

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, March 13, 1973

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in introducing to you and to the members of the Assembly approximately 45 students from Grade 9 at Mount Carmel School in the constituency of Edmonton Parkallen. I just want to say to them, Mr. Speaker, that the members of the House are always pleased to see groups such as this come here for the purpose of learning a little more about the proceedings in the Legislature, the history of the building and of the government of Alberta, and the very dignified and serious way in which we all conduct ourselves, Mr. Speaker. So I would ask them to rise with their two teachers who are with them today and be recognized by the House.

MR. JAMISON:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly 27 Grade 7 students from Major General Griesbach School in my constituency. The students are accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Zilinski. I would like to congratulate them and their teacher for taking an interest in following the proceedings in this Legislature. I would ask that they rise and be recognized.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Distribution of Psychiatric Reports

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I have two questions, the first of which I would like to address to the Minister of Health and Social Development. I wonder if the minister is prepared to advise the House as to what action has been taken regarding the widespread distribution of psychiatric reports by government social workers?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member raised this matter yesterday, and I wanted to comment on a couple of the things that were implicit in the question from the outset. First, with reference to apparent practice, I would want to tell him that no practice exists in regard to distribution of psychiatric reports to the types of occupational groups and professionals mentioned. However, I think it should be said that when the question relates to psychiatric reports that, of course, has a very special narrow meaning. And no doubt certain types of other reports are discussed by, say, a social worker and the principal of a school in a case where there is a youngster who is being counselled by the social worker and is perhaps also a problem in the school. We shouldn't regard it as either new or unusual in any way if things like that happen.

Yet, I'm going to make the presumption, Mr. Speaker, that the reference relates to a story in yesterday's Calgary Albertan in which some report is given of an incident at a meeting of psychiatrists where an allegation was made of lack of secrecy.

Before dealing with that, I wanted to record that I also take objection to the reference, for which I don't blame the hon. Leader of the Opposition, perhaps; I blame the report in the newspaper, or perhaps the statements made which gave rise to it, that there is "wide distribution" of information of the type I have referred to. Wide distribution implies that people who aren't entitled to receive the information may receive it. I don't think that any allegation of that type could be sustained, even if it comes from such an august assembly as a meeting of psychiatrists.

I'm going to presume further, Mr. Speaker. I know you, Your Honour, rule against hypothetical questions, but I don't know in regard to hypothetical answers. So I'm going to attempt to go a bit further and say that the question --

MR. SPEAKER:

Ordinarily, a question which is out of order is the correlative of an answer which is out of order.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I enjoy your command of the language so much that I don't mind being interrupted to hear the way you put that.

But I'm sure I'm right, Mr. Speaker, in saying that the question to the hon. Miss Hunley yesterday bears upon the report from the psychiatrists' convention in Banff. As hon. members would, I think, expect, because the reference was in regard to a provincial guidance clinic, and because that is my responsibility, I did discuss the matter with Miss Hunley. As a result, I am as satisfied as I can be at the moment that the incident referred to was a unique and single one, not the distribution of a psychiatric report, but the distribution of a case conference report to some of the people who were involved in the original case conference. In other words, we have a team approach to a therapeutic situation involving an individual, and that report was distributed.

The only other thing I wanted to say in regard to it was that that sort of information does fall still under the normal rules of the government as to confidentiality, and I have not ascertained that it went to anyone outside of the ones who were present at the case conference. If it did, then, of course, that would have been a situation which shouldn't have happened.

But I think, Mr. Speaker, in a final summation of my assumption that it occurred that particular case, there are at the present time, and have been for the last couple of months, draft policy guidelines being worked upon in the department in regard to confidentiality, which will, I trust, improve even more the degree of confidentiality, and go as far as can be possible to ensure that the practices of the department conform with the policy of the government in regard to confidentiality.

MR. HENDERSON:

Supplemental, Mr. Speaker, and supplemental to the question yesterday. The minister was also going to inquire as to whether there were psychiatrists on regular staff in the guidance clinics at Red Deer and Calgary.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have to admit to the hon. member that when I checked the Hansard record to bring myself up to date on commitments I made to answer as of today, I overlooked that. I don't have the answer yet, and I will indeed get it for him.

Sturgeon Lake Seismic Tests

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, could I address a second question to the Minister of Mines and Minerals, as to whether government practice allows for drilling of oil and gas wells on bodies of water such as the Sturgeon Lake?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Environment has been dealing with that question. Perhaps he would like to answer that question.

MR. YURKO:

The answer at this time, Mr. Speaker, is no.

MR. HENDERSON:

A supplemental, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Lands and Forests. If the answer is no, why is the government entertaining the necessity of seismic work on Sturgeon Lake?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, the original question was framed in terms of drilling wells rather than with respect to seismic operations. I am sure the hon. member knows more about the oil business than I do. But even I know it is essential to have some knowledge of the surrounding area and the nature configuration and quality of a resource pool in order to know whether it should be utilized on an economic basis.

MR. HENDERSON:

The minister is right in his assumption that his knowledge is rather elementary on the subject.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Tell me why.

MR. HENDERSON:

Has the government examined the necessity - in light of the fact that drilling is not allowed on the lake - of seismic operations being carried out on the lake? I know the companies want to, but have they examined the necessity of it?

DR. WARRACK:

As I said yesterday, Mr. Speaker, we are examining that matter at this time.

MR. HENDERSON:

A supplemental, Mr. Speaker. What are they doing about the undetonated dynamite charges that are apparently resting on the bottom of the lake at this time?

DR. WARRACK:

My understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that the charges that had been there were detonated on Friday.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Elevator Strike

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the hon. Minister of Manpower. Has the minister any statement to make on the report from the local radio station that the government is intervening in the elevator strike in this province?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, the speed with which one rises to answer a question indicates some judgment as to what one is going to say when he finally arrives at a vertical posture.

No, not in the sense of direct intervention. I might use this occasion to report that our promise and our government, through myself personally, and through the Chairman of the Board of Industrial Relations are extremely close to the mediation team headed by Mr. Bill Dickie, one of the Deputy Ministers in the Department of Immigration and Manpower who is the chief mediator for this dispute. I must say I have personally spoken with the chief negotiator for the

unions in western Canada and with some of the company representatives in eastern Canada.

The balance between working in Alberta on behalf of Albertans - and this includes the construction industry and their clients and the employees who are the elevator constructors, and a great number of people who could be in leased, or rented, or bought premises, including senior citizens - is of extreme concern to us. The balance between working on behalf of Albertans in the context of a national agreement is a rather sensitive one, but we are working on both fronts, Mr. Speaker. The question is an extremely important one.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the settlement within Alberta, separate from that across Canada, look favourable at this time?

DR. HOHOL:

I would have to speculate. The nature of collective bargaining, as I have been finding out through many years of collective bargaining, including last Sunday, is that prediction for even one hour seems to be a risky kind of occupation. So it would, be difficult, in all sincerity, to say that it appears optimistic or on the other hand to say that it appears completely out of reach.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wainwright, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall.

Rate Increases -- Senior Citizens Accommodation

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Has the minister received any representation from the Alberta Senior Citizens' Home Association dealing with a rate increase for the accommodation they provide?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am going to presume the association that the hon. member's question relates to is the Provincial Homes Association. They have several times asked the government to consider an upward adjustment in rates and whatever prospects there may be for that in the future, the answer up to the present time has always been that the government is not inclined to agree to that request.

However, I have been keeping track of the information they have requested which is the list across the province of foundation deficits incurred in each year. It has been my view that they are not large enough to create any hardship for the members in the foundation and that they have no difficulty meeting what is, in most cases, a small deficit. It would be the policy, unless that situation changes, to retain the same attitude, which is basically against any unnecessary increase.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Would that information be made available to members of the Assembly?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if all members have the same interest in that as the hon. Member for Wainwright. The schedule of deficits is three or four pages long. I believe I can certainly provide that without any breach of privilege. I do want to check that part of it, but I suggest that I will provide it to the hon. member and to other members who may be interested and who might also ask.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Organized Crime in Alberta

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question directed to the hon. Attorney General. In this report that you tabled yesterday for the Alberta Police Commission, do you agree with the report?

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please! We have gone some considerable distance in eliciting and supplying expressions of opinions by ministers, even personal opinions. Strictly under the rules though, they are out of order both in the questions and in the answers, and the questions should really relate to government policy.

MR. HO LEM:

Coming more directly, Mr. Speaker, my question is: what additional funds or directives have you given to the RCMP to control the spread of organized crime in Alberta?

MR. LEITCH:

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I missed the first few words of the hon. member's question.

MR. HO LEM:

What additional funds or directives have you given to the RCMP to control the spread of organized crime in Alberta?

MR. LEITCH:

Well, as to directives, Mr. Speaker, we haven't given any. The control of crime is one of the responsibilities of the police force and certainly to this date I haven't seen any need to give them any directives in that area. And when one is speaking of funds so far as the RCMP is concerned, that service is provided under a contract. The amount of money to be paid under that contract is fixed by the terms of the contract and doesn't depend upon the amount of service or work done, or the type of work done by the RCMP.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Attorney General advise the House what immediate steps your government will take to introduce new legislation to protect Albertans against organized crime?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't have in mind introducing any legislation directed toward that area.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Does your department have any procedures for scrutinizing the purchase by outside interests of several competing firms in select businesses, thus creating a monopoly situation?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member's question is not supplementary insofar as the Chair can see, and has no direct connection with organized crime. Perhaps the hon. member might use his next turn for that question.

