

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

[The House met at 2:30 o'clock.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being Bill No. 201 The Societies Amendment Act, 1973. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to The Societies Act if a group of individuals wish to incorporate themselves as a society, they are required, pursuant to Section 7 to make for certain provisions as provided for in Schedule B to the act.

Mr. Speaker, the bill would provide an eleventh requirement in addition to the ten now listed in Schedule B. This eleventh requirement would be that the society choose, from the moment of its incorporation, a rules of order by which the society's meetings will be governed in the future.

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

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, both galleries are filled with 150 excited --

[Applause]

-- If the hon. members don't recognize me, I am the Member for Edmonton Ottewell. Mr. Speaker, we have, in both galleries, today 150 excited Grade 6 students from Kenilworth School in my constituency. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Hancheruk and Mr. Whitney and I will ask them to please stand and be recognized.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to table the reply to Question No. 104, asked by the hon. Member for Drumheller on February 20, 1973.

CRAI QUESTION PERIOD

School Taxes Relative to Grants

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Provincial Treasurer. I wonder if the Treasurer could advise the House as to what implications there are, if any, for the Province of Alberta in the fact that local school taxes are apparently now taken into account in calculating federal government equalization payments to the province.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I think the best way I can answer that is first to clarify to the members that the equalization is a federal pool. In other words, the federal government can choose to spend the money where it wishes to spend it.

They are federal funds, not provincial funds. Now having said that, the announcement by the Minister of Finance, federally, that the pool would be increased was a decision in effect by the federal government that they would take federal funds and add them to the equalization pool, rather than spend them on shared cost programs or certain other factors. So really, it's an allocation of federal funds. To that degree, some shared cost programs also -- as we have argued -- have had an element of equalization in them. At the present time the inclusion of the school costs is really in line with the increased amount Mr. Turner announced.

MR. HENDERSON:

I gather, Mr. Speaker, that there was no prior consultation with the provincial government on this matter before the federal government made that decision?

MR. MINIELY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, at the finance ministers' meetings and at the First Ministers' Conference we indicated very strongly that we objected to the inclusion of school costs, but obviously the federal government has chosen to include that.

MR. HENDERSON:

One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Was the question of municipal taxation also discussed at the conference you mentioned?

MR. MINIELY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was. At the present time, my understanding of the announcement by the Minister of Finance is that municipal costs are not included -- just school costs.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewell.

RCMP Uniforms

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. the Attorney General. When it is necessary to have the RCMP present at demonstrations at the Legislature Building, why do they not wear uniforms rather than plain clothes, so the people know they are being watched,?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what the hon. member is referring to when he says it is necessary to have members of the RCMP present at demonstrations. Perhaps he would like to call some instance to my attention and I'd be able to give him a more complete answer. As to the presence of members in uniform or members out of uniform, that's something I'd want to review with the officers of the RCMP.

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly the hon. member could put the question on the Order Paper and then the hon. minister would be able to look into the details. The hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewell, followed by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

Commonwealth Games

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation with respect to the communities surrounding Edmonton, such as St. Albert, Sherwood Park, and Fort Saskatchewan. If these communities were prepared to provide some facilities for the Commonwealth Games, could they qualify for at least a portion of the multi-million dollar provincial grants for the games?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, without any question, yes, because they are not restricted to the City of Edmonton alone.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking, followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Anti-Litter Campaign

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of the Environment. Mr. Minister, you mentioned news releases in connection with your province-wide litter check. My question is, will there also be advertising in connection with the campaign placed in weekly newspapers?

MR. YURKO:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there will be some advertising. We haven't finalized this aspect of the program as yet.

MR. SORENSON:

A supplementary question to the minister. Regarding the old car bodies that you mentioned in your speech, have any studies been conducted to ascertain just how many cars there are, and how many go out of service each year in the province?

MR. YURKO:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, studies have been made in this regard. I can't remember the figures right off hand as to how many there are in the province that have to be picked up at this time. But the annual generation is approximately 50,000, which was the figure given to me.

MR. SORENSON:

A supplementary. Can the smelters handle this volume of, say, 50,000 each year?

MR. YURKO:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, they can handle this volume without any difficulty.

MR. SORENSON:

A supplementary. Has the minister given any consideration to adopting a program British Columbia has which is proving very successful? The government owns two compactors which travel from place to place, and also truck them to the smelters.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, we have given a considerable amount of attention to this problem, and we have a suggested plan for consideration before government right now. However, our attempt will be to favour the use of private enterprise in picking up and getting rid of the car bodies generated every year. I might suggest that because of the lack of time in formulating an overall plan in this area for this year, as I indicated in the House the other day, we have decided to have the Department of Highways and the Department of the Environment pick these car bodies up during litter check week, the end of April to May 6, on an interim basis only.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, followed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

University Salaries

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the Minister of Advanced Education. Can the minister advise the House if it is true that when

administrators at the University of Alberta, such as the President or Vice-President, step down from an administrative post to that of an instructor that they keep the original administration salary even though they are no longer providing the services of an administrator?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is asking for information peculiar to the University of Alberta and the recent announcement by Dr. Wyman that he will not be continuing as President of that institution after this year, I am sure I am in a position to enquire of the University for information. I think, however, it bears emphasizing that that kind of decision is an internal personnel decision of an institution which is governed by a board of governors. We are not responsible for their hiring practices or their personnel practices, but I am sure that certain of the information you require will be available to me.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the provincial government is advancing the funds for the university, does this government accept the proposition that Alberta taxpayers should be expected to pay a salary for a position which is no longer held, nor duties no longer performed? By way of explanation, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this is a broader question than that relating to just the present President of the University. I am talking about an overall policy with respect to administration at the University of Alberta.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the member's question. However, Mr. Speaker, may I remind the House that we can't have it both ways. We can't have a Minister of Advanced Education, for example, who is able to dictate the internal personnel policies, salary schedules et cetera and benefits of staff in universities and colleges on the one hand, and on the other hand, accept the argument that is so well put by universities and colleges -- but universities in particular -- that they are a special institution and government should not have their hands or fingers into the internal workings of our institutions. I am one who believes in institutional autonomy. I am one who believes that institutional autonomy is a function of academic freedom.

Coming back to the question, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, there are people, senior people, competent people on the staffs of universities and colleges who are paid much more than the people in this House. There may even be people who are paid much more than any other person in the public service. Certainly we have an interest in that. It is then for us to discuss this, if we will, with the boards of governors, and for the public to express their concern to the boards of governors. I come back to the point where I don't feel that I have the authority, nor should I, to dictate to a university or college the level of personal benefits, salaries et cetera offered in universities.

MR. NOTLEY:

A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister any idea of how widespread this practice may be at other institutions? And secondly, has the minister had an opportunity to discuss this particular practice with the Board of Governors at the University of Alberta?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the salary ranges generally, although I can't recall the specific details of associate professors, professors, deans, presidents et cetera. I know there are often wide ranges. I am sure there are some professors in university communities across this nation, much less this province, who are drawing salaries in the service of their university far in excess of the public service. That may very well be. I am sure that there are benefits provided to some people in the university community including an automobile or a house or other benefits, but again I come back to the point. While I am aware of these things, and while we can discuss these with boards of governors, we do not have nor should we have the jurisdiction to order that they are corrected if we do not agree with the level paid to a president or a senior faculty person.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Clover Bar, followed by the hon. Member for Smoky River.

The Liquor Control Act

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Attorney General. And, Mr. Speaker, because of the seriousness of the question, I would appreciate 30 seconds' indulgence to give a little bit of background. Hon. Attorney General, a constituent of mine was picked up on an illegal possession charge when she had not been drinking, and rather than pay the fine she took the seven days. My question is this: will there be any change in legislation to look at this illegal possession section of The Liquor Control Act?

MR. LEITCH:

Not at this session, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK:

Supplementary, in view of the fact that we have the .08 legislation, do you not think that the illegal possession section is redundant?

MR. LEITCH:

I don't think there is any connection between the two, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Smoky River followed by the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake.

Grain Cash Advances

MR. MOORE:

A question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Have you been able to determine yet what the intention of the Canadian Wheat Board is in regard to the collection of cash advances on farm-stored grain?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, we have concluded our discussions with the Canadian Wheat Board in relation to their collection practices. The Wheat Board has assured us that they are going to do no more than register their claims, and that they don't intend to be too harsh in following them up. They are hopeful, as we are, that the coming year will be a good one and this backlog of unpaid cash advances will be cleaned up.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has the government not considered the impact of what the obtaining of judgments against these farmers will mean? They may not immediately proceed to collect, but will it not have an impact on the farmers' credit rating and ability to obtain credit from other institutions?

DR. HORNER:

Not necessarily, Mr. Speaker. In my view, I don't think it will. The board has specifically said that they wouldn't follow up collection, but they have to -- because of the Statute of Limitations -- in some cases to register their claim.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question to the minister. Did the minister come to any understanding with the Canadian Wheat Board then as it relates to the collection on the first delivery of a new crop? Does a percentage of that go back to repay the Canadian Wheat Board advance or is the whole thing taken as they deliver?

DR. HORNER:

Well, it is still on a percentage of delivery.

MR. RUSTE:

Just a point for clarification, Mr. Speaker. Say that I had taken a cash advance and I was unable to deliver grain until my new crop comes in, and the moment I deliver that first load, shall we say, is the Canadian Wheat Board prepared to take it all or a part of the load?

DR. HORNER:

Depending on the kind of year we have, and hopefully it will be a good one, I am sure that the Canadian Wheat Board, from our discussions with them, will be very willing and ready to accept any kind of program of repayment that the farmer can make. They appreciate very much that those initial deliveries are also required to pay the expenses of the year.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge East.

Nurses on Mercy Flights

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Is it a government regulation that registered nurses accompany air ambulances on mercy flights?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has asked a question in respect to regulations which, of course, are matters of public record in the same way that legislation is. I presume the question relates more to policy than regulation. I am not certain of what policy is followed by the department -- the officials that administer the air ambulance service -- and I'll be glad to find that out for the hon. member.

MR. BARTON:

Supplementary. While he is looking who is responsible for the payment of the nurses on such mercy flights -- if he would look into that part of it too.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge East followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

Lethbridge Bridge

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Highways. What progress has been made on the bridge to west Lethbridge and the university?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question, the hon. Premier was in Lethbridge last fall when he announced that the bridge would be proceeding at that time. There is a great deal of work that goes into preparing a bridge, the design work, the aggregates, and so forth. The bridge is proceeding at full pace, as quickly as it can be proceeded with.

DR. BUCK:

Come on, tell the truth.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Paper on Municipal Grants

MR. WYSE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. You indicated to the House on February 16 that the 20-page formula or working paper to determine unconditional grants to municipalities would be released soon to the municipalities. Has it been released, and if not when will it be?

MR. RUSSELL:

No, it hasn't been released yet, Mr. Speaker. There is a very good reason for it. The "formula" -- and I use that word in quotation marks -- is in the form of a 20-page working paper. In other words, it's a process that you go through for the urban municipalities and the rural municipalities to ascertain their share, on a relative need basis, of the municipal assistance grants that are available.

I have indicated in my meetings with the municipal government people that we are trying to get it down to a simpler form than the 20 page working paper and release that to them. As the hon. members may be aware we are meeting with the AUMA tonight, and with both associations tomorrow night, and I expect that will be an item on the agenda. But until we deal with the more urgent problems of getting the details of this year's current budgets out for them I wouldn't want to get that working paper out to them because that is something to be studied in depth at a later time.

MR. WYSE:

One supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the government considering any changes in the 7.5 per cent ceiling?

MR. RUSSELL:

Not at this time, Mr. Speaker. We have broadcast far and wide that if any municipalities appear to be having problems with the formula and with the incentive factor we would like to hear from them. We have heard from a number of them, and I have written back and told them that their concerns are being given consideration and that we hope to get, very quickly, detailed information with respect to any changes that might be made.

I think that generally it's safe to say that the reaction from the citizens of Alberta towards that specific part of the program has been most favourable. The government intends to maintain that part of the program while still recognizing that in this first year there may be some difficulties with some municipalities. But that is going to be an item of discussion with them.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question. Can the minister advise the House what time sequence there will be as far as those municipalities which are having extreme difficulties with the 7.5 per cent formula, whether they are looking at a month or two months before they know when the government will make some allowance?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, to review the time sequence ordinarily the municipalities would not know until about today, when the provincial budget was brought down, what forms of financial assistance they might be getting. This year we indicated to them on January 16 the extent of the assistance. It's a new year. It's a difficult year because it is a very dramatic new program. There has been a good exchange of correspondence. We have set up these meetings -- they were originally scheduled for last week, but because of the events of last week some rescheduling had to be done -- but it is our intent to proceed as rapidly as possible. I recognize what the time factors are with respect to the municipal budgets and the duties of the municipal councillors, but I expect we will be getting the last details out to those who have asked for them very shortly.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister inform the House why Red Deer will be receiving some \$140,000 more than Medicine Hat in these unconditional grants, yet we have approximately the same population?

MR. SPEAKER:

This is the type of question that should probably be put on the Order Paper inasmuch as it may involve some detail and perhaps some calculations.

