspect taking place.

74-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 14th 1972

MR. WERRY:

No, I didn't mean to infer, Mr. Speaker, that there was no co-ordination. The generating companies now operating under a 15 per cent reserve sharing arrangement, in that each company has to have 15 per cent excess capacity over their highest peak load. Now what the Energy Resources Conservation Board stated was that in order to bring the most economic units on stream there should be an electric utility planning council that considers the total province, possibly Calgary Power will bring on, say, a 375 megowatt plant that, without disturbing the total reserve capacity of the other firms and municipalities, if Calgary Power picks up the total excess reserve then there would be a time lag in there where, say, Edmonton Power could bring on a 150 megowatt or a 300 megowatt plant which they otherwise wouldn't be able to bring on. Theirs would be incremental based on 100 and 100 or some such figure as that. But, by planning, one company could bring on a larger unit yet achieve the economies of the scale rather than the four companies each bringing on small units in order to maintain that 15 per cent reserve in there.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, if I might just very briefly address myself to the motion. I think the members of the House should be aware of the fact that the question of planning for power generating capability, be it thermal or hydro, was previously -- up until the development of the Energy Conservation Board -- the responsibility of the Power Commission of the Province of Alberta. It certainly is my understanding that there was an element of co-ordination involved through the commission. That was their basic purpose of existence, to see that uneconomic generating capability did not come on the market in small units or too large a unit, that didn't fit into the demand of the growth picture for power in the province, or to see that generating plants did not come into stream that were excessively large in comparison to the growth of power demands in the province. The question of co-ordination was there.

In setting up the Conservation Energy Board it was felt that it was becoming increasingly difficult to separate the question of electric power from the question of coal or fossil fuels or even atomic energy. It was a question of energy in total within the Province of Alberta and Alberta being the energy province of Canada that it was highly desirable to bring all these matters in court to make them under one jurisdiction. So the responsibility of dealing with the question of growth and development of power generating capacity in keeping with demands in the province, and the growth of demand, was assigned to the Energy Board.

I am somewhat surprised to now hear the suggestion from the Energy Board that they think a planning council should be set up to deal with the problem as it is my recollection that at the time the Energy Board was set up, it was charged with that responsibility as part of the whole question of the management of energy resources within the Province of Alberta. This seems to be desirable since in all probability, with the tremendous growing demand for electric power on this continent and with increasing technical capability to transmit electric energy over substantial distances, the question of coal export in the Province of Alberta could at some time in years to come turn into a question of export of electric power generated by coal. Instead of exporting coal it would be converted, in effect, into electrical energy and exported.

As far the resolution is concerned the question of planning has been a fact in the past in the co-ordination and I would hope that the legislation related to the energy board is sufficiently clear to make it plain that that is now the responsibility of the Energy Conservation Board and they are not advocating the establishment of another government body to deal with the question of planning.

MR. WERRY:

Just a point of clarification, the Energy Resources Conservation Board has still the authority for all that you mention. The Electric Utility Planning Council merely assists the Energy Resources Conservation Board in the background material that they need. I am sorry if I didn't leave that clear with you.

MR. HENDERSON:

Thank you, Mr. Minister. It left me with the impression that they were, in effect, trying to advocate this responsibility and pass it on to another government body which really is contrary to the concept of having an energy board. Certainly, as I say, Alberta is the energy province of Canada and looking to the long-term future of the province there's one thing that very clearly is necessary, is needed as a comprehensive, integrated, and closely co-

November 14, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

74-41

ordinated policy relative to the development of the energy resources in the province. I am pleased to hear the minister say that we're not talking about trying to fragment the system. It needs the exact opposite, in my view, so far as the best long-term interest the people of the province are concerned.

I can certainly appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the desirability of the citizens in the northern part of Alberta to enjoy the lower power benefits that accrue to the citizens of the province, the two-thirds that have their power supplied by Calgary Power. Very clearly, one of the methods of doing this would be a provincial power grid. The only thing I really question is the matter of feasibility study, because technically it is feasible, the power exchanger is going on. It isn't really the matter of a study, it's a matter of political policy as to whether the government wants to pursue such a policy. I might say quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I have an open mind on the subject, because there are, in my own constituency, a number of difficulties with the REA system. I don't know whether the Deputy Premier would agree with me on the matter or not, but I personally have the view that the REA system may have outlived its basic initial purpose and intent. It is still performing a function, but there are some problems within the REA system that are going to be difficult to rationalize without some change in policy.

Mr. Speaker, a feasibility study is really somewhat academic. It would basically just use up some more taxpayers' money, trying to arrive at a decision which can only be made in the political arena. And it clearly relates to policy, the way I see government. If the government as a matter of policy decides it wants to go this route, it's just a matter of evaluating the economics of it in how you're going to take over the power grids, whether the power companies are going to sell them gracefully or whether they're going to sell them ungracefully. And so, I think, the question of a feasibility study really begs the issue -- it would simply mean an expenditure of public money in a technical area which really relates to a political question.

I'd like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that possibly the mover and the seconder could be a little more explicit in their proposition where the resolution is concerned, as to making it quite clear whether they're advocating a publicly-owned power grid system, and how they see they would continue to maintain private enterprise in the generating capability that would feed power into the system.

The feasibility part of it -- I can't see. I just don't see where the question of a technical study deals with the policy of the question, as to whether government thinks it's in the public interest to do it or not. While I basically support a concept of private enterprise, quite frankly at this point, I have an open mind on the subject. I would be very much interested though, Mr. Speaker, to hear some further expressions of opinion from other members of the House on this issue.