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow followed by the hon. Member for Camrose.

Professional Strike Breakers

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Could you advise the House if any professional strike-breaking companies are operating in the Province of Alberta?

DR. HOHOL:

Not to my official knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. Have any Alberta firms or business organizations requested or made use of professional strike-breaking companies in Alberta?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, not that I know of.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. Have you received representations from the Alberta Federation of Labour requesting that professional strike-breaking services presently operating in eastern Canada not be allowed to operate in the Province of Alberta?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I have no immediate recollection of that, but I will check it.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney General. Have you received any secret police reports concerning eastern professional strike-breaking companies that have been known to make use of violence to keep management and labour from settling contract differences?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Apart from the question as to whether or not we have secret police or secret police reports this type of report is obviously confidential, and certainly is not the subject matter of a question in the oral question period. Beauchesne in 171 and the following citations makes it very clear.

Copies of Expiring Labour Contracts

MR. WILSON:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary then to the Minister of Manpower and Labour. Does your department make copies of computer print-outs of expiring labour contracts available to anyone?

DR. HOHOL:

That is probably not a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, but to the best of my knowledge, no.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Camrose, followed by the hon. Member for Stony Plain.

Improved Television Service

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Telephones and Utilities. Will you make strong representation to the CRTC in relation to the problems of Alliance, Killam, Wainwright, Viking and Provost in getting good television reception?

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, first I appreciate that the hon. member gave me notice of this question, however short.

He'll be happy to learn that according to our information the CBC is considering eventually putting small television transmitters at Forestburg and Halkirk, which I think would cover the area around Alliance, Killam and so on that he was referring to. Presumably their final decision will be governed by their own budget limitations -- and in the light of getting consent of the CRTC.

So far as the position of the provincial government is concerned, Alberta like other provinces, is concerned about the lack of provincial control over communications within the borders of the province. By communications I include television, cable television, micro-wave systems and so on. This has special significance in the light of prospective plans for educational TV and transmission of materials via micro-wave, and coaxial cables for cable TV and related uses.

This, Mr. Speaker, will be one of the many subjects of discussion at a meeting of provincial ministers of communication, in Alberta, in May. The CRTC -- for the information of the members -- is a federal body and its function is to prevent chaos in the air --

MR. LUDWIG:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the hon. minister lost contact with the question, don't you think you ought to sit him down?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's request is scarcely couched in terms which the Chair would accept with alacrity.

MR. FARRAN:

All I am trying to say, Mr. Speaker, is that we, as a province, object to -- not the base function of the CRTC to regulate the air -- but when its powers go beyond this point and it takes insufficient recognition of provincial jurisdiction within our borders.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question to the minister. When can he announce something for the Wainwright area? That was referred to in the earlier question.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. member didn't misunderstand me. I didn't announce anything. I said I was happy to tell him that the CBC was planning something. The province is not planning TV transmitters at either Forestburg or Halkirk. But I will communicate with the CBC to see if they have any plans for Wainwright.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Stony Plain, followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Reassessment of Farm Buildings

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs: will any legislation be introduced this spring or fall session in regard to assessment of farm buildings?

MR. RUSSELL:

[Not recorded]

MR. PURDY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will any consideration be given in legislation to lowering the general assessment period, so that in some cases such as in the Lac St. Anne County, people are not hit with a large increase in taxes, some percentages as high as 1,200 per cent?

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is quite true that a number of municipalities throughout the province have been disturbed by the effects brought about as a result of the cyclical nature of reassessments every eight years and changing market conditions, and certainly that is one thing we will have to be considering in the future. But I don't foresee any legislation at this spring or fall session dealing with that.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Great Slave Railway Extension

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to either the hon. Premier or to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. By way of explanation in the government's transportation policy, the minister was reported to have said that the government intends to press for the extension of the Great Slave Railway into the Mackenzie Valley. My question is: has the government conducted a feasibility study on the extension of the Great Slave Railway?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, we are in the process now of developing this study pertaining to this railroad.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of your statement about extending the Great Slave Railroad into the mouth of the Mackenzie River, is the government considering the economic benefits to Alberta in a formal way through a study of a Great Slave Railroad right up, to take the oil out from the Arctic areas?

MR. PEACOCK:

Well, Mr. Speaker, in relation to this study, we are looking at some preliminary work that has been done by, I think, the hon. member mentioned, the study done at Queen's covering the railroad of the Arctic. In our studies it is, of course, identifiable to the cost benefits in relation to Alberta, and how it can be identified and associated with other modes of transportation into the Arctic.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. Can the minister or the hon. Premier advise the House when the studies will be completed, and when some sort of announcement on this matter is likely to be made?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I noted the hon. member's original question dealt with oil, although I do recall that in the course of his remarks in the House he mentioned both oil and gas.

The preliminary information that we have, with regard to the question of gas, is that it is just completely uneconomic in every sense of the word. But that is preliminary information. We cannot give any definitive data to the House at this moment. When we would be in a position to give more definitive information with regard to the economics relative to oil, we have little doubt in our mind that it is worth much effort on behalf of this government to examine that as a feasible alternative relative to gas.

In addition, of course, we have to weigh those priorities insofar as that area is a matter under federal jurisdiction for natural resource, relative to the other matters that we have before us.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican, followed by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

David Threinen Case

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, my question today is directed to the hon. Attorney General, and it is a follow-up from a previous question regarding David William Threinen who recently was acquitted of murder in Lethbridge after spending 8 months awaiting trial, and he was re-arrested 20 hours later and placed in gaol again.

I wonder if the Attorney General has any comments he can give the House on this case today?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, my information about that is rather limited and so my answer, to some extent, must be guesswork as opposed to accurate information. But the information I have indicates that the person to whom the hon. member refers was on parole at the time. What happened, I expect, was that there was a revocation of the parole, and, of course, matters of parole are solely within the jurisdiction of the federal government.

MR. DIXON:

Hon. minister do you plan on any action to see if you can't intercede in the case as you have in other cases, where this man spent eight months, and that's all he had to go on his parole? Wouldn't the fact that he was in confinement during the eight months be taken into consideration?

MR. LEITCH:

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I said in my earlier answer, that would be a federal matter. If it was a revocation of parole, which I believe it to have been, it is, as I've said, solely within the federal government's jurisdiction.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Public Housing Projects

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Mr. Minister has the Alberta government had negotiations with the federal government regarding alternatives to large 'ghetto-like' public housing projects?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what term the hon. member used. Was it 'ghetto-like' public housing projects?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Right.

MR. GETTY:

I wasn't quite sure of the spelling. Not owning any, I wasn't sure.

Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion with the federal government in the whole matter of public housing, and I would prefer that the question be answered as far as possible by our Minister of Municipal Affairs, who deals with that subject more continually than I do.

MR. COOPER:

A supplementary for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Mr. Minister, is it the intention of the Alberta government to take advantage of the recent federal government's shared-cost subsidy proposal of leasing 25 per cent of units in privately-owned buildings for low-income people?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, the directors of the Alberta Housing Corporation presently have that and other similar programs under active consideration.

MR. COOPER:

A supplementary to the minister. Mr. Minister, was Alberta given the same opportunity as Ontario to reach an agreement prior to Monday, March 13?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite sure what agreement the hon. member is referring to.

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Minister, would you like this press clipping to supply the information?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Table it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member --

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is it your government's intention to place a moratorium on rents under which Alberta housing or the Alberta government is involved, similar to what the federal government has done where they are, for this year, not allowing any increases to senior citizens occupying that type of housing?

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, insofar as senior citizen accommodation is concerned within the province, of course those rents were set by Order-in-Council passed by the previous government, and certainly there is no intention by this government to increase those. As a matter of fact, I think it is probably common knowledge that we're bringing in legislation this spring which will withdraw the choice from our municipalities of imposing property taxes on such accommodations. So that is one positive move we are trying to take in order to keep the costs of accommodation down.

Insofar as the arrangements we may have under public housing programs are concerned, of course this is a three-government-level agreement and those are run by housing authorities throughout the province.

MR. DIXON:

I'd like to direct a supplementary question to the minister, it's regarding Baker House in Calgary. The rents have been increased there. Is the minister going to intercede on behalf of the residents there?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I haven't been asked to intercede, and presumably in that case that's an agreement reached between the federal and provincial governments. Now, when I hear more about it, that's something we could review, but this is the first I've heard about it.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Robin Hood Mills, Calgary

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of the Environment and it deals with the demolition of the Robin Hood Mills in Calgary. I brought to the minister's attention the matter of the pollution problem in that area and the minister had advised me --

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question, question.

MR. LUDWIG:

-- that he had given instructions to the contractor -- [Interjections] -- to see what he could do to abate the pollution. I wonder if the minister has

followed up his instructions to Johnson Terminals Ltd. to see if they are sprinkling the operation to keep down the dust problem in Calgary?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the department is certainly aware of the problem. They have inspected the situation and are keeping track of it quite adequately. The department has some very fine people working in it, and I am sure they can handle the problem.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I appreciate the fine people working in the department, but I am concerned about the minister's attitude. Has the contractor, in fact, sprinkled the operation to keep down the dust problem as the minister had advised it would do if the temperature goes above freezing?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the contractor was advised to use the spraying technique to keep the dust down if, in fact, it didn't present any difficulties with respect to subsequent freezing which would result in safety problems. But I am sure the matter is being discussed between the contractor and the department, and both are attempting to perform as adequately as they can under the circumstances.