The hon. member for Calgary Millican, followed by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

Latta Case

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Attorney General. What were the instructions and guidelines given to the Edmonton City Police Department when it was directed by the Attorney General's Department to interview the convicted murderer, Keith Latta, presently serving a life sentence in the Drumheller Penitentiary?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I think that is a matter I have already dealt with. But in any event, for the hon. member's benefit, I am quite happy to repeat it. This was a request that came to the department from Mr. Latta for an interview with the members of the City of Edmonton Police Force, and they were simply asked to accede to that request.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, just to clarify the point, my original question back on February 20 was asking on what authority did you ask.

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Were the two Edmonton City Police Officers who went to the Drumheller Penitentiary to interview the prisoner the same officers who were responsible for laying the original charge of murder against Keith Latta?

MR. LEITCH:

I don't know, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DIXON:

A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Seeing that the minister doesn't know whether they were the same two officers or not, my next question would be: now that the report of the interview is in the hands of the Attorney General's Department, when can we expect either action to go forward or the case to be closed?

MR. LEITCH:

Soon, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Taber-Warner, followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller. Sorry, right -- the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury, followed by the hon. Member for Taber-Warner.

Mobile Home Insurance

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't want to miss out on an opportunity to ask a question of the hon. the Attorney General. My question to the Attorney General is: have you had an opportunity to assess the increases in the insurance rates for mobile homeowners in the province? You indicated that you would do that and report back to the Assembly last week.

MR. LEITCH:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have passed on to the Superintendent of Insurance the request for some information on that subject, and it has not yet come back to me.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. At the Snowmobile Association meeting last weekend, or the weekend before, in Edmonton, you indicated that the rates of insurance you felt were reasonable for that association should be based on Alberta experience. Does the same principle of Alberta experience hold true for the rates to be charged as far as mobile homeowners are concerned?

MR. LEITCH:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the connection between the two statements, or the two situations, is a most tenuous one indeed. I want to draw to the hon. member's attention that the rates for snowmobile insurance and auto insurance are set by the Automobile Insurance Board, but there is no authority within the province to set rates for other forms of insurance. Those rates are set entirely without government involvement.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Taber-Warner, followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

Agricultural Hall of Fame

MR. D. MILLER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, can you advise the House where the Agricultural Hall of Fame has been moved to?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Barrhead.

[Laughter]

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. It's in the Provincial Museum where I feel it should be in conjunction with the very fine agricultural exhibit that is there under the jurisdiction of the very able Minister of Youth, Culture and Recreation.

MR. BUCKWELL:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister of Agriculture going to be one of the candidates considered for the Hall of Fame?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller, followed by the hon. Member for Macleod.

Distribution Report

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am sure if the hon. Minister of Agriculture answers this question he will go in the Hall of Fame. When will the feasibility report on rural gas distribution be tabled in the Legislature?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Better give us a date.

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the Premier and others have let the House know that in this session a rural gas policy will be announced. When that policy is announced, a decision as to what supporting documents will or will not be tabled will be made.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Macleod --

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to add something to the Deputy Premier's response there, and that has to do with the statement I made in the House yesterday with regard to the appointment of Mr. Farran as the Minister of Telephones and Utilities. He is charged with that responsibility due to the unfortunate events that have occurred. There is no question that there is going to be a delay. We would hope that that statement as to our policy on the important matter would be tabled during the course of this session.

MR. TAYLOR:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I might just mention that I have had inquiries from a number of gas co-ops and I have advised them that, due to the death of the late Mr. Werry, it would undoubtedly be delayed. But they are very anxious to get the report at the earliest possible time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Macleod, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

RCMP Centennial

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. the Premier. Mr. Premier, have you any plans regarding the RCMP Centennial in formal recognition of members of the Legislature, for example, here in Edmonton.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I can't respond directly to that question. Perhaps the hon. member could elaborate on what he has in mind.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Well I was thinking, Mr. Premier, of something like a banquet with the RCMP and members of the Legislature.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to take that matter up with the ministers who are responsible for the celebration, with a direct reference to Mr. MacGregor, who has been charged with the responsibility for that, and report back to the House.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, may I take the opportunity at this time to mention that the grandfather of one of the present members of this Assembly was one of the original members of this force, Mr. Buckwell.

[Applause]

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Self-Service Liquor Stores

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the hon. Attorney General. Is conversion to self-service liquor stores resulting in higher per capita sales?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure I don't know, but if the hon. member really wants to press the question I'll find out.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware of any losses due to shoplifting or theft under the new system?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Have you been down there?

MR. LEITCH:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think the general position is that there is very little -- in fact, for all practical purposes, no losses as a result of theft from the regular kind of store. But in stores where customers are able to go in and select their own produce, there has been some loss by shoplifting.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, does the self-service system have any effect on staffing requirements?

MR. LEITCH:

It is, my memory, Mr. Speaker, that there is some reduction in the staff required in the self-service store, although it is not a very large reduction.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drayton Valley, followed by the hon. Member for Wainwright.

Grande Cache Logging

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Has the native logging operation in the Grande Cache area been resolved?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the matters being taken into account by the gentleman heading the inquiry, Mr. Crump, and as a matter of fact I had a long conversation with him yesterday. So that is one of the matters being looked at there. It might be useful to mention that, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the timber licence in question is not held by the co-op, but is in fact held by McIntyre Porcupine.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wainwright.

Ombudsman's Telephone

MR. RUSTE:

My question is to the hon. the Premier. Has any further step been taken with regard to providing incentives or a toll-free number for the office of the Ombudsman so that people in remote parts of Alberta can contact him directly?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I don't have that information readily available. I will check and give an answer to the House and to the hon. member. I do recall the discussion that was involved. There was also some additional discussion that, I recall, Mr. Werry responded to as to the Zenith telephone number in general, relative to the public service. At least some work has been done by the Bureau of Public Affairs and I will check and report to the House.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question to the Premier. Would you look then at the matter of the same service to the office of the Farmers Advocate?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lac la Biche-McMurray.

Health Care Premiums, Benefits

DR. BOUVIER:

Yes, I would like to direct a question to the Minister in charge of Alberta Health Care Insurance. Is it true that at present when somebody is delinquent in their premiums to Alberta Health Care Insurance that the benefits are cancelled?

MISS HUNLEY:

No, that is not true, Mr. Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of pleasure on behalf of myself and the Minister of Youth, Culture and Recreation, and also the Minister of Education, in announcing the Future Farmer of Alberta Program, which we intend to institute immediately.

The program is designed to assist young people throughout Alberta, including city children, if they would like to undertake a project in the country. The guidelines are essentially between the ages of 12 and 18. The maximum amount of loan which the government will guarantee is up to \$600; the first year is \$300, the second \$400, and \$600 thereafter for young people who are in the program.

I am sure there are a number of projects that all hon. members can think about. There will be a distribution of this kit to each hon. member so that they will have a full and detailed knowledge of the program.

Essentially the objective of the program, of course, is to get our young people in rural Alberta interested in farming, to give them an educational experience in relation to the costing and the actual workings of an agricultural project.

The program is very flexible. The loan will be guaranteed on the advice of any adult adviser. This can be any number of people in the community -- either the -- I will come to the 4H clubs in a minute -- either their 4H leader, a teacher, another farmer in the community, but it cannot be a parent. And there are some pretty obvious reasons for that.

We think this program will not only interest young people in agriculture, we hope it will give us an increase in agricultural production in Alberta. It will also, I think, be a major impetus to the agricultural societies that are being formed and have been formed in Alberta, and will have a major impact in relation to the agricultural fairs throughout Alberta, as I am sure young people are going to want to compete at those fairs.

I think the other important aspect of this program, Mr. Speaker, is that for some time there has been a sort of argument, you might say, in the country in relation to the status of the 4H movement and its move from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Youth, Culture and Recreation. The position that I took in the Legislature a year ago was that we intended to keep it in the Department of Youth, Culture and Recreation and that we would attempt to have our agricultural field people much more involved than they had been in the 4H program. I think that the Future Farmer of Alberta Program, which is jointly sponsored by myself and my colleague, will meld the 4H people with agriculture in a very meaningful way without destructing their activities on the part of the Department of Youth, Culture and Recreation.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is the ideal kind of program for young people. It compares to the kind of work experience programs that are going on in some of the city and urban high schools. So we are very pleased that the Minister of Education, who has also been involved in our discussions, has agreed that with the approval of the principal in charge projects may entitle a student to an annual maximum credit of five credits in special programs.

We think, Mr. Speaker, that this is a really exciting program for young people in Alberta and I hope that all hon. members will feel free to give me their advice and will advise young people in their ridings in relation to the program. We intend to have a pretty major distribution of these documents to make sure

that all of our young people are involved and interested in it. The kits have a picture of a young farmer, and I'm very pleased to be able to tell the House that his name is Randy Thompson. His father was one of the youngest master farmers in Alberta recently, and he comes from the Innisfail area. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTIONS

172. Mr. Taylor asked the government the following question:

With reference to the King Aircraft CF-AFD what is the total cost of the 260 flights and the maintenance of this aircraft during the year 1972?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I accept the question.

174. Mr. Wilson asked the government the following question:

(1) How many inmates, showing age categories, are presently in the Bowden Correctional Institute?

(2) What is the projected use for this facility for 1973, 1974, 1975 and 1976?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, we accept the question.

175. Mr. Wilson asked the government the following question:

(1) How many new correctional officers will be required for
(a) the new Calgary Remand Centre; and
(b) the new Edmonton Remand Centre?

(2) Are any individuals being employed and trained at the present time within the Attorney General's Department, for the purpose of filling new positions created by the opening of these new remand centres?

(3) In what manner, and from where, will new correctional officers be recruited?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, we accept the question.

176. Mr. Wilson asked the government the following question:

(1) How many jail sentences of 60 days or less were given in Alberta in 1972?

(2) How many of these sentences included a fine option, which was not taken?

(3) How many people electing for an optional jail sentence arrived with sufficient cash in their possession to have paid the fine?

(4) What was the total cost in 1972 to the Alberta taxpayers, for inmates serving a sentence rather than paying an optional fine?

(5) What is the inmate per diem cost to the Alberta taxpayers for the
(a) Calgary Correctional Institute; and
(b) Fort Saskatchewan Gaol?

(6) What was the total fine revenue received from optional sentences in 1972?

(7) How many people paid a fine rather than take the jail sentence option?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would agree to that question standing over until Thursday? My prime reason for making that request is that I want to check with the members of the department to ascertain whether the information requested there is available. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, some of it

will not be available. In particular, I'm referring to sub-paragraph (3) of that question which reads:

How many people electing for an optional jail sentence arrived with sufficient cash in their possession to have paid the fine?

Mr. Speaker, we certainly have no way of knowing how much money people may have in their possession when they arrive at the court house.

But with respect to the other matters, Mr. Speaker, I'd like a little more time to ascertain where the information is available.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could clarify Question No. 3. The question was meant to indicate how many people arrive at the jail with sufficient funds in their pocket to have paid the fine. It is my understanding that inventory is taken of all of the personal possessions when the people are taken to jail, and that there would be ready records available in this regard.

MR. SPEAKER:

The practice of making informal amendments to these motions should perhaps be discouraged. If the hon. member wishes, he can reconsider the matter when the hon. Attorney General reports on Thursday as to the availability of the information. And at that time possibly the motion might be amended or withdrawn and redrawn.

I am sorry, I omitted to ask the House whether the House agrees that Question No. 176 stand over until Thursday as requested.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

177. Mr. Taylor asked the government the following question:

With reference to the report of the Select Committee on Censorship

- (1) What was the total cost of this committee for the year 1972 for;
 - (a) travelling expenses within the province,
 - (b) other expenses incurred within the province?
- (2) How much was paid to each member of the committee?
- (3) What trips did the committee of members of the committee make;
 - (a) outside of the Province of Alberta,
 - (b) who were the members making each trip,
 - (c) what is the cost of each trip in regard to;
 - (i) travelling of each member,
 - (ii) expenses of each member,
 - (iii) other expenses?
- (4) (a) What is the name or the names of the staff that was attached to this committee?

(b) What was the total cost of the staff attached to the committee in regard to; (a) wages? (b) travelling? (c) other expenses?

[The motion was carried.]

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

147. Mr. Dixon proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Wyse.

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

Copies of all correspondence and minutes of all meetings held between the Government of Alberta, its ministers or agencies, and the CNR since September 10, 1971, regarding the Alberta Resources Railway.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, in moving this motion last week the House asked if it could be held over. I agreed that it be held over until today, because I understood the hon. minister wished the mover and the seconder to delete "the minutes of all meetings." But the reason I'd like to have that stay in, Mr. Speaker, is that in the fall session, all correspondence prior to this date of September 10, 1971, including the minutes, were tabled. So I would like the minister to reconsider his request and table the minutes also of the meetings between the Government of Alberta and the CNR.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would have to move an amendment, seconded by the hon. Minister of Advanced Education, Mr. Foster, on the Motion for a Return, No. 147, that it be amended to delete the words "minutes of all meetings held." Therefore, I would like to table the amended motion.