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, a clarification. If the hon. member would refer to the Hansard of March 9, when I introduced the motion, I think it's quite clear what the reason and the ideas behind the mover and the seconder were with regard to --

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member, strictly speaking, could give that explanation when he's adjourning the debate, or when he's closing the debate.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I've spoken on this resolution so I don't have the opportunity to speak again on it, but if permitted I'd just like to say something in regard to what the hon. member said about putting the resolution in proper perspective. Last spring --

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. minister has the unanimous consent of the House, we can bend the rules in this fashion.

MR. HENDERSON:

There are other hon. members who want to speak on this resolution. I would be quite interested to receive a note from the member as to what it is he wants

to clarify. I think it would be in order to adhere to the regular rules of debate.

MR. YOUNG:

Well, Mr. Speaker, mainly I have questions on this subject rather than opinions at this point in time. I have to consider, in analyzing this resolution, what the objectives would be in a feasibility study. Reference has been made to the objectives as stated by the hon. member in introducing the motion last spring. But to me one of the objectives we would have to keep in mind in approaching a matter of this nature would be the efficiency of one form of system as opposed to another form of system. Now this is a highly technical area, one on which I certainly do not feel competent to judge, but whether, in fact, it is possible to relate a number of smaller systems servicing specific portions of the province in such a manner as to have a highly efficient system in a technical sense, so that they can be integrated in case of a failure in one system to provide power from other systems to that particular system.

The hon. minister, a few minutes ago expressed the concern of the Energy Resources Conservation Board to bring on stream projects in such a manner that we do not have, if you will, wasted power or inefficient, uneconomic utilization. The problem, of course, that he was relating to us, is the problem which is frequent in a number of types of public services, that of bringing services to the public in large discreet units. In other words, we can't bring increased power generation facilities on in small incremental units, but rather they must be brought on in large units at a time. So, involved in this kind of decision is the question of who makes the decision of what company proceeds, at what time.

A second consideration which I think we have to consider in this assembly, is the matter of equity of cost to the consumer. With the population of the province being as it is, somewhat grouped in spots and widely dispersed in other locations, we have had a number of systems develop in this province; the REAs to service the widely scattered rural population; Edmonton Power to service the City of Edmonton's facilities; Calgary Power; Alberta Power. Now the problem is, how do we equalize cost? And do we equalize cost in terms of the same cost per kilowatt-hour, or however we choose to measure it, our units of power, or do we equalize cost having regard to the fact that equity must consider the cost to the power company or to the public at large to service a far-flung farm, if you will, or to service a residence which is on an acreage outside of Edmonton, and which requires a line directed especially to it?

In this particular connection, I would have liked the hon. minister to have developed a bit on the concept of the fuel cell which I understand has been installed in a residence in Calgary. I believe as of a few months ago he presided at the throwing of that particular switch. I understand that this may, in fact, have some possibility for the generation of power to fit the needs of residences directly from other energy resources. My limited understanding of that development is that we might not, in fact, have to string hydro-electric lines to some of the far-scattered areas. I don't know at what level the technology of that particular development is, nor do I know what the economics of that development are likely to be, or if they are known now, what they are. These are considerations which I think we would definitely have to keep in mind in dealing with this particular resolution.

The other concern which I have in this resolution, or have in considering the overall policy dealing with energy in this province as far as service to residents or to manufacturing is concerned, is that of the conversion of one form of energy to another. We've seen some very, very rapid developments -- the fuel cell about which I have just mentioned is, I suppose, one of those in a minor form -- but we have seen some very, very rapid developments in terms of converting one type of energy to another type of energy. I suspect we haven't seen the last of these. In any co-ordinated approach we would have to have regard as to what kind of a system would permit us to implement these technological developments in the most efficient and effective manner for the well-being of our citizens. We've heard discussion on the tar sands and the potential use of coal; how this might be converted into electric energy. We, in this province, do not have, I suspect, a great capability left in hydro-electric energy in terms of conversion of rivers and streams into electricity, but we do have our gases and our coals, and potentially solar energy. After all, we're known as the 'sunshine province' and if any province should have a capability in this respect, it should be the Province of Alberta.

At the same time that we talk about a provincial grid on public versus private ownership, I think we ought to have another consideration, and that is the need for energy outside of the Province of Alberta. The question of

November 14, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

74-43

exporting energy was raised. There is no question at all that we have regard to the problems which are being encountered in the areas of Toronto, Montreal, and the eastern seaboard. There is a tremendous shortage of energy, and especially hydro-electric energy as we have geared up our consumer uses. In other words, the power companies, particularly New York City (I was reading about it) encouraged people to use electric energy for stoves for cooking, and are now in the process of discouraging people from using electric energy in this manner. In fact then, we should have regard as to what are the needs outside of the province. British Columbia may not be in a position to want much energy for some time to come, but it is quite conceivable that there will be a demand for energy to the southwest of the province.

To proceed to my last point, if I can make that point, it relates to the question of how we use our energy and what guidance should be given to our manufacturing companies and to our householders. What kind of equipment -- I'm speaking now of that driven by electricity or driven by gas (dryers, stoves, what have you) -- what kind should be most logically, effectively and efficiently used in the future. Should the province have regard in giving some direction to consumers and to manufacturers as to the kind of equipment which they should be manufacturing?

Mr. Speaker, it being 5:30, may I adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it the hon. member has leave to adjourn the debate. The House stands adjourned until 8:00 o'clock this evening.

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