MR. LUDWIG:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. When has the minister received a report on the site from his fine staff?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member is apparently ... I won't describe it for the moment.

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

Provincial Parks Rental Rates

MR. WYSE:

I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Is the provincial government increasing land rental rates in provincial parks this year -- or has it in the past few years?

DR. WARRACK:

The only land rented from provincial parks has to do with cottage subdivisions that exist in provincial parks, and in all instances cottage subdivisions that were there at the time the parks were established. There has been an adjustment with respect to those cottage rental rates to make it consistent with cottage rental rates on public lands generally. And that was not done this year, but last year.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question. In some cases could the rate be increased as high as 2,000 per cent, or has it been?

DR. WARRACK:

I don't know, Mr. Speaker, but I do know that on some of the cottage subdivisions they were paying as low as \$5 per year.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge East, followed by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

Agricultural Development Corporation

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. Is there any way of speeding the processing of applications for loans under The Agricultural Development Corporation?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, that particular problem has been under consideration by the department and we have put on additional staff to make sure that the applicants are aware of the situation and to get the applications through the counselling service. I would like to stress, Mr. Speaker, that The Agricultural Development Corporation has a limited amount of money to loan each year. One of the jobs of our staff is to direct the farmers in the various areas to take an overview of the various financial institutions and the availability of credit to them, rather than for the moment to try and satisfy the tremendous credit needs that are required in agriculture.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. minister would comment on the delays that appear to take place after approval and after it's sent to Treasury, and if this could be checked.

DR. HORNER:

I will be pleased to check that out, Mr. Speaker. Again I think that in a great number of cases the loans are those kinds of loans which have conditions attached to them. And sometimes in the ones that I have checked out, the conditions that have been attached haven't been followed through at the other end as well as the Treasury.

I'm sure the House will appreciate that these loans are loans in which we are trying in some cases, to salvage people for agriculture, or salvage a situation which is very difficult, and conditions have to be applied. But I am quite willing to check out with Treasury to try and speed up the whole process.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. What is the purpose of the local committees? Do they give the first screening to these applicants, or is it just for advice?

DR. HORNER:

They are advisory committees on all phases of agriculture and are appeal committees with regard to people who feel that they have been wrongfully dealt with by the board itself. It would be impractical and indeed not very feasible for the local committees to screen all of the loans. The other very prime reason for the committees is to deal with the federal small farms program which has been delayed because the Farm Credit Corporation refuses to do winter appraisals.

MR. D. MILLER:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, on this subject. I'd like to ask the hon. minister if it wouldn't expedite matters if the definition of a farmer was restated to make it more applicable and more realistic. Complaints have come from my constituency in this respect. They recommend that this change would be necessary.

DR. HORNER:

Well I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, if anybody is wise enough to come forward with a definition of a farmer that would be agreeable to all, I'd certainly appreciate it as well. Perhaps the Department of Municipal Affairs and several other institutions, including the Department of National Revenue, might be appreciative of a proper definition of a farmer. I think that each of these has to be another reason for the local committees -- that they should, in fact, have the final say as to who is a farmer in their area.

Again I want to stress that there have been a lot of applications made to The Agricultural Development Corporation by people who, in fact, in my view, should have gone to The Farm Credit Corporation or regular lending institutions.

We don't intend The Agricultural Development Corporation to become just another bank. If it does that it will have failed in its job of trying to do something in a very difficult area in agriculture.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister of Agriculture could advise the House how successful the farm development corporation has been in re-financing those loans under federal farm credit where foreclosure actions were taking place last year, as well as several actions taken by private mortgage and lending institutions?

DR. HORNER:

Well, as I have said before, Mr. Speaker, we're certainly looking at all of these, and where there is a possibility of making the situation viable we have gone to great length, particularly in the Peace River area, because of the successive years of difficulties experienced by farmers in that area. Naturally we haven't been able to satisfy everybody and probably never will, but we have been dealing with, and have developed a good relationship with the officials of The Farm Credit Corporation here in Alberta. They, of course, have to work within the Statutes of the House of Commons and the regulations as laid down by the federal government, but they have been very co-operative. I think the results will show that there have been fewer foreclosure actions going ahead. In addition to that, we have had discussions and are continuing to have discussions with the other private trust companies, particularly those involved in the foreclosure actions.

The entire matter of credit is under continuing review, and requires that continuing review if we are going to be able to take off the greatest production year in history in 1973.

MR. BUCKWELL:

I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker --

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the final supplementary on this topic?

MR. BUCKWELL:

-- to the Minister of Agriculture. I believe it was last year -- it may be while he was on this side of the House -- when asked would he give us a definition of farmer said "f-p-pooof, there is nothing to that." Would he please give us --

[Laughter]

MR. SPEAKER:

I wonder if the hon. member would spell that word for Hansard.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that the idea I was trying to stress to them when I was over there and they were over here was that they had to be much more flexible and start to put a little bit of initiative into agriculture, which they failed to do. That's why they are over there.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury, followed by the hon. Member for Vegreville.

Grazing Land

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Lands and Forests, and it deals with available grazing land. I would like to ask the minister if his department plans to give greater priority to local individuals when available grazing land is up for disposition?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that we do that now. But it is also fair to say this had been done prior to my assuming the office. I think the question really comes down to the matter of whether there would be a change in that regard and I must say that I think the policy of this emphasis by the previous government was a proper one and I intend to continue it.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question. Is the minister going to put greater emphasis on the fact that a local individual living in the area has need for that grazing lease when it is available? It is a matter of not continuing the emphasis, but greater emphasis so that local people have the opportunity to acquire the land.

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, I took it from the hon. member's remarks that he was dissatisfied with the degree of emphasis the previous government had put on this point.

MR. CLARK:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker. What is happening now?

DR. WARRACK:

There's that beautiful word 'now' again.

Yes, as a matter of fact I think it would be perfectly consistent with the progressive thrust of the Department of Agriculture and its outstanding minister to do just that. This would be, if anything, a change of policy in that direction.

MR. CLARK:

I'm not concerned about the progressive policy of the Minister of Agriculture, I'm worried about the slowness of the Minister of Lands and Forests in moving in that direction. It's your responsibility.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, the responsibility comes under the Minister of Lands and Forests because he is the minister.

DR. WARRACK:

That's why I answered.

MR. CLARK:

Are you going to move in that direction?

DR. WARRACK:

That's why I answered, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vegreville and that may conclude the question period.

Artificial Insemination Course

MR. BATIUK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Is it the minister's intention to continue the agricultural short courses on artificial insemination in the coming winter, due to the fact that a large number of applicants were not able to participate because of the large volume of applications?

[Laughter]

DR. HORNER:

I might say, Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. Member for Vegreville that we intend to continue the short courses in AI. I might say also to the Legislature generally that while this might be amusing on the surface, the matter of the production of semen is of very great importance to the Province of Alberta in that we are the leading producers in Canada and, in fact, export something in the neighbourhood of \$6 million worth and we expect that to go up substantially in the coming years. The main reason for that, of course, is that we have in Alberta perhaps the greatest genetic pool of semen of anywhere in North America.

MR. BATIUK:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. After my inquiry of the minister earlier this year, would the minister consider having his department absorb all or part of the registration fees for such courses?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, we are having a look at that in relation particularly to our young farmers who are developing beef herds, because the more upgrading we can do, the better cattle we are going to have and we will be able to maintain the very substantial position we have in regard to quality. So I can say to the hon. member, we are having a look at that to see whether or not we can provide some assistance through the Family Farm Division and my department.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I should wish to make a statement, this having to do with the unemployment circumstances in Alberta for February.

The Alberta unemployment rate of 5.6 per cent is the second lowest in Canada compared to Ontario's rate of 5.0 and compares favourably with the national average of 7.3 per cent. The February participation rate is high, the highest for that month since 1966, and the highest for all provinces in Canada. This is particularly important in view of the fact that the labour force is continuing to rise a great deal faster than the capacity of the nation to provide jobs. Along with the high participation rate of 59.5 per cent, employment has increased by 5,000 from 652,000 to 657,000. From January to February, while the total size of the labour force remained stable, the male labour force declined by 2,000 and the female labour force increased by 3,000.

Growth of employment for females was stronger than for men. Employment for females grew by 6,000, while employment for males remained stable. On a monthly basis the drop in unemployment appears to be evenly distributed between males and females and between younger and older age groups.

Employment in the agricultural sector remained relatively stable from January to February. On a yearly basis the rate of growth of the labour force is still high and employment is growing at a lesser rate.

I should like to give some more total figures with respect to the labour force, Mr. Speaker. The size of the labour force increased slightly from 695,000 people in January to 696,000 in February of 1973. The current figure represents an increase of about 39,000 over the recorded labour force in February of last year. Mr. Speaker, this is a particularly significant figure as the present labour force has increased nearly 40,000 over the same month a year ago.