I might just add, Mr. Speaker, that because of the sensitivity at this time of the negotiations that are taking place, it certainly isn't in the public interest to table these minutes at this time.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there any further debate on the amendment?

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I think the government should really reconsider its decision not to table these minutes. They certainly had no hesitation tabling the minutes of the meetings of the board, plus other correspondence, last year when it concerned the previous government. And all of a sudden now to stand up and say because there has been a change in the government, that since September of 1971 it isn't in the public interest to table the information, is a little bit hard to comprehend.

I also find the suggested amendment highly questionable in principle, in light of the government's announcement they are going to have a complete open public inquiry into the entire exercise of everything involving the ARR. We find now we are going to discuss the matter of co-ops. The request for the motion is in keeping with a motion that was ordered by this House last year where the minutes of the meetings of the Board of Directors of the ARR were tabled in this House for the period December to September of 1971.

Now, as I say, Mr. Speaker, to decide all of a sudden that because there is a change in government the minutes of the meetings and so on are confidential -- we have to challenge on principle. It was public previously, it should be public now, particularly in light of the inquiry that is forthcoming. There is absolutely no reason for secrecy on the matter.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, before the hon. minister closes the debate, I would like to raise one question with regard to the statement he made. He said that due to the sensitivity of the situation at the present time, he is not willing to table the minutes. Does he mean to indicate that when the program or the plans are finalized he would then be prepared to table the minutes, if this is indeed a good reason for not tabling them at the present time?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what I indicated. At this time the situation is that sensitive that we do not feel it is in the best public interest to table those minutes.

MR. BENOIT:

But will you do it later?

MR. PEACOCK:

I'll certainly consider it.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, speaking to the amendment, I feel that the minister in the House the other day suggested all the agreement was finalized. I was disappointed and I have to be honest with you, Mr. Speaker, that two members opposite decided to practically move a vote of non-confidence in the minister. But the minister did say at the time that it was finalized and I think if that particular agreement is finalized I cannot see what is sensitive about it.

This is an important issue because many times you find that the minutes in some correspondence are of great help because they give the background as to why the final decision was made. This is why we were interested in it. I feel the government should reconsider this amendment and allow this motion to go forward in light of the fact that minutes of all other correspondence prior to 1971 were tabled in this House.

MR. HENDERSON:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if we could have a copy of the amendment?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of things raised by the government --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. Possibly I should mention that I am not at all sure that the amendment, in the form in which it has been submitted, is in order. The amendment does delete the words mentioned from the motion, but then at the bottom it is endorsed with these words, "subject to the usual consent of the parties involved." Now I take it that that it is an essential part of the amendment and it should somehow be incorporated into the text of the amendment. If the House will agree, rather than to spend more time on it this afternoon perhaps this amendment might be redrafted and the matter might be adverted to again on Thursday.

Does the House agree that the matter might stand over until Thursday and by that time perhaps the amendment could be redrafted?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

158. Mr. Ludwig proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Wilson.

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

(1) Rate increases that have been made for use of the Southern Alberta Jubilee Auditorium and the Northern Alberta Jubilee Auditorium since September 10, 1971. Please itemize all categories of increases. Please table all correspondence received by the minister concerning this issue since September 10, 1971, and his replies to said correspondence.

(2) Dates of meetings held with high school students of Alberta and the minister or his representatives prior to the decision to increase charges for use of the Southern Alberta Jubilee Auditorium and the Northern Alberta Jubilee Auditorium for graduation ceremonies by high school students. Please table correspondence received by the minister dealing with regard to increased rates to high school students for use of the Auditoriums for graduation ceremonies, and his replies to the said correspondence.

(3) Revenue increases expected to be received by the government from the increased rates levied against use of the auditoriums for high school graduation ceremonies annually.

MR. LUDWIG:

I would like to make a few comments on the purpose of this Motion for a Return. It has been announced by the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation that there will be increases to high school students in Alberta for use of the Jubilee Auditoriums for graduation ceremonies. I believe that, in keeping with its attempt to convince the people, the government usually consults

those who will be affected by any government ruling, and likes an input from the people concerned. I wish to make an input on behalf of the high school students concerning this issue, which may appear trivial to a lot of hon. members but which in fact --

MR. SCHMID:

Point of order. Mr. Speaker, I did not make an announcement that fees for auditoriums would be increased for high school students.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, if the minister is prepared to stand up and say that there will be no increase to high school students for use of the auditoriums for graduation ceremonies, I will withdraw this motion. I am not prepared to let him confuse the public.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, there was a general increase for categories a, b, and c of auditoriums, but at no time were high school students singled out in whole categories.

MR. LUDWIG:

I said nothing of the sort, Mr. Speaker. They were caught in the dragnet, but I understand that they were given a particular increase. And if the minister wishes to debate the merits of my remarks he should wait until his turn comes.

MR. FOSTER:

[Inaudible]

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, Mr. Foster wants to get into it also. I think he should also wait. He shouldn't be annoyed at me, because I have put his name into Hansard a lot more often than he has.

But, Mr. Speaker, when you talk about input from people, it is the responsibility of the minister to ask for input from the high school students as it concerns them, or he should listen to the MLAs who are the representatives.

I am particularly concerned -- and the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs is laughing -- he was concerned about the students apparently until he got into office -- that when students are affected adversely the minister has an obligation to meet with them. I am sure that this can be arranged, and I would like to see it if he has not --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The subject of the motion is not whether the minister should meet with some students. The subject is whether this information should be given.

MR. LUDWIG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GETTY:

On a point of privilege, the member has in fact raised my name and made a statement that is absolutely false, and I would ask him to retract it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair is unaware of what that statement might be.

MR. GETTY:

The statement, Mr. Speaker -- and I am sure Hansard will reflect it -- is that he mentioned that I was interested in the students until I was elected and then lost interest in them. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that unless he is able to provide some proof of that he should withdraw the statement.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I believe that whether the hon. minister has lost interest in the students or not is a debatable issue, and if he is sensitive about it he can holler all he likes.

May I continue with the remainder of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, so far as the motion is concerned?

AN HON. MEMBER:

When are you going to get started?

AN HON. MEMBER:

You want a vote on that?

MR. LUDWIG:

When the applause dies down I will go on, Mr. Speaker.

The main objection I have to the action of the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation is set out in Clause 3. I believe that information should be given as to how much revenue the government intends to receive from this increase to the students. Mr. Speaker, it is a vital question. I believe the minister has an obligation to perhaps explain the wisdom of his judgment or to knuckle under and back off -- like I think he ought to -- and level with the students of this province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View permit a question? When he mentioned the last time in the House that the increase was 100 per cent, did he mean to all the students in Calgary?

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I took the hon. minister's word when he said there was not a 100 per cent increase, so that issue was closed. I'm not mentioning 100 per cent here, and if the minister wants to bandy around percentages, he knows that percentages do not give me the facts.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to amend the motion. I move, seconded by the hon. Allen Adair that Motion for a Return No. 158 be subject to concurrence for tabling by the correspondents.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the amendment if I may --

MR. SPEAKER:

I don't know if the hon. minister has finished speaking to the amendment.

MR. SCHMID:

It goes without saying, Mr. Speaker, that in a democracy we usually ask the concurrence by correspondents, since I feel that anyone who writes to any government should at least have the privilege of having that privileged information. As long as he thinks otherwise, he can make his own decision.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there any further debate on the amendment? Does any one wish the amendment read? Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, just on a point of procedure. Are we now moving to a procedure where this question of the usual concurrence is now going to be put in a formal motion on all occasions from now on?

MR. MINIELY:

[Inaudible]

MR. CLARK:

Just as long you have decided how you want to deal with them that is all I wanted to straighten out.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I gather they are asking a question of the Chair. But it became apparent yesterday, from one use by an hon. member of Motions for a Return as a point of privilege, that there is some concern about the amount of detail and casualness the House has used in dealing with Motions for a Return. Perhaps you may want to give the House some direction in that regard.

MR. SPEAKER:

Generally, with regard to Motions for a Return it's impossible for the Chair to tell whether the information requested is in the possession of the government. That has to be left to the government.

All the Chair can do is to try to see that the Motion for a Return is in proper order. There may be some question also whether that is final, because under Rule No. 43 our rules provide -- at least by implication provide -- that motions of questionable propriety may get onto the Order Paper and that their propriety, or impropriety, may then be drawn to the attention of the House by the Speaker.

With regard to making these motions which deal with correspondence or communications exchange between government and other parties, with regard to making the consent of the other parties conditional to the order, as mentioned yesterday I did send out a memorandum to both sides of the House, and I must leave that to the wishes of the House. Pending that I think we should deal with these motions, and the questions, strictly according to their text. It's very doubtful to me whether informal amendments should be made, although we did make them to some extent in the past.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order. I understand there was a memorandum from yourself on this matter, and I have not yet received it. So I wonder if we couldn't let the matter stand until I do receive it and examine it?

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could indicate whether or not it would be his intention, if his proposed amendment carries, to be prepared to table the balance of the information as soon as possible and not hold up all of the information until he gets the agreement from the correspondents?

MR. SPEAKER:

As far as the Chair is concerned, to do this in strict propriety would require an amendment to the Motion for a Return.

Is there any further debate on the amendment?

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order that has been raised regarding the amendment, I wonder if we aren't going to get ourselves into a situation where you ask for an Order for a Return that is really a public issue, and this particular issue has been debated both publicly and in this Legislature. So I believe we want to be careful before we pass amendments that say, "Well, we can't bring in correspondence," if someone writes in on an issue that has been a public issue. Because I think that other than that you would never have to -- as long as the minister can assure me that he isn't going to use this as a vehicle to prevent a motion coming back to the House. With that assurance I

have no objection to the amendment. But I think we want to be careful that we don't use an issue saying that it isn't in the public interest when really it is. If people personally write in complaining that they support or don't support a public issue, I don't think that this is a matter on which we need to get the permission of that particular person.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Well, I do.

AN HON. MEMBER:

I don't.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, surely the hon. member appreciates that we are introducing the amendment because of the request to the Chair and the opposition for strict compliance with the Notices for Motions for a Return. In my view there are a number of these Notices of Motions for a Return which are completely out of order. They are hypothetical, and I don't understand how you can have a hypothetical question that is out of order and then have a hypothetical Notice of a Motion for a Return that is in order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Cypress on the point of order.

MR. STROM:

On the point of order I find myself just a little confused at this moment because I am not aware of any members on this side of the House ever arguing the point that the government should have the right to consult with the person who wrote a certain letter to them before tabling it. I would hate to think that we would be moving, Mr. Speaker, into this procedure quickly without giving some thought to it, and I would suggest too that it could place the government in the embarrassing position of where they may have overlooked it at some time or other, and failed to have the amendment passed.

I would suggest that this should be looked at rather carefully before making a change of procedure of the House, because certainly I am not aware of any members on this side of the House arguing the point with the government that they should get the consent of the person writing.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, just a point of clarification. My understanding at the moment is that we are debating the amendment. I don't think the hon. Member for Calgary Millican was really debating on a point of order. He was really debating the amendment that is now before the House. As I said earlier, I haven't received the correspondence that has been referred to in the House relative to this matter, and I suggest we simply proceed with the debate on the amendment.

I think there is some logic in the argument that amendments to the basic question or a motion should be dealt with in a formal manner. And I understand that's the text of the general subject that is under discussion in your correspondence, Mr. Speaker. It is my understanding at the moment that we are not debating a point of order. We are debating the merits of the amendment that has been moved by the minister.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, in the course of this session there have been numerous Motions for a Return which have been accepted by the government. Many of them have been accepted with the rider, subject to obtaining the usual OK from those people who are involved in the correspondence. Now that has been done on a casual basis in the past and seemed to satisfy the House.

There now appears to be, Mr. Speaker, some pressure that there should be strict adherence to the words that are accepted by the House. We heard a pitch for that idea yesterday. So, Mr. Speaker, you can't have it both ways. Either you stick strictly to the motion as it is presented and accepted by the House, or you don't. All the hon. Minister of Youth, Culture and Recreation has done is that instead of making a verbal rider, he now is making it the formal amendment, so that in fact --

MR. HENDERSON:

We are not quarrelling with that. I think there is a misunderstanding here. We are not quarrelling with --

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I'm speaking to the amendment, I don't know why the hon. Opposition House Leader doesn't want to speak to it when it's his turn.

MR. HENDERSON:

I thought, Mr. Speaker, we were debating the pros and cons of the consent of the parties.

MR. GETTY:

I had the floor, Mr. Speaker. Why doesn't he sit down?

MR. SPEAKER:

[Inaudible]...must occur the misunderstanding -- that's the substance of the amendment -- is to make the order, if the motion is passed, subject to concurrence by the correspondents. This is the substance of the amendment.