The number of males in the labour force was 455,000, a decrease of 2,000 over the January figure of 457,000. During the same period the number of females in the labour force increased by 3,000 from 238,000 to 241,000. In terms of age the group from 14 to 24 years increased from 181,000 to 186,000. For the group 25 years and over, 511,000 persons were involved in the labour force as compared to 513,000 the previous month. The size of the "not in the labour force" group increased from 471,000 in January to 473,000 in February. One year ago the comparable statistic was 480,000.

Mr. Speaker, because unemployment is in many ways a national phenomenon with respect to mobility, I know that the Assembly and Albertans will be interested in the unemployment rates for provinces. For Canada, the unemployment rate for February was 7.3 per cent. In Quebec, it was 9.7 per cent and in Ontario, 5.0 per cent. As an aside, it is difficult to escape the

conclusion that the degree of industrial development in Ontario continues to be a factor. In British Columbia, the rate was 8.3 per cent and in Newfoundland, 16.2 per cent. There was no report this morning from Ottawa with respect to Prince Edward Island. Nova Scotia has a rate of 8.9 per cent; New Brunswick, 14.1 per cent; Manitoba, 5.6 per cent; Saskatchewan, 5.9 per cent; and Alberta, Mr. Speaker, 5.6 per cent.

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

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

With reference to the 1972 Priority Employment Program (PEP).

- (a) How many persons, without receiving any training under the program were provided with employment under the program?
- (b)
 - (1) How many persons were trained under the program?
 - (2) How many of the persons who received training under the program secured full time employment in the field of training taken under PEP?
 - (3) How many of the persons trained under the program secured part time employment in the field of training taken under PEP?
 - (4) How many of the persons trained under the program
 - (i) returned to their former jobs?
 - (ii) are still unemployed?
- (c) What was the total cost of the program during 1972?
 - (1) How much of this was for training purposes?

194. Mr. Barton asked the government the following question:

- (1) How many new provincial parks have been approved since September 10, 1971 to date?
- (2) How many old provincial parks were closed during the period September 10, to date?
- (3) What are the names of the new provincial parks which were opened?
- (4) What are the names of the provincial parks which were closed?
- (5) Was there correspondence or communications between the government and people or organizations in the vicinity of the closed parks, before they were closed?

196. Mr. Henderson asked the government the following question:

- (1) How much public money was paid out by the Department of Health and Social Development or the Department of Social Development for methadone drugs prescribed to patients by Dr. David Craig of Edmonton during the years 1970, 1971, 1972?
- (2) How much public money was paid out by the government or its boards or agencies for operation of the methadone clinics in Calgary and Edmonton during 1972?

197. Mr. Dixon asked the government the following question:

- (1) How many oil wells have qualified for the period October 15, 1972, to March 8, 1973, under the government's Drilling Incentive Program? If any, location of well and name of company or individual who made application for the drilling licence?
- (2) What are the proven reserves resulting from any discoveries since July 1, 1972, under the Drilling Incentive Program; the location and name of the new field or pool involved?

(3) How many drilling licences were issued for development wells during the period October 15, 1972, to March 1, 1973?

(4) How many licences issued for exploratory wells (new field wildcat wells) during the period October 15, 1972, to March 1, 1973?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to tabling a return for the Assembly.

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

187. Mr. Notley proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Clark:

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

All background information collected by the RCMP and received by the government on Al Burger of Faust, Alberta, Floyd Griesbach of Wabasca, Alberta, and Bruce Thomas of Slave Lake, Alberta.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, in continuing the debate in support of this motion that all background information collected by the RCMP and received by the government on Al Burger of Faust, Alberta, Floyd Griesbach of Wabasca, Alberta, and Bruce Thomas of Slave Lake, Alberta be tabled in this Legislature, this request to me, Mr. Speaker, is tantamount to a petition from the three men involved.

Rather than taking the petition route they are asking this Legislature, through this Order for a Return for the disclosure of their background files gathered by the police at the request of this government, that any suspicion and doubt cast upon them can be revealed in order that they may clear their names.

To me, Mr. Speaker, that is a reasonable, and I think, a request that is quite in order because we are concerned when our own personal character is involved and we are unable to defend ourselves without having all the facts. This is all these hon. gentlemen are asking, and it is their own request to this Legislature.

These men are appealing to this Legislature, the highest court in the province, to help them clear their names of doubt and suspicion that such an investigation has brought about. Mr. Speaker, they are asking for equality before the law. They broke no laws that required police action. They are asking this Legislature, as any other Alberta resident can do, to right a wrong this government has done to them.

Mr. Speaker, they are asking for justice and are entitled to be granted their request, even if it means embarrassment and loss of face by the government. A government who requests police investigation of people who have committed no crime, no criminal act, or broken any law is opening up the door that puts civil liberty in complete jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, it's the first step and a giant step towards the knock on the door in the middle of the night, which is the most feared action by people who are interested and concerned in maintaining liberty for everyone, and the maintenance of personal liberty.

Mr. Speaker, why would this government, which has made such an issue of its Bill of Rights, want to keep something confidential when the aggrieved parties are asking for the information to be made public in order to clear their names? Mr. Speaker, to me the most precious thing a man has is his good name. When a person's reputation is placed in question his natural reaction is immediately to use every effort to clear his name, especially when he has committed no crime.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier -- and I'm sorry he's not in his seat because I would have said it just as emphatically as I am saying it today -- has stated many times, both inside and outside this Legislature, that he believes there must be legislation to protect the people from the growing power of the state.

He has publicly complained that the people of Alberta have not grasped the importance of his Bill of Rights.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the events of the last few months by this government lead me to arrive at the conclusion the opposite is true. His government, his 'now' government, hasn't grasped the true meaning of its own Bill of Rights,

when they are denying these people who have been caught up in a police investigation when they have committed no crime. Surely to goodness the Bill of Rights should have some meaning, and they should be granted their request by this Legislature.

To me our Bill of Rights is more important than the federal Bill of Rights because we deal to a greater extent with property and civil rights within our province. The area of justice is a provincial right, as is health and education. The Motion for a Return asks that our Bill of Rights not only be passed but lived up to in the true spirit that it was intended to do.

Mr. Speaker, Al Burger, Floyd Griesbach, and Bruce Thomas, all residents of our province, are requesting this Legislature that justice not only be done but seem to be done. Our Bill of Rights is on trial today.

Let's uphold and support the legislation by supporting this Motion for a Return in order that these aggrieved residents may clear their names, and secondly, and probably the most important, that the present Alberta government can uphold its own Bill of Rights, ensuring justice for all, even with those with the government -- may disagree with the government.

Mr. Speaker, I can see no alternative than the members of this Legislature, if they believe in justice and freedom for all, would not support this motion, because the important part of this motion is not asking for confidential information on people who don't want it disclosed. This is a complete reversal. These are people, directly affected by the actions of this government, who had a police investigation called when no crime had been committed. And so, to these men, not only for themselves but to their families, we owe justice because their names have been held up to suspicion and doubt.

I don't think there has been an issue that has been more publicized than the Slave Lake issue. It was, unfortunately, an abridgement of the Bill of Rights, and by varying it or refusing to come forward with information, in my opinion, will only hurt this province, and hurt the cause about which this present government made so much in their own Bill of Rights.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge all hon. members to support this resolution in order that justice can be done in our province.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in support of the motion before the House at the present time.

I believe that the hon. members on this side of the House have made a very good case for tabling the information requested by the three gentlemen involved. It is not a case of someone wishing to table information while the parties concerned are opposed to it. It's with full permission in writing of those men who are involved and who want to have the suspicion that was placed over their position in the community, and over their names, removed.

I believe that we had got off to a good start on the situation when the Attorney General apologized, and made it clear that he made a mistake in judgment, and that it won't happen again.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that it will happen again now, with the pronouncements on the stance taken by the hon. members who came to the defence of the Attorney General. I don't believe that he appreciated this defence, but they came to his defence stating that the Attorney General ought not to have apologized. So we are not only defending the names of these three people, we are defending an important principle. Now that we have it from the hon. members opposite that they think nothing wrong was done, the battle for civil liberties for the provision of a proper Bill of Rights for this province and for showing some respect for the rights of others in the civil liberties area has to be fought for, and that is what the hon. members on this side are doing.

I thought that when the Premier got up and made a speech -- a rather fiery speech and pounded his chest and said he is proud of the Attorney General for apologizing, he would do it again if it happened -- we would have to -- if the same thing happened again, it is up to all of us in this House to ensure that it will not happen again, and if it does happen again, that whoever is responsible does not escape with impunity...

I was surprised at some of the remarks made by the hon. members opposite -- and I appreciate they may have been stirred by a bit of emotion -- wishing to defuse a situation that has developed and has certainly developed with a great

deal of embarrassment to the government, but instead they poured fuel to the fire and we are once more now fighting for what we believe we are entitled to defend.

I think the hon. member, the minister now, Mr. Farran, stated that the morale of the people is important. If the RCMP could not investigate and protect the people, then the morale of the public would be affected. I've never heard a more ridiculous argument in this House. When he states that three men can be investigated for no apparent reason -- there has been no reason given in this House, at least not an acceptable reason why they were, in fact, investigated -- because saying we wanted to know them better, Mr. Speaker, is not a reason. It's not a reason that we ought to accept, nor that the people will accept. No reason for justifying the investigation has been given and we can only conclude that if no reason is given, then the reason for investigating these men was political and none other. Of course, unless somebody comes up and convinces us that there was good reason...

So we are therefore not prolonging a political debate; we are fighting for a principle, a principle that was so greatly lauded in this House by the Premier and the hon. member, Mr. Ghitter, as something being historical in this province. I say there was considerable flag-waving by the hon. Premier and the hon. member, Mr. Ghitter, as to their thrust, as it were, in the field of civil liberties. And then the final blow was certainly brought home to the people in this province when the very people who made so many wonderful speeches in support of their human rights legislation -- and how this was new -- and it's a new era dawning upon Alberta -- and what happens? They demolished everything they stood for and lost the confidence of certainly the members on this side of the House, and the people of this province, by violating the very things they brought into legislation just such a short time ago -- and violated it as I said, Mr. Speaker, in more than one respect.

It would be different if this was inadvertent, or if they were really and truly repentant. But when we see almost -- almost with a flourish or a display of arrogance, they are saying, "Oh no, we didn't do wrong, it's right, we'll do it again." Then the fight is on, Mr. Speaker. And I think we can challenge the government to stand up and do the right thing this time. They must not place the confidentiality between the hon. Attorney General and his employees as being superior to the rights of the people who are involved in this particular issue.

I could say a lot in rebutting some of the arguments that were put forth, particularly by the hon. member, Dr. Paproski, but his remarks were hardly worth a rebuttal because I don't believe he meant what he said. If he read his remarks the next day, perhaps he should retract them. They were utterly and completely contrary to anything we believe so far as the rights of people are concerned in this province. I believe he simply did not know what he spoke about. I think that the matter of enforcement of law, respect for law and order, does not stop when we are dealing with the Bill of Rights and with human rights legislation, because that is, in fact, our paramount or supreme law in this province. So it is much more to the discredit of the government if they themselves violate the law they brought in than to have someone say that if the police are in any way criticized that they will be handicapped in enforcing the law in the province. That was nonsense, and, as I stated Mr. Speaker, those words were made by the hon. member Dr. Paproski, the hon. minister Mr. Farran, and the hon. member Mr. Ghitter in a vain attempt to support the very weak position of the minister with weak arguments.

And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we should all stand up unanimously and permit this motion to pass and help the people who requested that information be made available, help them to clear the situation they are in, and dispel the attitude that has prevailed in this province that the government is flouting the Bill of Rights and the human rights legislation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I listened with considerable interest to the comments made by the members opposite. I can readily appreciate, after hearing the comments, why the Premier chose the hon. Attorney General for his post, because he was obviously clearly the most competent of the people who spoke the other day. But

I do want to make just one quick observation with regard to the arguments presented by the hon. Member for Kingsway, because I find them rather frightening. In the March 8 edition of Hansard he is quoted on page 653 as saying:

To demand that this information is made public is to demand of the final judge of the Province of Alberta -- that is the Government of Alberta --

I will read that again, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is a rather frightening statement:

To demand that this information is made public is to demand of the final judge of the Province of Alberta -- that is the Government of Alberta --

Well, with great respect, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that the Government of Alberta is the final judge of Alberta.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. NOTLEY:

It seems to me that one of the reasons we passed the Bill of Rights in the first place was to protect individual citizens from excesses of government. Now I trust that the hon. member got carried away in the debate and that his statement does not in any way, shape, or form represent government policy. But it is nevertheless disturbing to hear that kind of comment made in a debate on a matter as important as this.

I must also say that I was rather astonished to hear the comments made by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, especially in view of the fact that he was the member who introduced Bill No. 2, a very important document and one which was supported by both sides of the House. I couldn't help being more than a little bit disturbed by the harshness of his speech. It is obviously ridiculous to equate the situation at Slave Lake with the needs and the requirements of dealing with organized crime. Equally unfortunate his choice of words -- such words as "draft dodgers" and "radicals". With great respect to the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, it is not a crime in this society to be a draft dodger nor is it a crime to be a radical.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. NOTLEY:

We are talking about individual rights. It occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, that that kind of language is clearly intemperate. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, I couldn't help thinking that Spiro Agnew would look like Martin Luther King by comparison to the hon. member's commitment to civil liberties.

The hon. minister Mr. Farran entered the debate, and I think that's perhaps the best comment I can make about his contribution.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed, agreed.

MR. NOTLEY:

Now, I do want to take a moment, however, to review the arguments presented by the hon. Attorney General, because while I differ quite sharply with him, I believe this Legislature at least has to respect the arguments that were submitted.

The first argument is the suggestion he makes -- and he uses the example of a minister and his deputy minister -- Mr. Speaker, while that might be a legitimate argument, we are not asking, in this Motion for a Return, for any information of an interdepartmental nature at all. We're not asking for the conversations the Attorney General may have had with his deputy attorney general. We are simply asking for the background information collected by the RCMP on three individual Albertans. So I think to confuse what is an interdepartmental matter with a request for information gathered by an outside agency is, in fact, to miss the point of the Motion for a Return.

Secondly, the Attorney General attempted to make the argument that in order to make it possible to obtain information throughout the province, some confidentiality had to be maintained, otherwise people giving information wouldn't give it, whether it be to civil servants, or to the police, or anyone else. However, I submit with great respect to the Attorney General, he himself refuted this argument when he stated in the Question Period a few days ago that if a minister were going to act on a matter in a way that was prejudicial to an individual, he owed it to that individual to disclose that information so the individual could then try and correct the information, or at least check the information. Well, if the information in that documentation is of any value at all, it's obviously going to provide the background on who supplied it. So therefore it seems to me it would be impossible to retain the confidentiality the Attorney General talks about in his speech on Thursday, if in fact there is going to be any disclosure, at any point, to anyone.

The final concern I have, Mr. Speaker, is with respect to two answers that were given, one by the hon. Minister Without Portfolio, Mr. Adair, on February 19, 1973. It was with respect to a question I posed in the Legislature initially to the Attorney General, and he referred it to Mr. Adair. Mr. Adair says, and I quote:

In relation to the gentleman from Wabasca, the Wabasca Logging Co-op is the one I was reviewing. I was aware he was involved in that one at some time previously.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General also makes the same general argument on page 117 of Hansard on February 20, 1973. The Attorney General is quoted as saying:

There is another co-operative in the area in which another of the gentlemen involved has played a prominent part, and for which the prior administration guaranteed a loan of something in the order of \$600,000.

In other words, both the Minister Without Portfolio, Mr. Adair, and the Attorney General made it pretty clear that the gentleman from Wabasca, Mr. Griesbach, was in fact, involved in some way with the Wabasca logging co-op. Obviously this is information that must have been presented to them as a result of the RCMP background file. I have no reason to disbelieve either minister. However, Mr. Speaker, I think I should point out to members of the House there is at least some evidence to indicate that background information is incorrect. I have a letter from Mr. Greistach, and he says:

Dear Mr. Notley:

The fact that Mr. Adair says in Hansard that I was connected with the Wabasca logging co-op...which is wrong...

and he supplies me with a background of his employment record dating from 1933 until 1972. While he was in the Wabasca area in 1968 and 1969 as a community development officer, Mr. Griesbach's claim is that he was not connected with that logging co-op. He also makes the same claim in a postscript, Mr. Speaker, in the letter that I tabled on Thursday of last week.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am a little concerned that two ministers of the Crown may be making decisions on the basis of information which may, in fact, not be accurate.

I think I should point out, for the information of the members of this House, that Mr. Griesbach has had really quite an outstanding record. For some eight years he was the national secretary of Canada's Farm Radio Forum. He has had experience in a number of areas, especially in the whole field of agriculture, and has been active in the United Farm Young People of Ontario, the County Federation of Agriculture in Simcoe County, a member of the Ontario Royal Commission on Agriculture, appointed by the government of George Drew. This is hardly the kind of dangerous radical that the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo inferred.

Mr. Speaker, because this matter is one which has disturbed many Albertans, because there is considerable evidence to indicate that the government may not be aware of all the facts, I would ask the government to reconsider their position, not to look at this from the viewpoint of a partisan confrontation between the government on one hand and the members of the opposition on the other. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the question of civil liberties is clearly at stake in this issue.

I would hope that members will consider just how important it is that this matter be cleared up, that the air be cleared, that the reputation of these three individuals be vindicated beyond any question, and in the process, Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that we would do a great deal to clear the air as far as the government is concerned too.

So I would hope that the members opposite will support this resolution. It is presented out of genuine concern for the individual liberties of three Albertans, three Albertans about whom we all should be concerned.

[The motion was defeated.]

188. Mr. Cooper proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Wyse:

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 ministers, departments, agencies, or boards, evaluating The Priority Employment Program for the fiscal years 1971-72 and 1972-73.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I notice the hon. member, Dr. Hohol, is not in his place and he is responsible for The Priority Employment Program. Would the members agree to have this stand until he is back?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

189. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Dixon:

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 ministers, departments, agencies or boards, with regards to the impact of the Alberta Opportunity Company on rural Alberta.

[The motion was carried.]

191. 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:

All correspondence during December of 1972 between the Government of Alberta and the Japanese Trading Company from Vancouver, regarding the sale of over one million pounds of honey belonging to The Peace River Honey Producers Co-operative of Alberta.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, just to show the purpose of the tabling of the letter and the necessity for the Return, I would like to read a brief letter from Mitsubishi Canada Limited to myself re honey.