Now the other topic which is under discussion is whether there should be an ad hoc or permanent amendment to the rules to automatically make this a condition of every Order for a Return involving communications or correspondence between the government on one hand, and outsiders on the other. This is under debate now and I understand this is what the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs is addressing his remarks to, an amendment which says that Motion for Return No. 158 be subject to concurrence for tabling by the correspondents.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the amendment I --

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I haven't ended yet. I appreciate the hon. members have two ideas in their mind. One is, as you say, some change, some permanent change to the rules, but the hon. House Leader of the Opposition does not have any correspondence having to do with that and so we'll put it aside and I'm not dealing with it. I'm dealing directly with the amendment and the reasons why it has been presented and the reasons why I think the House should agree to the amendment.

There have been members on the other side who have made the pitch that they would not like to have this happen. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that people writing to the government, individuals or governments -- I don't know why we would give any special protection to governments and then stand up and say that we shouldn't protect an individual. Why in the world would we do that? We are always dealing with public matters in the Legislature, and to say that because a person writes in on one of those his letter should, in fact, automatically become public, the government cannot just agree with that contention. And therefore we have the amendment.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say that I agree with the amendment. I think the amendment makes good sense. If we're going to require the approval of a Minister of the Crown in Ottawa before we table his letters when he is a public servant, then certainly we should secure the approval of John Doe who lives out on a farm, who doesn't have any friends, before we table his letters. I'd like to see the amendment accepted because it is sound in principle.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the amendment at all and I'm surprised that the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs set up a straw man and spoke at length on it. I just want to tell the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation that I'm concerned about him tabling the correspondence he got from me personally. He had my consent and I would like to see him table the correspondence he sent to me. That is the main part of the motion.

[The motion as amended was carried.]

MR. SPEAKER:

While I'm on my feet I'd like to express my regret to the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I just sent a page to inquire as to what happened to his copy of the memo, and I learned that the postman was ill. I believe by now the hon. Leader has received a copy.

161. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Dixon.

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

- (1) The maximum potential shipping rate of existing export pipelines (Interprovincial Pipeline Co. and Trans Mountain Oil Pipeline Co.),
- (2) The maximum average monthly pumping rate achieved to date for these pipelines.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I would let that motion stand unless the hon. Leader of the Opposition wished to amend it or withdraw the motion, or perhaps even have a ruling by yourself on it.

The concern I have, Mr. Speaker, with the motion as it is worded is the request dealing with information in the control of two pipeline companies which are under the jurisdiction of the National Energy Board which is a federal jurisdiction.

The question also concerns me that if that information is presented in this House, the validity of that information may be challenged and the question I have in my mind is whether we as a provincial government can vouch for the authenticity of that information and produce it in the House that may be questioned by the hon. opposition.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I think that the points raised by the minister are well taken and certainly I appreciate the argument that the bodies in question do fall under federal jurisdiction in a technical sense. They are nonetheless vital questions so far as the industry activities, marketing operations, and the sale of Alberta crude, of which the taxpayers own 80 per cent, are concerned. I would imagine that the government has the information and I would assure the minister there is no question of challenging the accuracy of the information that he might have and that he could provide on the subject.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I did ask it to stand because although we have the assurance of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, we are getting into the strict technicalities of it. And I think by having it stand, it would perhaps give the Leader of the Opposition some opportunity to consider how he might redraft it to get the information he so desires.

MR. SPEAKER:

With regard to that point, and not wishing to create a precedent at the moment, and subject to further research, it is the opinion of the Chair that this perhaps should be in the form of a question rather than a Motion for Return. It doesn't ask for documents, it asks for information and it would readily lend itself to a question if sections 1 and 2 were prefaced by the words "What is..." I think there has got to be some distinction between a Written Question on the Order Paper, and a Motion for a Return, and this may be it; subject, as I say, to further research on the point.

Do I take it that the House agrees to the suggestion by the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals that Motion No. 161 stand over to Thursday?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I have no objections if the House would concur at this point to withdraw it as a return and re-phrase it as per your suggestion as a question.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it then, that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has the unanimous consent of the House to withdraw the motion?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

164. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Gruenwald:

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

A copy of the study or studies done by or commissioned for the Government of Alberta, its departments, ministers, agencies or boards which assess the implications of the large number of certified or degreed teachers who are at present unemployed or underemployed.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if this could stand, in the absence of the Minister of Education.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree then that No. 164 stand over until Thursday?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

165. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Ludwig.

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

What steps the government has taken towards the implementation of a program of emergency funding in the case of accidental loss of recreation facilities.

MR. SPEAKER:

In this regard, if I just may interject. This also would appear to be a proper subject matter for a question rather than for a Motion for a Return.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to take your advice and I will withdraw it and have it placed back on the Order Paper in the form of a question.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury have the unanimous consent of the House to withdraw the motion?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

166. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Cooper:

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

(1) Two copies of all directives by the Government of Alberta, its ministers, departments, boards or agencies, to employees of the Government of Alberta, its boards or agencies, with regard to the transfers of Government of Alberta employees to Ponoka, Three Hills and Camrose.

(2) A copy of all correspondence between the Government of Alberta, its ministers, departments, boards or agencies, and the Civil Service Association of Alberta, regarding the transfers of Government of Alberta employees to Ponoka, Three Hills and Camrose.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to amend, seconded by the hon. Attorney General, Motion for a Return No. 166 by deleting Item 1 for reason that it calls for information within departments of government.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there any debate on the amendment?

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, dealing with the amendment and waiting for a copy of it, the purpose in putting Motion No. 166 on the Order Paper is to get some indication of the policy that the government is taking in regard to moving government operations to Ponoka and to Camrose. And the purpose of us putting this question on the Order Paper is so that we can see if the government has given a directive to those people who are employees of the government in those agencies as to whether they will, in fact, live in that particular centre or not. That was really the initial reason for the information, and without having had the opportunity yet to look at the amendment the minister is proposing, I would like to ask the minister if this amendment would preclude us from receiving that information?

DR. HOHOL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I anticipated that that may have been the reason. If I were to table the information in item No. 1, that kind of information would not be accessible then to the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury, because the question the gentleman spoke about is a question of policy. A question of policy, then, is a different matter, obtained differently, and one which is known, or can be known, to government. This is a matter of detail directed at specific individuals. This would emanate from that particular policy, so I submit that that kind of information would be obtained in a different manner. So, I will stand by the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Can we have the amendment?

MR. SPEAKER:

The amendment reads -- it's perhaps not quite in the usual form. The amendment is:

To delete Item 1 in Motion No. 166.

I should mention here, also, pursuant to my duty to draw these things to the attention of the House, that Item 1 is probably not in order, inasmuch as it asks for the type of intra-government information which is not ordinarily accessible to a question from the outside.

Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

[The amendment was carried.]

Are you ready for the question on the motion as amended?

[The motion as amended was carried.]

167. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Henderson.

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

The titles and general subject outlines of all research studies commissioned by the Minister Without Portfolio Responsible for the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission, as well as the individuals commissioned to undertake the studies, the projected costs for each study, the completion date for each study, and the anticipated date each study will be tabled in the Legislature.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I move an amendment to Motion No. 167, that the following words be struck out: "and the anticipated date each study will be tabled in the Legislature." That is seconded by the hon. Attorney General. This information, and the results of the studies, I co-ordinate rather than commission, but I felt perhaps it would be in order for me to make the information available. But I am not able to provide the House with the anticipated date each study will be tabled in the Legislature, and I therefore ask that that be deleted from the motion.

MR. SPEAKER:

At this juncture perhaps the Chair should also draw to the attention of the hon. member who has put the motion on the Order Paper that it, too, would appear to be the type of motion which should rather come in the form of a question.

Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

[The amendment was carried.]

Are you ready for the question on the motion as amended?

[The motion as amended was carried.]

168. Mr. Benoit proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Henderson.

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

Alberta oil and petroleum condensates consumption for the years 1970, 1971 and 1972 and the forecast for Alberta consumption for 1973 to 1980 inclusive.

MR. SPEAKER:

This also is one of those that could perhaps more properly appear as a question.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is considering withdrawing the motion for revision, might I suggest to him too that he look at the word "consumption" raised in that motion. I might add for his benefit that most of the figures we have deal with supply and demand. I would question, really, whether we can get figures of the actual consumption, by virtue of the fact that no one knows when they do purchase, and whether any of the petroleum products are actually consumed or not.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the minister may, in the strictest sense, be relevant, but I think essentially what we are concerned about is the breakdown. How much of the oil and gas produced within the Province of Alberta is consumed within the Province of Alberta?

I realize there is a time factor when you refine a barrel of oil, some may go into storage and may not be market consumed for a while, but really in terms of refinery demands, that information is available as to the percentage of it that is processed and consumed in Alberta. The information that is requested is relevant and the technicality that the minister raises is not significant when it comes to the basic question. I'm not just sure I follow his argument on the particular matter about consumption.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, to be absolutely clear, we have information available that I think the hon. members are seeking. I am suggesting that that deals with the question of supply and demand. Those are the words used in the figures we have. If the hon. member could so rephrase his motion that he could use it in those terms he would get the information he requires.

MR. HENDERSON:

Could I ask the minister a question? Is he suggesting that the Motion for Return would be acceptable if the word "consumption" was replaced with the word "demand"?

MR. DICKIE:

Well, I think perhaps he might find the words "supply and demand" would give him more of the additional information he would really desire. Certainly with the question of the word 'demand' itself, he would get that information; we have no objection.

MR. HENDERSON:

We are not specifically concerned at this point, Mr. Speaker, about the issue of the matter of supply in this particular motion. I wonder -- if the minister is then simply suggesting that the word "consumption" be replaced with the word "demand", if he would care to move an amendment to that effect?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, all I suggested, sir, was that this be withdrawn and replaced as a question.

MR. HENDERSON:

[Inaudible]... suggested, Mr. Speaker, but I quite frankly don't find the particular suggestion relevant. If the Speaker insists I would be quite prepared to do it, but I don't follow the particular exactly -- the nonsense -- of why it should be one or the other. If the Speaker wishes to so direct, fine, but I didn't take the Speaker's suggestion as a direction. If we can settle it at this time I think it is quite in order to settle it.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, might I just reply because I did take it from your suggestion that the mover would give consideration to withdrawing it and revising it and coming back. I didn't realize the seconder was so involved and would feel so strongly about it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Speaker has no authority to tell any member what to do. It's entirely up to the House whether it wishes to leave this on the Order Paper as a motion, or have it come back as a question, notwithstanding the rather unflattering reference by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, for the time being I am prepared to let it rest and whether it comes back as a question or a motion amended will be determined later on. So we will withdraw it for the time being.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House to withdraw the motion?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

169. Mr. Benoit proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Henderson.

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

Projected expansion of pipelines exporting oil out of Alberta for the period 1973 to 1980 inclusive.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to be in a position of being objectionable today on technical matters, but I would also ask that he give consideration to withdrawing that one, realizing again that he is talking about the question of pipelines which are under federal jurisdiction, projections that would be within the control of those companies under the jurisdiction of the National Energy Board. Again when he is considering that motion 169 with 161 he may be able to phrase the questions in such a way that we could get him the information he so desires.

MR. SPEAKER:

May I just also draw to the attention of the House that this is another one which should probably appear as a question. May I also say in this regard that the text of questions need perhaps not be as strict and exact as the text of a motion which may become an order of this House, and which in the opinion of the Chair, should be as exactly worded as a statute since it has the force of law once it is passed.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of keeping things in order for today, I would agree to withdraw this one also.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree unanimously that the hon. member may withdraw Motion No. 169?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion is withdrawn.

170. Mr. Benoit proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Henderson.

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

The volume of beer produced in Alberta for the years 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971 and 1972 inclusive versus the volume of beer consumed for the same years.

MR. BENOIT:

Since this deals with another minister I may have better luck.

MR. SPEAKER:

At the risk of monotony may the Chair also draw to the attention of the House that this one might more properly be put as a question.

MR. HENDERSON:

On a point of order, I would like to suggest that we would certainly eliminate a lot of discussion of this type if the discussions could take place before we get the motions on the Order Paper. Because, I find that once the thing has been accepted, and it has gone on the Order Paper, to go through these exercises, I think, is largely wasting the time of the House. I suggest very sincerely, Mr. Speaker, that we have gone through an exercise in debating withdrawing three returns, which I am quite certain the government is prepared to answer with a modification in the wording of a question someone has dealt with.

It is highly desirable not to go through this repetitious exercise of changing one from the other, I realize there is difficulty in determining at times which way it should possibly go.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, we would remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition that in the question of handling these Motions for Return the government was being, in my view, very co-operative until the matter was raised in a very strict sense by a member of the loyal opposition. We are simply now saying today if that is going to be the way they are interpreted in this Legislature, that we have to adhere to the strict wording of the motion. Certainly the words of the hon. leader now are, in my view, not at all fair when you consider the action taken by them in interpreting the motions.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I wish I could agree. The government is at liberty on their side to state their views on the question of whether they think it should be a motion or a question. I have directed my remarks to the direction that I think should be forthcoming from the Chair before the matter gets on the Order Paper. This was the crux of my particular comments, and hopefully we would avoid these rather fruitless exercises that we are going through today. And if the government wants to make a motion and switch it over, that it is their prerogative. But this is, I think, a rather time-consuming proposition. The comments of the Treasurer about splitting hairs on these matters because a matter has been raised by a member on this side of the House aren't particularly relevant to the remarks I was making in my address to the Chair.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, in discussing that point I think, rather than saying that the Chair should be responsible -- and I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that there are some areas in which you will want to judge -- really it appears to me that time and effort should be spent not in the House and not with the Speaker, but rather with the gentlemen who are originating these motions, so that in fact they know exactly what they are asking for, and then say so when they construct their motion.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I think the hon. members of the House will agree that the difference between a question and a Motion for Return in many cases is pretty slight. It could be balanced one way or the other. I have always used the criteria that if a question required considerable time to answer, or if documents had to be tabled, then I would put it on as a Motion for Return. Otherwise, it went on as a question. And, whether or not that interpretation is strictly according to Beauchesne may be questionable, but I think it is a good guideline. I would suggest to the hon. members that whether we put it on as a question or whether we put it on as a Motion for Return, we should be just as careful making sure that the meaning and the wording is exact and the intent is obeyed.