Many thanks for your kind arrangements in introducing us to Mr. Gerry Hackey of The Peace River Honey Producers Co-op Ltd. in Fahler, Alberta.

I thought you might be interested to know that through your good offices we were able to purchase all of the honey which the above organization had available.

Signed by the Assistant to the President of Mitsubishi Canada, and I will table this in response to Motion 191.

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it that since the Motion has already been complied with, it isn't necessary to put the motion, but if the House wishes me to put it I shall.

MR. DIXON:

I would like to look at the letters because I asked for the December -- I am anxious to find out about this 48 hour honey sale. I don't want to be denied my right to come back on the motion if the information is not to my satisfaction.

DR. HORNER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I responded to the motion as it was placed on the Order Paper. It said, all correspondence during December of 1972 and I have tabled the correspondence for December, 1972. I thought it was good enough for the House to hear and so I read it.

MR. SPEAKER:

If there is any doubt about it and the motion isn't being withdrawn, if the House is ready for the question I will put the question.

[The motion was carried.]

192. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Hinman:

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

The environmental guidelines given Syncrude for the development of the Alberta tar sands.

[The motion was carried.]

195. Mr. Ruste proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Strom:

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

A copy of the study, or studies, completed by the Government of Alberta, its departments, ministers, agencies or boards which analyse the across-the-board price increase in gasoline, oils and fuels in terms of the effect of such increases on the farming industry.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, with due regard to the hon. member, he had a previous Motion that already dealt with this matter some time ago. I don't know whether the House wants to have the same kind of Motion continually placed on the Order Paper, but we are in the process of preparing the answer to the previous Motion, and this is a duplication. I suggest very sincerely that it be withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. Deputy Premier able to refer to the number of the previous motion?

DR. HORNER:

I don't have the Hansard.

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, it is 182.

MR. SPEAKER:

Well at the moment I am not able to say just how identical these two motions may be. Perhaps the mover of the Motion might wish to consider whether he wishes it to be dealt with, or wishes to let it stand over until he can see whether the previous motion covers the necessary territory.

MR. RUSTE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, would you just let it stand for the time being and we will check that?

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it the House agrees to the suggestion by the hon. Member for Wainwright.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I want to raise another particular problem in relation to a number of these motions and make it perfectly clear to the House that motions requiring interdepartmental memos will, in fact, not be tabled because it is not the custom to do so. I particularly refer to No. 195. With regard to interdepartmental memos or some other motions that have already been passed, it must be very clear that interdepartmental memos are not required to be tabled and will not be tabled in response to these motions.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order on that. I think if the hon. Deputy Premier and yourself, sir, would check the Votes and Proceedings of this House in earlier years, you would find that in 1970-71 there was interdepartmental correspondence and there is record of it, and Motions for Returns in this House approved to clearly establish there is a precedent in this House in that regard. The Motions for Return were placed on the Order Paper by some of the gentlemen seated opposite and I would suggest, sir, that it isn't a case of checking the transcripts, it is a case of simply looking at the Motions for Return recorded in the Votes and Proceedings of this House.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, with due deference to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and he can stretch a point any time he likes to try and make his point -- but Beauchesne very specifically states that interdepartmental memos are privileged information and shall not be tabled in response to a Motion for a Return. To suggest that we are going to get into the kind of things the hon. leader is talking about is just not so. Otherwise each one of these motions will have to be amended.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker on speaking to the point of order. Beauchesne takes precedence in this House, except where this House determines otherwise. I bring to the attention of the Chair that there is a precedent in this regard, and I would simply quote Sessional Paper No. 113 from the year 1971.

It's a motion proposed by Mr. Hyndman, seconded by Dr. Horner that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

1. A copy of the edict of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, dated on or about December 2, 1970, and directed to certain civil servants prohibiting communication by them with the public and prohibiting them from answering questions posed by citizens concerning pollution and environment in general and the Peace-Athabasca Delta, in particular.
2. A list of the names of the civil servants who requested the hon. minister to issue the said edict.

The reply -- a copy of a memorandum dated November 18, 1971 and the answer to the second part: "No civil servant asked for said information."

This is recorded in the Votes and Proceedings of this particular Assembly and as such establishes a precedent that takes priority over Hansard, or over Beauchesne, Mr. Speaker --

DR. HORNER:

No way.

MR. HENDERSON:

-- And the suggestion by the hon. Deputy Premier that all of sudden the rules of Beauchesne are sacred and this House is not a master unto itself is completely out of order and incorrect, because this House in the past has set this precedent and the evidence of it is recorded in the Votes and Proceedings.

I suggest that rather than render a decision at this point, the Chair should take the matter under advisement and examine the record. Because the record is there, the precedent is there, and Beauchesne is not applicable because of those particular precedents.

DR. HORNER:

Absolute nonsense, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows it. The particular document he refers to was a public document by the time we asked for it, because it had been well circulated by the civil servants who had received it and objected to it, and they made it public themselves. That isn't a precedent for anything. Those are the facts of the matter.

MR. HENDERSON:

A point of order. What goes on outside this Assembly has nothing to do with Motions for a Return ordered inside this Assembly and approved by this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. Opposition Leader permit the hon. Deputy Premier to finish his remarks on the point of order?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is again wrong, and I suggest he return to his studies of the rules of procedures so he will know what is going on. The facts of the matter are, as I've outlined them, that the document he refers to as setting some sort of precedent was a public document at the time. It was no longer interdepartmental because the civil servants who had received it objected to it and made it public. Mr. Speaker, that is really not the point that I wish to make other than to fill in a little history and educate my hon. friends a little bit.

The point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is whether or not the government of the day produced an interdepartmental memo doesn't break the rule that they should not be ordinarily produced on a routine Motion for a Return. That's the point I wish to make very clearly that, in fact, on a routine Motion for a Return -- and I want the House to be aware of this -- we have no intention of producing interdepartmental memos in relation to these Motions for a Return. In some of these motions where no studies are being done the answer will simply be that there are no studies.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the point of order I believe that we have just witnessed one of the best arguments and the best defences for closed government in this province that we have ever had.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to allow that to go by either, because the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View has shown his ignorance of the rules of this Legislature for some time. The point I am making is simply that we have to have some ground rules established in regard to these Motions for a Return very frankly, Mr. Speaker, because of the actions of the Member for Calgary Mountain View.

We, as a government, are not saying for a moment that we won't publish reports that should be published, but if we expect to get that kind of unbiased and objective support from our civil servants -- and that's the whole thing behind the question of interdepartmental memos -- then they have to know that they are going to be privileged and they can put their opinion and their ideas forth in a real manner. Otherwise you undermine the entire ability of the civil service to serve their ministries. That's the important point, Mr. Speaker, and not the gobbledgook the Leader of the Opposition has been talking about.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, the reason I rose to my feet on the matter was that the Deputy Premier was quoting Beauchesne, and I'm simply pointing out that our precedents on this particular matter in the House take priority over Beauchesne. I can't quote the other incident, where there was a motion approved asking for inter-departmental correspondence. It was passed, approved by this House, and is on record in the Votes and Proceedings. But I would be pleased to dig it out and provide it to the Chair.

If the government chooses to simply say "no", they are not making the information available. That's their prerogative. But that was not the subject of debate so far as I am concerned on the point of order. It was the fact that there is a precedent before the House. The argument that it's public information because the minister says it was available outside the House is basically hearsay and absolutely irrelevant insofar as the Motion for a Return ordered by this Assembly is concerned.

But, Mr. Speaker, the basic question is that there is a precedent in this House for making the information available and if the government chooses to say "no", fine. We are quite prepared to let the matter be determined by a vote of the House. But we are not prepared to accept the argument that the rules of Beauchesne are applicable, because clearly there are precedents in this House which indicate that they are not applicable in this particular matter.

MR. SPEAKER:

There appear to be two points of contention before the House at the moment. One is whether or not the rules of the House may be amended by a single, or two or three precedents. The other is, to what extent we are going to go in applying the Orders which are made as a result of Motions for a Return.

With regard to the example which the hon. Leader of the Opposition has cited, I haven't had a chance to check the example although we have it out here on the table. But subject to further consideration of the point, I would have to say that a mere departure from the rules, if such this might have been, or was, cannot of itself amend the rules. The rules must be amended in a more formal fashion than that.

And referring to Beauchesne, it's pretty well enshrined in the practice of this House because it is formally adopted and incorporated into the rules of the House by reference in Rule 1.

Now with regard to the production of confidential or intra-governmental or intra-departmental papers, it is quite difficult and at times impossible for the Chair to determine whether, in a given motion, papers which are requested are of a confidential nature.

Some of the motions are worded very broadly and again, subject to further consideration, it would be the respectful suggestion of the Chair that in such instances, if the government, knowing what the direction of the motion is, is of the opinion that the papers are confidential, then the government may make that known, may defeat the motion if it wishes, or in some other way deal with that aspect.

If we are going to adopt this kind of principle routinely, then it would be the respectful suggestion of the Chair that the House might wish to consider an amendment to the rules, making an exception for documents which are of a confidential nature.

In regard to the motion which is now before the House, it was impossible for the Chair to say whether or not it involved the production of confidential documents, and if such be the case, I would assume that it is open to the government to object to the motion by the means at its disposal.

DR. HORNER:

On Motion 195, I think we have agreed to allow it to stand so the hon. member can consider whether or not he is duplicating the motion. I brought the other matter up on a point of order for clarification because I think there has been some confusion in relation to Motions for a Return.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, another point of order. I would suggest that there is no similarity between Motion for a Return No. 195 and 182. No. 182 is dealing with diesel. No. 195 is dealing with gasoline, oils and fuels.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Just like beer and ale.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, now I know why the farmers of Alberta suffered so long -- because my hon. friends over there don't appreciate that when you're talking about farm fuels, you're talking about gasoline and diesel fuel -- both of them -- and in the statement I made that my hon. friend from Wainwright is trying to get the background information, I refer to both diesel and gasoline.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. When the hon. minister has no arguments he starts to get personal.

He's almost like the preacher, when he hasn't got a sound argument then he starts to yell and pound his rostrum. Well, if the hon. minister wants some other differences in these two resolutions, if he wants an interpreter to help him understand them, I don't mind going to two or three other points. No. 182 is asking for the calculations done by the Department of Agriculture. Now I don't know, maybe you don't want me to educate the hon. Deputy Premier, I don't know.

MR. SPEAKER:

The realm of education is at the moment in more competent hands than mine. But to come back to the motion which is presently before the House, there is not clearly, in the opinion of the Chair, such an identity between those two motions -- at least it isn't apparent to the Chair at the present time -- that the second one should be ruled out of order because 182 was agreed to on March 6. And I would suggest, therefore, that any objections which there might be with regard to confidentiality or duplication might be dealt with in the course of debate, if any, on Motion No. 195.

MR. HENDERSON:

Well, Mr. Speaker, is the motion going to stand, or are we going to proceed with it at this time?

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion is before the House and the mover if he wishes to debate the motion, may proceed to do so.

MR. RUSTE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, in light of the discussion we have had, I ask that the motion stand. That is my understanding.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

So, as the Chair understands it, Motion No. 195 will remain on the Order Paper pending the hon. member's opportunity to study the Return which is filed to Motion 182.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. Before we leave this particular part of the Order Paper, I beg the attention of the Chair. Motion for Return No. 147, which was not disposed of, has been left off the Order Paper, and it

concerns the tabling of documents pertaining to the Alberta Resources Railroad and the board of directors. The way it stands at the moment, is that the Chair had received an amendment from the minister, Mr. Peacock, and it said there was some question as to whether the amendment was in order, and was to take the matter under advisement. The next two times the matter came up, the minister was out of the House and it has been left off the Order Paper, and I would ask the Chair to take it under examination.

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it should go back on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER:

Motion No. 147 then will be restored to the Order Paper and if the Chair recalls correctly, there is the re-drafting of an amendment outstanding, with regard to that motion.

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. Mr. Zander proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Trynchy:

Be it resolved that the government give consideration to changes in The Big Game Act and Hunting Regulations in order to halt the rapid decline of our moose and elk population by prohibiting the carrying of unsealed firearms in commercial and service vehicles in the green areas except during hunting season.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, for some time now the residents and other people in the province of Alberta have been concerned about the rapid decline of moose and elk in District No. 5 and south in the related areas, to the border south of us.

Perhaps there are many reasons why the decline of moose and elk has occurred, but primarily the decline of the elk. I am referring to the government survey that was done about four years ago in the foothills area of the province of Alberta. They stated at that time that a herd existed of something like 2,000 elk in that one area. Today, taking the same survey, it indicates that the population of elk in that area has dropped to an alarming low of some 700 head in that one particular area.

Not many years ago, not too many, Mr. Speaker -- and I may say that I love to hunt when I get time -- we were able to see numbers of elk in herds of somewhere around 10, 12, 40, and 50 in one area. Today, this survey shows, and I am not quarrelling with it, but I do believe it's wrong, that there are approximately 8 head per square mile. Now I think perhaps that was a misquote because it is about 3 to a township.

I have discussed this area with the registered trapline holders in that area, the outfitters and the people who are engaged in hunting there, and we find that the decline has occurred perhaps at the same time that the oil industry moved within that area.

In area No. 5, which comprises most of my constituency to the west, the oil industry has established gravelled roads which serve perhaps two oil sites in a battery on the same quarter section. We find that we have about eight oil wells or leases to a mile.

Now what has happened; I have discussed this with the oil industry, they have prohibited, they have absolutely refused to let any employee of theirs carry any firearms in their own vehicles while they are on the job. And I think this is commendable because they realize, too, that something must be done to preserve our elk and moose population in the area.

But the problem arises where service vehicles, sub-contractors over whom the companies have no jurisdiction, carry as many as three rifles or guns in their truck and they carry them 365 days of the year. It is a temptation, and I think maybe as a hunter it is sometimes a greater temptation, when an elk appears on a lease road, and you have the gun in the vehicle and it's there for a purpose to kill, I think he will do it.

My only concern is also that these vehicles are radio-equipped. And one only has to watch to see that in whatever area they may be, if an animal happens to be noticed by any employee in one of those commercial vehicles, they radio,

and I am told by people who know and are also concerned, any vehicles within the area come to help to get this animal.

Now if this is the intention of carrying these weapons in these service vehicles, I think the animal that shows up on any lease road, hasn't any more chance than a soldier had in Vietnam because of all the sophisticated machinery available to kill this animal. I think we have to take steps as a government to try and protect, by whatever means we have to save the elk and moose population in the area.

I spoke to the wildlife officers, I spoke to the forest service branch out in the area, and they agree that the decline has come about drastically since about 1969. If we continue on -- in fact one of the rangers remarked -- if we continue in the direction we are going today, if we are not going to try and conserve the wildlife in the area, he said, within a few years we will resort to rationing or draws to permit a person to go out hunting for elk or moose.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.]

The biologists tell us that there is a conception rate, Mr. Speaker, of about 80 per cent in our wildlife, although the very contrary argument exists between the outfitters, they claim that all the females, or most of the females, that have been shot in the area were not pregnant and were dry cows. Now if 80 per cent of the female population were -- in moose and elk we presume they have twins -- if this were the case, in the fall or during the summer, our wildlife officers or our forestry officers should be able to ascertain the number that are available in the area.

Mr. Speaker, I'm really concerned, also, about the herd that was in the Brosseau Valley Flats, which is the breeding area of the elk in that area. One of the wildlife officers told me that in that same area there were about 27 head of elk, and a group of our native people pulled in there, and when they were through, there weren't any left.

Now, if we consider, if the biologists are right and the people in the field are wrong, then perhaps the one thing we should do is to send the biologists out into the field to bring in here some of these people who know what they are talking about.

I have an article, Mr. Speaker, that I don't agree with, and this comes from our chief wildlife officer. He said that there are anti-hunters. This was in the Journal on Thursday, January 16, written by Gary Cooper. It seems to me that the anti-hunter feeling -- anyone who doesn't want to kill an animal is considered an anti-hunter -- I've hunted for many years, Mr. Speaker, but never in all my life have I read an article such as that issued on Thursday, January 16 in The Edmonton Journal. I can't agree with it, because I, as a hunter, want to see that my neighbour or anyone else is able to hunt if he wishes to do so. But when we permit the shooting of cows, especially the female elk, when we are at a low ebb in the elk population, it certainly concerns me and concerns the people in my area; unless we put some regulations in the game regulations and in the Act.

Mr. Speaker, frankly, I agree that some years ago when the elk were sufficient in population that they could be hunted -- back in about 1946 and 1947 -- no one was permitted to shoot a female elk and only a bull elk after he registered eight points. I know it is very hard for a provincial government to prepare regulations to suit all occasions, but nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the concern expressed by people in my area, and not only in my area but throughout the province, is that somewhere we must stop the rapid decline of our big game population in the West.

Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting to note the elk population, at least the big herds, exists almost exclusively south of Whitecourt -- to the border to the south. We find the industry is encroaching upon the green areas, and there is almost wanton killing done by these people who carry firearms 365 days of the year in their trucks.

I know there are farmers -- and I was concerned about this in preparing the resolution -- that I did not mention farm trucks, because no farmer in his sane mind, who has grazing areas in the green areas, is going to go out with a rifle unless it is to protect his cattle from being molested by bears or wolves.

Mr. Speaker, there are perhaps difficulties in preparing regulations, but sometimes these difficulties can be overcome, perhaps by the complete removal of the cow elk from the regulations for 1973-74, or maybe also by removing the cow moose from the same regulations. Now it may be possible that in game area No. 1

it can be permitted that both female and male moose can be taken. But certainly I would say that south of Whitecourt and to the area south to the international border, Mr. Speaker, we should prohibit the taking of the female species of both moose and elk.

And also perhaps we should look at shortening the time -- we open the season now on September 15 at about the same time as the mating season for moose and elk. Certainly a farmer would not turn his bulls out on the range and then harass them with all types of vehicles and rifle fire while the mating season is on.

I think these are some of the areas, Mr. Speaker, that we have to consider. If not, we are going to be rationed or we are going to be on a lottery system in our selection of who shall hunt and at what price we shall hunt in the future. Thank you.

MR. TRYNCHY:

Mr. Speaker, in seconding this resolution I would like to bring to the House a few points which the hon. Member for Drayton Valley did not present.