I get the feeling that some people feel if you put it on as a question you need not be as careful with the wording, and I would suggest that that is hardly so. We should be perhaps equally careful with the wording of a question and the wording of a Motion for a Return. If we could generally accept the criteria, or if you want to give us some other guidelines, stating that if it takes some time to prepare and if documents have to be tabled we use a Motion for Return, or otherwise we put it as a question, we would be able to save a lot of time in the House.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, a final word before you give your ruling on this point of order. We do have someone who screens these questions and Motions for a Return before they come to the order --

[Interjections]

I'm not talking about our side, I'm talking about the official screening. I believe Mr. Speaker determines whether they go on the paper or not, and I wanted to know if that is so.

MR. SPEAKER:

The point raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition is well taken. The Chair has perhaps been a little bit lax in this regard. But as the hon. members of the opposition are aware a great number of questions and motions which have been submitted since last spring have been sent back with requests for

amendments. And without wishing to enter into the debate in any way, the Chair has been reluctant to appear to be too restrictive or too repressive. It now appears from the experience of today and in the recent past that perhaps the Chair should have been a little stricter in this regard, and I will do that in the future.

Now with regard to Question No. 170 I believe I have already mentioned that this may be more properly put as a question. While I'm on my feet, may I make the same observation with regard to No. 173 and No. 182 if that may affect the course of the proceedings this afternoon.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Member for Highwood would be prepared to go three-for-three today and withdraw this one also. I don't put it on the basis that it ought to be a question as opposed to a Motion for a Return. My difficulty is that I simply can't be sure what the hon. member is asking for.

Really in that question I would have the same problem if it came back on the Order Paper as a question. The Return really asks for two things. Firstly, the volume of beer produced in Alberta for a certain number of years. Now beer, Mr. Speaker, probably means to some of us ale and stout as well as what is more accurately called beer. Whereas others would make that segregation, call some of these beer, some ale and some stout. In fact, the Liquor Board in its Annual Report makes that division. So when the hon. member uses the word beer I am not sure whether he means in its restricted sense, or in the larger sense of including ale and stout.

Now he also talks about beer produced in Alberta in that year. Again, Mr. Speaker, there is beer produced in Alberta by commercial breweries, and there is also beer produced in Alberta by people for their own consumption -- I suspect some legally and some illegally -- and again I think that should be made clear.

He talks about being produced -- I would assume from the nature of the question that he means produced and marketed. But again, Mr. Speaker, there is beer that may be produced and stored; there was beer last year that I am aware of that was produced and dumped. And that again leaves me with some uncertainty of what he requires when he asks for the beer produced in Alberta.

I have even more difficulty with the second part of the question where he asks the volume of beer consumed for the same years. In the first part of the question he says "produced in Alberta," and in the second part of the question there is no area. I assume he means consumed in Alberta, because I would certainly hate to have to go to the task of finding out all the beer that was consumed elsewhere.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I assume he meant the beer that was sold in Alberta as opposed to consumed, because we wouldn't have any real idea of whether all the beer that is sold is consumed or stored, or what happens to it after we sell it. In fact, when I was looking over this question I was reminded of the incident I had heard about where a lady decided that she ought to bathe in beer because she had heard that it was a great improver of beauty. As the incident goes, she filled the tub and dunked around in it for an hour or so and came out and someone asked her how the experiment had gone. She said, "Well, I don't know whether it improved my looks very much but I certainly feel good."

So, really, Mr. Speaker, I am not intending to be facetious or technical but these questions, if we are to answer them accurately, need to be very carefully phrased. There is a second reason for them being very carefully phrased. It's quite possible that if the hon. member takes great care in how he asks the question, he'll get the precise information he wants, and it is something we can provide for him at very little cost to the taxpayers. Whereas if we have to interpret and guess at what he might be needing, it might involve a great deal more expense to the taxpayer to supply it for him.

MR. TAYLOR:

I hesitate to give the hon. Attorney General any information about women because he knows far more about women than I.

MR. LEITCH:

Agreed.

MR. TAYLOR:

But I did hear from a very beautiful woman that she drank beer and bathed in milk.

[Laughter]

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, speaking to the motion, I am getting the distinct impression that there are far too many lawyers over on the other side. I don't know. We seem to be arguing the legality, and I think the motion is quite clear. The gentleman is asking the volume of beer produced in Alberta, and the volume consumed. I suppose what he is going to do when he gets the Return back, if it is so ordered by the House, he will be able to say, "Well in Alberta we produced so many thousand barrels, and the other was imported beer, I take it."

I think we can get too technical on these, and we also put the Chair in a difficult position too. It's not the Speaker's position, I don't think, to try and throw up any roadblocks to any member trying to get something on the Order Paper. I am sure the hon. Speaker would be the first one to say that. I think we need to be careful and I agree that wherever possible we try and make the motions as clear as possible. But at the same time I don't think we should be spending hours trying to find little legal technicalities that are going to knock someone's motion off the Order Paper. That is not the idea of this House. So, Mr. Speaker, I think if our lawyer friends opposite would try and help rather than hinder by saying, "Well you know this isn't quite technically right but I think this is what the hon. member wants." instead of trying to say, "He's out of order."

AN HON. MEMBER:

You started it.

MR. DIXON:

I don't know why the hon. members opposite are getting so touchy about these things. I guess they must think that the open government is going to close on them or something. But, in any case, I think we should, wherever possible, assist members to get their Order before the Assembly and I am sure that we will look forward to the answers. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that we need to be careful before we start making too strict rules that a particular motion is in order. We are always anxious for them to get in as good an order as possible, but we shouldn't spend hours trying to figure out how we can prevent an hon. member from getting his motion before the House.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, a word on the motion, if I may, for a moment. It's been suggested that some legal technicalities have been thrown up. I would like to suggest, as someone on this side of the House who has been put through a good hour, or close to it, of this exercise, which I have to agree is not gaining us very much, that the ability to communicate, and to communicate precisely and accurately is not a capability which should be limited to the legal profession. I certainly hope after this afternoon that it will be a capability that will be exercised to a greater degree by Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot let that crack go by. I, for one, probably have a talent -- or haven't a talent. But on the government side of the House, there is more talent academically than probably has ever been in this House before, and yet there is not one of you, except for probably the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who can read a speech unless you have written it out.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That's telling them.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, speaking to the motion --

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, if I may please, it's impossible --

MR. SPEAKER:

Is this a point of order? Order please. The hon. Leader of the Opposition is speaking to the motion.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I think it has to go -- we accept the rather jocular suggestion that nobody on this side knows how to read and write. I've been accused of being an idiot by people who are more intelligent than anyone seated opposite, Mr. Speaker, so that really doesn't particularly bother me. And, I realize there are a few lecturers over there who figure they have to get up and give everybody instructions on how to carry out these elementary exercises.

But it also stands as a fact, Mr. Speaker, that the government, of course, if it wishes to frustrate any return, can get into one of these exercises we have gone through here today. I suggest there is a difference between this particular motion and the previous two we agreed to withdraw.

The previous two -- there was a question of jurisdiction that the Minister of Mines and Minerals raised -- of the provincial government as opposed to the federal government. And on that basis, I think the suggestion of withdrawing, rephrasing and changing the words slightly was quite in order. But there isn't that element involved in this particular motion. And we could go through numerous dissertations from the gentlemen opposite as to what the words should be here and there and so on and so forth, and I guess, Mr. Speaker, the motion could be turned down on that basis. But clearly there is a difference between this motion and the previous two.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, if the government has any doubt as to the clarity of the motion, they are quite at liberty to move amendments to clarify it, which they have done in the past. And if they object to it in principle, they can then vote it down. But let's not go through these exercises, Mr. Speaker, that basically entail an opportunity for a member on either side of the House to get up and demonstrate how witty he is in the realm of semantics. And if the government doesn't accept the motion, they don't like the words of it, amend it. If they don't like it at all -- vote against it. But the suggestion that this motion be withdrawn, Mr. Speaker, is simply not in keeping with the realities of the situation a propos of the previous two motions.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the motion and the wording thereof, I must confess that I am getting just a little concerned with the technicalities we are getting into. And I want to point out to the House, and I'm sure my learned friends on the other side know this, that even with the most careful phrasing, the most careful wording, no statute can be declared to be absolutely clear, as far as I know, until it goes before a judge, and a judge makes his decision on it. Then, by precedent, it is my understanding that it has been interpreted so that people will understand it.

I would hope that in this Legislature we are not going to resort to the kind of interpretation where we will finally have to take it to the extreme case of trying to get a judge to interpret what has been meant by a certain motion that has been placed on the Order Paper.

It seems to me when I read Motion 170, that it is very clear it refers to the volume of beer produced in Alberta, and then it goes on to talk about the volume of beer consumed. And certainly I'm not an English or grammar expert, but it would be my clear understanding that it would be Alberta they would be referring to in the second, that being clearly accepted as being the area in which they are seeking information. Now the only valid point that I have heard the hon. Attorney General raise was the matter of what beer included. And I can certainly see some arguments there as to whether beer should be all inclusive and cover the other areas that he mentioned, or whether it should not.

As far as referring to the consumption, I just cannot follow the argument that it would refer to an area much greater than that of something already mentioned in the motion. May I say in closing, Mr. Speaker, that I would think we have been wasting a great deal of time in one sense. Maybe it would clarify it for those of us on this side to know henceforth that we are going to have to seek legal advice as to whether or not our wording is absolutely right. I hope we will not arrive at that situation, but that rather we will, by some mutual co-operation, try and get an understanding of one another and what it is we are seeking.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker --

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this debate, I too would like to voice my hope that the government would reconsider the position they have been taking generally today. I can appreciate that in the case of the two previous motions, or I believe one of the members from this side pointed out, there was a very important distinction. We are talking about other jurisdictions. But in the case of this particular motion, as I listened to the Attorney General, I couldn't help but feel that he was grasping at technical straws. Admittedly he grasped at them with a good deal of lawyer's skill, but nevertheless it seems to me that the whole proposition here of Motions for Return could be defeated if we become over-technical.

I certainly agree with the point brought forward by the hon. Member for Cypress that if we want to be very technical and we then have to go to consult with lawyers, we are never really going to reach a stage where we are going to have language which is absolutely clear. As a matter of fact, if that stage ever came, we might be able to put an end to the hon. Attorney General's profession, which some of us might feel would not be the greatest tragedy if it ever hit Canada, but with great respect, it is not too likely and therefore it seems to me that we have to use some flexibility.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that in the interest of fairness, and in the interest of making sure that the legislature operates as it should, that the government will reconsider their position on this matter and accept the motion.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, there was never any indication by the Attorney General that he wouldn't, in fact, accept the motion if it was properly worded. We also got a great deal of abuse the other day from the Member for Mountain View regarding the question of the returns.

You will recall also, Mr. Speaker, that you have been very strict with regard to the matter of the Motions for Return in relation to what the Order does to the government once it is passed by this Legislature. Because of that development, it has become necessary for the government to make sure that we know what is expected of us by an Order of the Legislature.

And for the hon. Member for Fairview-Spirit River to now talk sweetness and light and everybody is great as long as you know what the other fellow is thinking about, maybe you can answer the question. Mr. Speaker, it is just not that simple. It has to be that the hon. members are going to have to --

MR. HENDERSON:

Amend it, amend it.

DR. HORNER:

Well, we are now being asked by the Leader of the Opposition not only to do the work, but to do the thinking for them as well. That may be necessary. I sometimes feel very strongly that it is, but I think that it would be a little bit presumptuous of me, Mr. Speaker, to do the thinking for the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CLARK:

That doesn't usually bother you.

DR. HORNER:

So I simply suggest, Mr. Speaker, that No. 170 should be withdrawn and raised in the proper manner and they will get all the information they require.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, it's my motion, I would like to say something to it, if I may, in closing.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member close the debate?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LEE:

I would just like to make a couple of comments. I am amazed at the comments coming from the other side. They are trying to gloss over their incapability to word a proper Motion for Return. We are amending them over here. They are suggesting that Mr. Speaker should read them over. I suggest that perhaps they should get some proper research staff themselves in order to do this. They have taken up the time of the House now for something like two and a half weeks. We've had problems that have been coming up over and over again. Worded has been one of them. This isn't the first example of a poorly worded return. It is one of many. I hope it's the last.

We have had examples where members on the other side have continually mentioned that they are debating the issue. A good example is the Member for Calgary McCall, who continually debated an issue the other day and had to be reminded that he was doing so. They are continually bringing up items that require amending -- things like inter-departmental correspondence, minutes of meetings for issues that are now in negotiation, and returns that should have been questions, requiring concurrence of other bodies. It amazes me. I've always thought that private members' day was for the advantage of the opposition. I'm just amazed at how they are gobbling up their own days with these silly little items on Motions for a Return. I think that the time consumed on amendments, points of order, advice that is required from Mr. Speaker, and repeated debate on things that keep coming up over and over again, could well be spent on better debate. It's not the responsibility of the Speaker, and it's not our responsibility to amend these issues; it's your responsibility to bring in a proper Motion for a Return.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member now close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. BENOIT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members. I am just about persuaded that it doesn't make any difference how a question or a motion is worded. If somebody wants to take exception to it, they will. If hon. members suggest we might have more researchers over here, we don't have any task forces to do our work for us, so we may have to do our own.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt in my mind, in spite of what the hon. Attorney General said about not wanting to be facetious, that he has a very good idea of what I anticipated by way of reply. If there is any problem distinguishing between beer, ale, stout and whatever else, his annual report doesn't make any distinctions. It simply includes liquor and beer. And I'll settle for the beer that is included in the annual report.

MR. LEITCH:

This is, Mr. Speaker, precisely where the problem arose. The annual report, if he is referring to the Liquor Board Report which I think is the only relevant one here, does make that division. And while I'm on my feet speaking to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make one comment about technicalities.

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. Attorney General leave to speak again on the debate?

MR. HENDERSON:

[Inaudible]...on this side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

How many members?

MR. HENDERSON:

[Inaudible]

MR. SPEAKER:

I'm afraid we'll have to draw the line somewhere.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, to avoid a conflict I'm prepared to draw it as having now been passed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I choose to leave the motion as it stands, worded as it is, and I will take my chances on the reply that I get from the Attorney General.

[The motion was defeated.]

MR. SPEAKER:

With regard to these motions, the Chair would express the hope that although we may have spent some time this afternoon on the actual procedure and text, there is a certain minimum clarity of language which, I think, can be achieved in these circumstances without becoming unduly technical. And to a reasonable extent, the assistance of the Chair and the table, and possibly the Legislative Counsel, is available to members on both sides of the House in drawing their motions and questions. I believe that this is similar in all Legislatures and Parliaments and that this may, perhaps, prevent a recurrence of this kind of debate in the future.

171. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to this Assembly, seconded by Dr. Buck.

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

Two copies of all studies commissioned by, and completed for, the Government of Alberta, its ministers, departments, agencies, or boards, with regard to:

(a) The costs of busing school children at present, and

(b) The cost of further busing as a result of the new school construction freeze.

DR. HORNER:

Can I call it Thursday, Mr. Speaker? In the absence of the Minister of Education I would ask that this stand.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. Deputy Premier have the consent of the House that this motion go over to Thursday?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion goes over to Thursday.

173. Mr. Taylor proposed the following motion to this Assembly, seconded by Mr. Clark.

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

1. How many civil servants were on the payroll of the Alberta Government on September 9, 1971?
2. How many civil servants were on the payroll of the Alberta Government on December 31, 1972?

MR. TAYLOR:

While I am on my feet, the reason I put this on a return is that I thought Item 2 particularly might require some time to prepare, and that is why it is there as a Motion for a Return.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the hon. Member for Drumheller with respect to Item 2. I am prepared to accept the questions as a resolution, but for pretty obvious reasons I would like to amend, seconded by the hon. Attorney General, Item 1: the date September 9, 1971, to be replaced by September 10, 1971.

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it that the amendment, moved by the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour, is agreed to by the House?

[The amendment was carried.]

MR. SPEAKER:

Are you ready for the question on the motion as amended?

[The motion as amended was carried.]

179. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Miller.

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

All correspondence since September 10, 1971, between the Minister of the Environment and the Government of Canada with regards to placing more emphasis on the Canada Water Act in regard to controlling water resources.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I think I would first like the record to show that it is only your restraining hand that keeps a lot of members, particularly front bench members, on this side from making a speech whenever they are asked a question. In rebuttal to the point expressed by the hon. Member for Macleod, when he indicated that there are a quite a number of people on this side who can't make a speech but must read it, there are some of us who would be very glad to make speeches on the basis of a single question that's asked.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make some remarks in regard to this Motion for a Return. I would have been somewhat happier if the word "managing" had been used rather than "controlling", because the record as it is indicates that the Canada Water Act would be in fact controlling water resources, and this is not necessarily the case. The Canada Water Act, in most cases, implies a joint management for water resources. However, I am prepared to accept the wording as it is, with the following amendment, Mr. Speaker. And that is, adding to the motion as it is the following words: "subject to the concurrence of the Government of Canada in regards to tabling such correspondence."

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there any further discussion on the amendment?

[The amendment was carried.]

MR. SPEAKER:

Are you ready for the question on the motion as amended?

[The motion as amended was carried.]

182. Mr. Buckwell proposed the following motion to this Assembly, seconded by Mr. Ruste.

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

The calculations done by the Department of Agriculture which led to the conclusion that the increase to the farmers in diesel gasoline costs would equal \$3 million and as a result of the Property Tax Reduction Program \$12 - \$15 million would go to Alberta farmers.

[The motion was carried.]

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

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

Copies of all correspondence between the Government of Alberta, its ministers, departments, agencies or boards and Alberta Farm Organization with regards to the establishing of the Future Farmers of Alberta Program.

MR. RUSTE:

On a point of clarification I would like to make the following amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly the hon. member might wish to withdraw the motion and put it back on the Order Paper in amended form.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, could I get unanimous consent? It's a matter of a typographical error.

In the third line it reads "Alberta Farm Organization". I would like to change that to "Alberta Farm Organizations".

MR. SPEAKER:

I am sure the House would agree that that correction may be made without a formal amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[The motion was carried.]

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

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

Be it resolved that, in any upgrading of the Kananaskis Highway from Highway No. 1 to Coleman in the Kananaskis Valley, a maximum speed of 50 miles per hour, and a load limit designed to prevent heavy industrial usage be established for this road, to insure recreational access for Alberta citizens to this unique area while at the same time minimizing adverse environmental impact on the valley.

MR. LEE:

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is an issue which is common to all of us, as members of the Legislature --

MR. LUDWIG:

On a point of order, I believe that that motion was highly out of order. It is almost the worst bit of grammatical construction ever presented in this House. Furthermore, a motion that contains three or four ideas in one sentence is bad, and it is uncertain. The grammar is lousy to put it bluntly, Mr. Speaker, and I am of the opinion that after all the bantering, the words kicked around and discussions on technicalities, if bad grammar were a crime we would have no government here today. So I believe that the hon. member Cal Lee, after the very eloquent speech he made about correction and accuracy of expression, ought to take his motion home, get a task force and straighten the thing out, because --

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

As far as the Chair is presently aware, the motion is in order as it stands. If the hon. member wishes to --

[Interjections]

Order please. Order please. If the hon. member wishes to propose an amendment in the course of debate he is, of course, free to do so as to grammar or any other provisions.

MR. LEE:

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I don't think the hon. Member for Mountain View would know a dangling participle from lynchpin if he says it anyway. I noticed that in his dissertation he didn't make any suggestions as to how it might be improved.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, this is an issue common to all of us as members of the Legislature, but it has probably been accentuated in a public response sense, more for those of us in Calgary and southern parts of the province for those people in northern parts. While I was chatting with our friend from Edmonton Strathcona, he did mention that last summer he and his family motored from one end of the valley to the other, and as one of the creatures of the forest, I had hoped that he might tell us a little more about his idyllic experience.

For those of you who may not have had the opportunity -- as Mr. Koziak has -- to visit this very unique scenic part of Alberta, I would like to tell you briefly a little bit about the Kananaskis Valley before I dwell on the resolution itself.

The northern end of the valley begins some 45 miles from Calgary at Highway No. 1 near Seebe on the Morley Indian Reserve, and runs parallel to the Rocky Mountains some 130 miles in the south to Coleman in the Crowsnest Pass area. The valley at the north end is approximately two miles wide, narrowing to approximately half a mile in the southern part near Coleman, and consists of an area of some 2,500 sq. miles. Bordering the valley on both sides are mountain peaks which rise some 4,000 to 5,000 feet above the valley floor. Through the valley a number of rivers and tributaries run, the main ones being the Kananaskis and Oldman rivers. There are also a number of tributary creeks and lakes within and on the slopes of the valley, the larger ones being the Barrier Lake and the Upper and Lower Kananaskis Lakes. From the valley floor there are also a number of tributary valleys, many with access to the eastern side of the valley near the Calgary area.

The vegetation in the valley is a major contributor to its beauty, with an excellent covering of alpine and tundra forest. Although past fires and intensive cutting have had quite an influence on the valley, the regrowth has to a great extent retained its scenic quality, which is pervasive throughout the whole area.

In a wildlife sense, the imposition of man on the valley has had quite an effect on the game on the valley floor, especially near the northern end. But one can still find, especially in the tributary valleys, a number of elk, moose, bighorn sheep, deer and other wildlife. Those of you who enjoy fishing would enjoy the valley and its tributaries. Lands and Forests has conducted an ongoing seeding program, maintaining the stock in these lakes. The building of the hydro-electric dams, however, by Calgary Power at the Kananaskis and Barrier Lakes has influenced to a great extent the population of the fishing stock in these lakes.

I want to move on now to present an inventory of the current and past land use of the valley during the last 100 years. This history began with some logging operations in 1883, and since then there has been, in general, a light variable use of the valley in total. In a resource sense Calgary Power has, as I mentioned, established two hydro-electric establishments, one at Barrier Lake and one at the Kananaskis Lake. There have been extensive timber operations for a number of years in the Mud Lake area, and a number of mineral extraction claims of oil, gas, coal are held through the valley, although none have been developed extensively to this point.

Within the valley a number of management research studies are being conducted. The Government of Canada, for instance, maintains a forestry

experimental station on a tract of land which they have held since 1935. The Marmot Basin watershed research is in this area and an environmental research station operated by the University of Calgary in conjunction with the Government of Canada experimental station was also situated in the Kananaskis.

But it is in a recreational sense that the valley has been utilized most commonly in the last few years, to the extent that now approximately 700 cars will visit the valley on any given day during the summer period. Families and individuals picnicking, camping, hiking, trail riding, fishing, hunting, photographing, mountain climbing, backpacking, in fact enjoying just some of the activities people are involved in in their visits to this valley.

In addition, some 71 lots have been leased for cottage holders at the Kananaskis Lakes. There is a youth hostel in the Ribbon Creek area and a recreational reserve area in the Evans Thomas area, but there is no development on this one to date.

There are also, and I might add very limited, facilities for roadside picnicking. In a service sense in the valley power transmission lines have been constructed from one end of the valley to the other, and approximately half way down the valley there is a service centre consisting of a service station and some overnight facilities. There is also a forestry and ranger station in the valley.

Having given this background on the valley and some of its land use, I would like to turn now to the road, the forestry trunk road and the proposed highway through the valley. The road as it now exists is largely maintained by the Department of Lands and Forests as a forestry trunk road, except for the first 27 miles which have now been transferred to the Department of Highways and Transport. The development of the trunk road in fact, has followed past valley development and was completed in 1951 under the jurisdiction of the Eastern Rockies Conservation Board. It is, however, to this date, basically a forestry service road and hasn't been developed even for its recreational use. However, as I mentioned, its use has escalated by the visitation of families to the area during the summer period, and what they have been able to utilize is simply a substandard gravel road of substandard quality and maintained, not by the department that has the technical capacity to do this -- the Department of Highways and Transport -- but by the Department of Lands and Forests with some co-operation from Calgary Power in the winter time.

I might note though that the valley does have other access than the north and south ends. There is access from Longview, from Nanton through the Chain Lakes to the valley, Maycroft, and from Turner Valley through to the Upper Kananaskis area, in addition to the north and south ends of the valley. I might add that these are gravel roads, just as is the forestry trunk road itself at this point. It's not designed for high speed travel and although they do provide an alternate access to the valley for those who wish to take a smaller, sort of a clover leaf, route, these roads are also of a fairly low design standard. But they do provide alternate ways to get into the valley and to enjoy it for those of you who are hardy enough to journey in this manner.

Due to the expanded use of the valley, however, and because the road in its present form is of a low standard -- it's approximately 18 to 25 feet wide with sharp curves, steep grades, and of a low gravel standard and is looked after by the Department of Lands and Forests and Calgary Power -- the volume and safety standards demanded of a road with the usage it is now getting, can't, I feel, be maintained by the Department of Lands and Forests. Consequently assistance has been requested by that department from the Department of Highways and Transport for some years for assistance in maintaining the road.

So in 1968 the road was surveyed by the Department of Highways and Transport for the first 30 miles, and in late 1971 that department undertook a winter works project to begin clearing on the first 12 miles at the north end of the valley. Tenders were let for this in February and for the upgrading of the first 12 miles.

Stressing again that the present road is of a low standard, and that some paved upgrading was required, let me describe the proposed highway as is illustrated by the first 12 miles. The first 12 miles of the highway follow this design standard. It is a two-lane highway of two 12 foot lanes in addition to a 6 foot parking shoulder on either side equalling a total road width of some 36 feet. The highway provides for a design speed of some 70 miles per hour with an operational speed of approximately 60 miles per hour, although I might stress that any speed limit can be established on this road. When I say 70 miles per hour, I am talking about the design standard, not the established speed limit.

In the construction of this road of the standard that I have just mentioned, a right-of-way of some 200 to 300 feet is required, although the department is attempting to keep this, as far as possible, to some 150 feet in this first 12 miles. The design standard utilized by the Department of Highways and Transport, I might also note, is a safety standard. It provides for a safe passing distance, a proper sight distance for intersections, and parking shoulders for those people who do wish to stop and view the scenery and wildlife. The department has noted that people very often don't wait, for instance, until they get to a viewpoint to stop and view wildlife. They may stop at any point and consequently shoulders have been established all along the road, and once again to also maintain a safety standard. Shoulders may also be required for people who stall on the road and just can't go any further, thus providing once again a safety hazard.

At this point let me give you some idea of the public reaction to this road and I'm sure that most of you have had some response on this. Some of the present concerns that are expressed by people about the road and about the development of the valley itself.

The first concern is this. A concern about the total development of the valley. Although there has been a variable use of the valley during the last 80 years or so, the development of the first 12 miles of the highway has brought this whole idea of development to public scrutiny and concerns have been expressed about the total development of the Kananaskis. Last year's resolution in this Assembly showed unanimous concern of the legislators here for the very real need for recreational development in the area of the national parks and, of course, the Kananaskis which runs parallel to the park.

By implication, since development in the national parks has been postponed, this serves just to accentuate the need for recreation for people in the southern part of the province within areas of provincial jurisdiction. And the usage of the Kananaskis by some 700 vehicles per day has only emphasized this very fact.

I add to this the accessibility of the valley for the people in the Calgary area, just 45 miles away from the top, and also to the large population in Edmonton by a very good highway between these two cities, and I think we can all see the real need for some type of development in the Kananaskis Valley.

A second concern though is the nature of the current proposed road -- the nature of the road which I have just described. And through projection of the construction on the first 12 miles, many Albertans have questioned the design standard of this road on the first 12 miles, saying that the same safety standards could be maintained by a more winding, narrow road, one with a lower design standard. Consequently we have seen the formation and presentations by such groups as the Kananaskis Action Group, urging postponement of road construction, the initiation of public hearings and land use investigations prior to any further development which I might add have been granted, and this development has been postponed subject to these hearings.

A third concern of people in the province about the valley is that they themselves, as a population, should have public input and personal impact on the development which occurs in the valley. Now these people want to see environmental studies prior to any land use development of the valley. As I said, this is being done but it is a concern.

So now I come to the Resolution which I have presented to the Assembly today. But I want to note two things before I do talk about the Resolution.

Number one, that the construction standards have not been established beyond the first 12 miles. That the road upgrading to this point now has been limited to the first 12 miles and, in fact, there is a moratorium on any further development of the road in the valley. But Alberta citizens can influence the remainder of the development of the road within the valley.

And secondly, and this I want to stress, upgrading is required on the road. And most people aren't arguing with this fact. It is a traffic hazard; the dust in the valley due to the heavy summer usage does have a pollution effect on the valley. And at the very least some form of paving is required on the road to establish a safety standard and to minimize the effect of the road on the environment.

But it is the design and the manner in which the road is being developed and will be used that does concern me. And it concerns along with me, I know, a number of my constituents.

I want to make a couple of recommendations as reflected in this resolution. The first one is that the design of the first 12 miles shall not be the design for the total highway through the Kananaskis Valley. And I'd like to explain this in light of the need for safety standards.

I feel that a safety standard for the valley road does not require a designed speed of 70 miles per hour. In fact, if we build a road of 70 miles per hour standard, the nature of this development could well dictate prematurely the utilization and the value in future years. It implies, by the design standard, an industrial and a primary arterial use which I don't accept as necessary for this highway. If it is going to be used as a recreational road, then it shouldn't be a primary arterial road, available as a short-cut from Coleman through to Banff and northern Alberta. And once again the maintenance of the safety standard is necessary and I would like to mention to you the alternatives that I see in the design and construction of the road to maintain a safety standard.

First of all I would suggest this: that the Department of Highways and Transport be given jurisdiction over the entire forestry trunk road. The last couple of decades have shown that Lands and Forests and Calgary Power can't maintain the road at a standard with the technical know-how that we have in Highways and Transport.

Secondly, I would suggest that a speed limit of 50 miles per hour and a design standard development of 50 miles per hour be established in the development of this road as a secondary road, not a primary arterial. Now this would mean that the road could be developed which would require only something like 130 to 150 feet, instead of 200 to 300 feet of right of way for its development.

Thirdly, I would recommend that load limits be established to prevent heavy industrial usage on the road. Now although there has been some industrial development in the area, and there could be in the future, we could, I feel, develop the access roads I mentioned earlier from the eastern side of the Rockies, instead of using the main road as an arterial highway.

I would suggest fourthly that the Department of Highways and Transport, in the construction of the road, develop variable widths where passing would be required for trailers and slower traffic, for instance as you see on passing on hills. You don't need to develop both sides with six foot shoulders, perhaps just the one side with variable widths instead of constructing passing shoulders as a constant standard right through the valley.

Fifthly, I would suggest that paved upgrading be initiated on other access roads to the valley, at the point when usage accelerates on the Kananaskis. Then perhaps we can develop these other roads to handle that extra traffic, instead of paving the road, as I said, at 70 miles per hour.

And let's not kid ourselves, once you've paved a road through the valley, there is going to be extra usage. They have 700 cars a day now, it will probably increase to something like 1,500 a day at peak periods. And maybe these access roads could take off some of that pressure on the road from the north and the south. But we do have other access roads through the valley, as I have mentioned, through Longview, the Chain Lakes, Maycroft and Turner Valley through to the Upper Kananaskis Lake.

In fact, I might mention the route through to the Upper Kananaskis Lake was recommended by the Lombard North Planning Group as a possible major right of way entrance into the valley. But with the development of these access roads, as usage dictates, as I have said, we can take the load off the north and south ends.

I would suggest, sixthly, that in the development of the road, aesthetics should at all times be one of the supplementary variables in planning for the road. In fact, we might utilize the services of a landscape architect to assure an aesthetic restoration along the total route as it is being constructed. Perhaps this capacity is within Highways and Transport now, but if not, perhaps we could contract with a landscape architect.

So these are just a few suggestions that I would have on the development of the road beyond the first 12 miles. Once again, to establish a design standard which is a safety standard I feel would minimize the adverse environmental impact on the valley.

But this in itself isn't enough. And I do have another recommendation. Apart from the road, if we are to design a road that doesn't dictate the use of

the valley, then other methods for determining the manner of total development must be established for this valley. Not everyone agrees that this should be a recreational area. I am sure you have heard representations from people who feel that this valley should be retained as a wilderness area. And at this point, although I feel that it should be developed as a recreational area, that is not what I am arguing.

I might note first of all that in the development of a land use plan for the valley, impact studies now are being initiated allowing for full public input prior to any further development. As I mentioned before, the development of the highway past the first 12 miles has been suspended until extensive public hearings have been held.

Here are some of the studies that are now, or have been, in operation. First of all, the Foothills Resources Allocation Study is now being conducted by a Natural Resources Co-ordinating Council under the direction of the Department of Lands and Forests. Secondly, the Environmental Conservation Authority will be conducting open hearings this spring into total use of the Kananaskis Valley, along with a number of other areas in the Foothills area.

Thirdly, in November, we received from the Department of the Environment an environmental impact statement for Provincial Primary Highway No. 40, which was a statement specifically on this road. I believe all members received this in the House last fall.

Fourthly, the Department of Highways and Transport, in conjunction with the Department of Lands and Forests, contracted last spring with the Lombard North Planning Limited, providing recommendations for the development specifically of the highway and its design.

But as I said before, this in itself just isn't quite enough. Although we do advance with planning in this proper manner, I feel that one more action is important. This is the establishment of an inter-departmental task force to integrate policy, public response, and total development of the Kananaskis Valley. By this I mean that the development should not be dictated in that valley by one provincial department. Its decisions are the nature of its particular development plan.

I would suggest that senior people from the following departments be assigned to such an inter-departmental task force for involvement in this planning.

First of all, obviously, the Department of Lands and Forests, under whose jurisdiction the valley still remains.

Secondly, the Department of the Environment, since ecological and environmental effects of the imposition of man and his development in the valley are, of course, a crucial variable within this valley.

Thirdly, the Department of Industry and Commerce certainly would be involved, in that in some future development the Alberta Opportunity Company may be involved in a recreational development.

Fourthly, the Department of Mines and Minerals, since a number of mineral leases are held in the valley.

Fifthly, the Department of Highways and Transport, as previously stated, by involvement with the forestry trunk road and through perhaps an extended servicing of the road.

Finally, if recreation is, in fact, to become a major development within the valley, and one that I personally support, the Department of Tourism should be involved, perhaps as a co-ordinating agency for an inter-departmental task force, chairing and directing activities within the valley. To this point, it appears to me that there has been no such full-scale inter-departmental discussion of the development of the valley.

So these are my recommendations, supplementary to the resolution that I have brought to you this afternoon. I am saying that we have an opportunity in the Kananaskis Valley. Major development hasn't occurred to the present in that area, and the highway can be a right of way for the use of the valley in a recreational sense, but let's not put ourselves in the position where a highway will dictate the nature of the future use of the Kananaskis Valley.

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to second this resolution, I would like to point out that I, too, have had the experience of driving in the beautiful Kananaskis Valley. And I can assure you that never in my life have I driven a road such as that. It had to be the rockiest, roughest, dustiest road, I believe, in all of Canada. I can sincerely agree with the minister that something has to be done to that road.

But Mr. Speaker, in this day and age, when we ourselves and our tourists travel our beautiful highways, what do we actually see of Alberta? Try driving the Trans Canada highway west from Banff -- speed limits up to 70 miles per hour. If you slow down you are a danger to everyone behind you. All you can do is try and keep up with the traffic flow. What chance has a tourist to see any or all of those beautiful mountains? Try taking your eyes off for three or four seconds in the Rogers Pass and you'll end up a statistic.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just what can a tourist view on our great highway system? Mr. Speaker, last summer my wife and I had the opportunity to travel through the Custer National Park of South Dakota and Wyoming where they have had more experience and more expertise in the business of tourism than we have been exposed to here in Alberta.

Custer National Park has one main thoroughfare through it; it is called the David Lewis Trail. It's a good paved road, its speed limits are 60 miles per hour. And all the other highways in that park are so designed with a 20 to 22 foot top -- maximum top speed 40 to 45 miles per hour. Here the highway was so designed as to even bend around a single oak or pine tree. Corners were down to 25 miles per hour. No straight stretches on their highways were longer than 200 yards in the park. Pines in area of that road grew right up to the pavement. On one very beautiful stretch of this highway, the trees literally grew over the top. Never in my life, Mr. Speaker, have I enjoyed a drive quite like that. We had time to notice the flowers, the wild-life, cattle, terrain and especially were able to hear birds singing from our car.

We had an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to talk to the park wardens and inquire about how many people were using their roads, what their problems were, what they had really going for them. They indicated that in designing the roads in their parks in the United States their belief was that parks are for recreation and for people.

Mr. Speaker, what do we actually do, or should do, when we go on a holiday? It is to relax and unwind and as they so ably said in the Custer National Park, we try to get people to slow down so they can enjoy our beautiful outdoors.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution states that a speed limit of 70 miles per hour be posted on the Kananaskis-Coleman road. Mr. Speaker, I believe that with the type of highway that is going to go in there it will be practically impossible to control or to keep people down to 50 miles per hour with a 36 foot top and probably a right-of-way in excess of 200 feet. Mr. Speaker, there is a good enough road in there through the Kananaskis now; let's leave well enough alone. Either dust-proof the road or put asphalt on the present road, and when we visit our beautiful outdoors we will have an opportunity to get away from the speed-mad age.

MR. DRAIN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate very much this resolution being brought before this Legislature and I can also proudly announce that I have made a number of trips over the Kananaskis highway. I would say I have probably made about 2,500 or 3,000 trips over it. In fact, I could shut my eyes and see every curve on this road, every backfill and every culvert. I could talk about the area the way it was before the road was built. I could talk about the time when I was a boy and I put my pack on my shoulders and walked up where the Kananaskis is. I would leave after school on Friday night and go way off into the wilderness, and it was wilderness then. There was no dust, there was no industrial development and things were as Mother Nature had made them. You could camp out, you could cast your line into the creeks that run there, and you could catch two and three trout at a time. Those were very nice days, and this is how I would have liked to see the world remain, but unfortunately --

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is a fish story.

MR. DRAIN:

That is not fish story. I can go further and I can talk about breaking up a match like this and throwing it in and go boop, boop, boop, and fish. You bet your life, that is how it was. But unfortunately, you know, the world didn't stay still. I grew up, and population increased.

You know, it is remarkable even in my lifetime, how things have changed in Canada. I remember going to school, I think it was in Grade 6, or Grade 7, and they were saying they had a population in Canada of about 8 million people. They were saying that some day there would be a population of 14 million, and some day there would be a population of 21 million, and there is 21 million. So therefore, the options that I had when I was a boy are not the options that are prevailing today.

The Kananaskis Highway was built for one single purpose, and the purpose was to protect the eastern slopes of the Rocky Mountains. It was funded by the federal government and protected by the Eastern Rockies Forest Conservation Board. The reason why this particular policy was developed was because of the recognition of the value that the hillside cover had in the matter of controlling and regulating the flow of water in the area.

However recently, and I think the major impact has hit in the last four or five years with the dawning age of leisure and the accelerating growth of our cities, there has been a tremendous use of this particular Kananaskis Highway for the reason that it was not intended, and that is as a wilderness area where people can go and picnic. The usage that has developed therefrom has become, well, you could term it fantastic. And it is accelerating at a rate that is truly remarkable indicating to me that any type of road development of a lower standard than that contemplated by the highway development, would be in fact, irresponsible -- it would be a waste of money and not in the context of good management.

Now I speak about roads because I know of roads. I have built a lot of roads, built a lot of roads in bush areas. And it certainly would appear in the initial processes of building a road and clearing a vast space of ground, 150 feet wide, people look at this and they are affronted. They can't understand why you can't lay the ground right on its edge without disturbing any of these beautiful little trees.

But really, what does this mean? You are in a timber growth area. The result of clearing and disturbing the soil along a right-of-way of the dimensions that are proposed in the Kananaskis Highway has this particular effect, the effect of exposing the mineral soil. And what are the results of exposing this particular mineral soil? The result is that you have now created the proper seed environment for lodge pole pine. So in spite of what you want to do, in spite of the manner in which this area has been disturbed, it will reseed itself by natural conditions and four years hence there will be a total coverage of new growth of pine.

So what happens in the interim if this road is built and the highway department carries out their policy of seeding along the right-of-way? You have an accelerated source of natural food for the game. Studies conducted along the roads that have been built through Banff National Park, the Trans-Canada, show as a result of the clearing, as a result of the seeding, the game population has been enhanced. So, in effect, by building this highway you are going along at a compatible manner with nature. However, this is pretty difficult for a person who has not lived in the natural environment.

I think of Hollow Creek on the British Columbia side -- and I was in Hollow Creek before there were any roads put in. And Hollow Creek had some of the finest spruce I ever saw in my life. It was from 135 to 145 feet tall, and about 20 inches on the butt, and there was only a crown of limbs at the top. And I said this is wonderful. And it was. But what happened? There was a spruce beetle infestation occurred, with the result, Mr. Speaker, that this timber was no longer healthy and was rapidly dying. So there was an accelerated program of logging inaugurated and the entire forest was completely taken out. And to add insult to those who are so entranced with the aesthetics, Mr. Speaker, the British Columbia Forest Service set fire to the entire area and all you see now is a black and charred mess. And I looked at this job and I said, "Boy, this is a wonderful job." The reason why I said it was because now you have created the basis for natural reproduction, you have created the basis for a new forest and you have salvaged what Mother Nature would have destroyed.

So we talk now about the Kananaskis Highway and we say we shouldn't have a road that is up to the standards of other highways in Alberta. You do not talk

or even consider the population of the province and the way it is going to grow and the amount of people that are going to use this. Right now it represents a distinct hazard, as the hon. members have mentioned, Mr. Speaker.

There have been insinuations that any type of industrial development would be so repugnant that this, in fact, would be the Rape of the Sabines or the Vandals sacking Rome. Mr. Speaker, I don't think this is so, because after all there is industrial use in this particular area. There has been industrial use since 1951. We have the Savannah Creek Gas Steel Development and they have to be --

MR. LEE:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe that at any point during the moving or the seconding of the speech that a statement was made that industrial development should not occur within the valley. We are talking about industrial development as it relates to the usage of the road, but not that it should or shouldn't be.

MR. DRAIN:

The point that I am trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that industrial development is not, I think, a total affront. The reason why I say that is, the timber leases have been sold and they have been set out under timber management basis. They are being logged because the timber is overmature, because the deterioration factor excludes the growth factor.

But if nothing is done with these you are just going to have a morass and a jungle of twisted trees, and what will this result in? It will result in what is called the ultimate forest climax. And what is that? Fire. This is a great cleanser of nature. Before this area was ever disturbed by man this was the forest cycle, a total cycle of 450 years from the growth of the little pines that I talked about, up to the vast big spruce and the encroachment of the balsam and the deterioration and the accumulation of litter on your forest floor to the extent that Mother Nature finally created the conditions that required the cleansing agency of fire. This cycle has been repeated in this area thousands and thousands of times.

Now man, with his control, has defeated this. The result is that there has been a brushing-in -- sickly stands of timber are protected, and this cycle no longer prevails, so how does man answer this problem? He answers it by the processes of logging.

I have attended meetings of the Eastern Rockies Conservation Board in relation to this particular area. I remember one specifically, and I remember very well because I tossed for the check to take the members out for lunch and I got stuck and it cost me a lot of money, so I remember very well. Just proves that I am not always lucky.

Anyway, the problem that we were discussing was the reproduction of spruce. In fact, some forester came out with the theory that there could not be spruce reproduction in the area because of the fact that it was too cold. I made the contention that if they started an earnest program of trying to eradicate all the trees in the Eastern Forest Rockies Area, they would never succeed.

Now looking at the usage of this particular thing, there are gas wells, there are logging operations, there are coal leases, on which millions of dollars of exploration money have been spent. If we go the way of saying that this must be saved for the birds and the bees, and the locusts and the tourists, and the lands of pine needles and pine cones, and that all of these should be directed properly then we should say at least give them their money back with interest, because, I mean, you have led them down the garden path. You have allowed these people to spend millions of dollars on exploration, and you now say, "No." Well I would say, at least pay them off. That would be the very least you could do from the standpoint of business ethics.

So, talking about the speed limit, what is the difference? And truly I can tell you that I have driven the Kananaskis Highway at a considerable rate of speed. I remember one time when the district ranger and I were checking a timber limit. For some reason our truck got stuck, and we had to wade across a ford. It was April. We were wet up to the neck, we were cold, and we were walking down the road, when along came a guy in a car. There was one straight stretch in the road, and he said, "You fellows going some place?" "Yeah, we would like a ride." So we got in the car and the guy belted it up to 75 miles per hour, and the ranger looked at the speedometer and saw 75 miles an hour. In spite of the fact that he probably would have frozen to death, he said, "I'm the

district ranger here -- Slow her down to 35 miles an hour." I said, "God bless the Civil Service of Alberta because they look after us all the time."

[Laughter]

So anyway, Mr. Speaker, the point I am trying to make is that a speed limit can be set, and the steering damage is not significant. There will be more benefits of more grass, more and more people will want to use this area, and you have the responsibility -- the Minister of Highways has the responsibility -- to provide these people with the type of road they can travel on. He is accepting these responsibilities, and I am totally astonished at the hon. member when he comes up with such an outrageous resolution here. I don't know -- if he is thinking of crossing the floor there is room over here.

[Laughter]

Of course there is a little doubt in my mind about one particular thing, and that is if there is a question of priorities. And I wouldn't be too concerned about that because things are moving faster than we think, and there is something that happens to people when they become grounded in an urban area. They experience, I think, probably subconsciously, a pent-in feeling, and though they may not go down the Kananaskis Highway, or they may not go camping, they have in their minds a place they can go to, a place where there is something to do. When they think of something like this they are totally outraged at the idea that it is going to be attacked. So this is one of the problems.

Now there is another thing that hasn't been mentioned. Supposing we say that we build this to a substandard. We have substandard bridges and all the rest of it. Here we have a glorified footpath with some oil on it, or that seems to be the implication. A good road -- I am really not quite clear -- a good road, but not a good road. Supposing you had a fire -- think about that -- and you had to move heavy equipment in. This can happen. You have to move it rapidly. Then what? This is one particular thing.

There is another thing I hope this highway will never be used for. That is, in an emergency situation where you would have to evacuate Calgary by way of a secondary road in the mountains. By nature it is safe from aircraft and enemy attack. From this standpoint alone this is an important thing to think about.

If this Kananaskis area -- this beautiful area -- is going to be subjected to study, and of course our answer to everything in 1973 is a study. We seek out the great wise men, the oracles of Delphi, the seers of the past. You know, when they did a projection in the good old days they simply got a sheep, cut out its entrails and read the signs from that. And probably they would be just as effective as some of the studies that we have on a continual basis, Mr. Speaker.

So when you talk about a study, I often wonder in my mind, what would have been the implications of, say, the study of Sir John A. Macdonald that said, "Well, now we are going to build the CPR in order to save British Columbia from going over to the American side." And someone said, "We can't do that, just think of the damage to the environment." And there was a lot of damage, but anyway the railway was built and Canada was built. So in some cases people come first, and the study comes second. I'm not saying that all the studies are disadvantageous. There certainly must be some advantages because people do them, and for no other reason except that they create a lot of employment, Mr. Speaker.

Another thing, in relation to the Kananaskis highway, is the tremendous danger existing at the south end of that highway as a result of the coal-hauling on that road. This is something that has been of major and serious concern to me despite the best efforts of the company, and they are making the efforts in relation to the amount of money they have to spend. They have water trucks on this highway continuously. They are hauling 100 ton loads of coal over it. They maintain the road and pay for the use themselves, so let's not think that the people of Alberta are being swindled.

But this churns up a fantastic amount of dust. Tourist traffic goes over that road and intermingles with the coal truck traffic. Any tourist that makes that trip and gets involved with that coal traffic is never going to come back on the Kananaskis highway because he has had it. So if an alternate route cannot be put in to accommodate the tourist traffic, then the Kananaskis highway should be diverted as a safety feature, at the gap at the south end and down through Lundbreck. And when I say this, the Board of Trade at Coleman will probably get my scalp but I express the proper concern and a realization of the danger involved.

Another thing, relating to road quality, that I didn't mention is the simple fact that people to a greater and greater degree pull trailers over this road. And most of the people who do pull trailers, and pull them probably one week in the year, are not professionals, and certainly they should have tangents and the type of cars that can handle this type of load.

Another factor that enters into the quality of this particular road, and convinces me of the necessity of the high standard that it is being developed on, is the weather conditions you have to face at that particular altitude. I think the picture goes something like this. For every thousand feet of elevation you gain, the amount of moisture that develops is 10 inches. Now you come from a mean level in Calgary of 3000 feet, more or less, or 3,500 feet, up to about 6,800 feet at the top of the Wilkinson Summit. Then you have a weather system there totally beyond the experience of the average driver on the big flats. You have these very adverse winter conditions. The result is that they are constantly getting into difficulties, so the wider and better the road is, the finer the grade, the more pleasant the trip will be. Because remember, when the hon. member talks about usage of 700 cars a day, he hasn't scratched the surface. You are talking about 7,000 cars a day, you are talking about 10,000 cars a day, and this is what you are looking at a few years down the road. And then, as the hon. member also mentioned, the reason why there isn't usage of this particular highway at the present time is simply the quality that is not there.

The hon. Member for Camrose constituency referred to that when he said this was the dirtiest, roughest, toughest, horriblemst, and worst road he ever travelled on. Well, I've gone on some that aren't that good either.

So then I would be very loathe to see, in spite of all the studies that are done, the environment of the Kananaskis changed by tourist developments, by huge industrial developments. I would like to see a more or less good road through it which will grass in, where nature will replace the trees that have been removed. This is how I would like to see it.

But then there is another thing, looking a long way ahead. Where else in the province, other than the Grande Cache area, is there such an enormous quantity of high grade metallurgical coal available? In excess of three billion tons of coal in the Oldman River watershed. Now maybe we can say in our ego or in our self-interest that this is ours and we can keep this for ever.

But the day will come -- I don't think it will come soon, and I don't expect it will come in our lifetime -- but the day will come that population pressure, political pressure will not permit us to sit on these resources no matter how eager we are to do so. So we have, I think, to look in terms of all things -- the relationship of the aesthetic values, the sounds of the elk whistling on the hillsides, the cry of the lynx, stop by at the river and look at a beaver pond, take a second look at the river and see the old pop cans the admirers of ecology have thrown in there, the old tires, tin cans and all the plastic containers -- all of this that people cry so much about.

I have some statistics, Mr. Speaker. I would love to talk all night boys and I am sure you would love to listen to me. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. member leave to adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

DR. HORNER:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the motion by the hon. Deputy Premier, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

March 6, 1973

ALBERTA HANSARD

14-589

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[The House rose at 5:29 c'clock.]