I think this resolution is a good one, but I believe there are two parts to it and I would like to speak first to the second part -- banning guns in commercial vehicles. In my discussion with the wildlife officers and the people in my area of Whitecourt this has been quite a problem. I have before me the front page of the Whitecourt Star, dated March 7, with a picture of a moose shot along the roadside and left there. And the saying is:

The senseless waste of one of this area's major resources was found on the weekend, when this cow moose was spotted near the Mobile Oil Road, with its throat slit but not gutted. Local Fish and Wildlife officials refuse to comment.

In the last few days, Mr. Speaker, I have checked with the wildlife officials in Whitecourt. They have no doubt that this animal was shot by an oil worker going to work, packing a rifle in his vehicle. This is something that has been going on for quite a few years, and it seems to create a problem -- and I have noticed this before -- you drive down the street in Whitecourt and you look in the back window of a half ton and there's a gun rack there -- there's two or three guns. You see these trucks in front of the bar and I am sure that when they go home and see a moose or a deer or any animal go across the road, it is just pretty darn handy to grab the rifle and shoot it. I think this restriction should be placed, but I have some doubts, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to say why I have these doubts. It could affect people that should be packing rifles, and I refer back to a case that happened in my constituency. This is also in the green zone, where we had wolves bothering some cattle. I had one person in the green zone who lost 27 head of cattle because of wolves. Now I would hate to see this gentlemen not being able to pack a rifle to protect what is rightfully his. In the long run this gentlemen had to move his cattle out of the [Inaudible] back home, the wildlife officers brought in some specialists who got rid of the wolves, and this is one of the ways that this could affect the farmer or rancher who must have protection.

I think forestry should work with the game officers more closely than they have in the past. This is something that hasn't been done too effectively in the past, and I hope it will improve.

Another thing we should do is have hunter-training schools. In the Whitecourt constituency a few years ago hunters out in the bush shot a man sitting in a yellow Department of Highways truck on a highway and killed him. Now I really don't see how this could be allowed to happen if we have some rules. It wasn't a minister, no.

There is another thing that I would like to see changed, and now I am going to speak on the first part where it says: "In order to halt the rapid decline of our moose and elk population." I really believe that the season is too long. I believe that a season from November 1 to December 20, a season of six or seven weeks, is long enough. Firstly, in the September months there is no snow. I have seen a lot of hunters come back and say, "I shot a moose but I couldn't track him, so he was gone." I have seen hunters come back after a real hot day, and the meat was spoiled. So what good is this to us? I don't think we should be hunting in the rutting season. I don't think that is sportsmanship. I think that is just plain murder.

I would like to go on further, Mr. Speaker, and talk for a brief moment about Canadian hunters. I would like to suggest that we get better information to them. I have a case here that happened this fall. It was in the Edmonton

Journal. I think every hon. member has probably seen it -- they have changed the name of Whitecourt to Kangaroo Court. And really, there are two sides to this story. But I really believe that we should get information to these hunters when they come in so they know what they are doing, and also we should provide the hunters with guides, not no. 2 guides, but a real specialist guide that will show them what they have to wear. Furthermore, we should stick to the regulations of two hunters to one guide.

I would like to say that if this continues we might have to go to a draw system, because the game is not there. I have talked with many hunters in my area and have hunted there myself for a number of years, and I might say that in the last three years I haven't shot any game. Maybe I didn't know where to go or they heard me coming, but the game is not there, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to read a report on a fish and game meeting in Whitecourt. There were a number of people present, and this is what they had to say on non-resident aliens. They say:

Non-resident aliens should be compelled to hunt under a licensed outfitter employing only Class "A" guides. It is felt that this would benefit outfitters financially as they cannot compete against the Class "B" guide who in most instances is not a qualified guide. The non-resident alien should be made to show confirmation of his booking before being issued a hunting licence, and that he must obtain this licence through the Fish and Wildlife offices. It is felt that by this method a control would be placed on non-resident alien hunters. If this system is not practicable it is then felt that the non-resident alien should be placed on a draw system for moose, elk, et cetera hunting, and limit the amount of hunters.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Drayton Valley talked about the hunting of natives in our province. This is something that is a federal problem which we cannot control, but I would like to bring to the House some points and figures and facts on what this is doing to wildlife in our province. I know we can't control it but I think we must move in this direction.

In 1972 there were 5,300 moose licences issued to the hunters of Alberta; approximately 19,000 moose were shot. There are 29,000 Treaty Indians in Alberta and they shot a little over 8,000 moose. But the thing that really disturbs me -- and I might say that according to facts and figures one moose is enough food for two people for one winter -- is that in central Alberta the licenced hunters shot 6,000 moose, yet a group of Treaty Indians amounting to less than 650 in this tribe shot over 4,000 moose. Now this is quite a figure. If you just figure this out, what are they doing with the moose? I really do not object to hunting by the Indians if it's for their purpose, but 4,000 moose for this amount of Indians does not show me where they can use this for their own consumption.

Furthermore, in the reports that I have, if this continues, the harvest of these animals will far exceed the production. In January, 1973 in the Rocky Mountain House area, in 25 days one Indian shot 43 animals. In the Frog Lake area there is no hunting for white people, yet the Indians are free to hunt and they are exterminating the game. What I think we should really do is not take away the rights of the Treaty Indians but we should have a system set up where they have to apply for a licence and once this licence is filled they could come back and get another one at no cost, but in that way we can monitor the killing and the wildlife management in Alberta.

I have an article here from the Drayton Valley paper showing a cow moose shot with her twin calves lying unborn beside her and it says, "Example of game and hide-a-ways by one band of Indian hunters." It continues, "It's a shameful waste of game." It goes on to say that one Indian family from Hobbema took out five moose in as many days. Now that's over two tons of meat. But what really concerns me is that the tribe in Hobbema also has a tannery for moose hides yet these moose hides are left out in the field to rot.

They also go on to say that the Indians do not follow the game once it is wounded. The statement here says that there is a witness in a case where wounded game had not been tracked more than 200 yards off the road before the chase was abandoned. This gentleman actually followed the tracks. So there again we have some waste.

As I said before, Mr. Speaker, restrictions on moose hunters, such as limiting all-terrain vehicles, the number of tags and eliminating the cow season are of debatable value if other groups of Indians maintain unlimited kills.

Another group of 8,200 Indians moved off a reservation in the foothills and harvested an average of two to three big game animals every day all last winter. That amounts to 450 moose during the course of a winter. There again, I can see no reason why all these moose have to be shot if it's not for their own consumption.

We'll go to a case in the antelope season; 57 antelope were checked out by one Indian party of six treaty Indians in two trucks on opening day of the season. Thirty-five elk out of a herd of sixty were taken by one Indian. Forty moose were taken by Indians along six miles of road in Cold Lake.

Mr. Speaker, I really believe we have to move in this direction. I know it is a federal matter, and I just want to point out that our government should get together with the federal people and see if rules can be changed so we can monitor the kill and improve hunting for all Albertans. Thank you.

[Mr. Drain and Mr. Ho Lem stood up.]

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker --

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I believe Mr. Ho Lem has it.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to make comments on the debate regarding the resolution because I am sincerely interested in the conservation of wildlife in Alberta. When I first saw the resolution it occurred to me that perhaps it was made for two reasons. One reason, possibly, was the genuine concern of the mover and the seconder with regard to the rapid decline of the moose and elk population in Alberta, and secondly, they could possibly be members of that large group of people who year after year buy a big game license for \$5, plus the \$3 wildlife certificate. They then proceed on a nice Saturday afternoon into the woods in search of deer, elk, moose and so on. Year after year, of course, they come back with an empty bag. This, indeed, would be very, very frustrating and so on.

Now I suppose that after many years of such exercises it would become indeed discouraging and frustrating. Over the years I have seen many hunters, supposedly hunters in Alberta, employing various methods in hunting big game. You can classify them in various categories: the first category, sniffers; the second one, spitters; the third one, trackers; the fourth, blowers; and then finally, the sitters.

Let me give you an explanation of these categories. The first ones, the sniffers, are the ones who go into the woods, look for animal droppings and then proceed to smell the droppings, and so on, to find out the freshness of the manure. They think that if the odour is strong then, of course, the game must be very close at hand.

The spitters, on the other hand, are the ones who spit on the finger and raise it in the air to find out which way the wind is blowing. Once that is determined, they walk against the wind to make sure the animal will not get wind of the human scent -- rather, they would get the animal scent first. These hunters are classified as the spitters.

Now, the trackers. The trackers are the group that goes into the forest to look for tracks. First of all, they have to determine what type of tracks they are. I have known a hunter who tracked an animal for days, and finally when he caught up to it he found that it was a cow. The other type of trackers are those who go in circles, because first of all the animal is very, very smart. They form a circle and finally, as the procedure goes, they find that the animal is actually tracking the hunter because of the circular motion.

Now the fourth category is the group they call the blowers. These are the people who indicate to their families that they would like to have a moose horn for hunting season. They get it at Christmastime, and right away they proceed to practice on the horn. They accomplish many things, including blowing various tunes. Some of them are even able to blow 'God Save the Moose' to the tune of our national anthem. They expect when they go into the field that once they blow the horn they will be surrounded by a bevy of bull moose.

Finally, you come to the sitters. This is the group that drives down the highway and sees a big sign which says, "Beware, drive carefully, moose crossing road". We've seen these signs in Alberta -- deer crossing the road. So what do they do? They gather the cars and they get very comfortably located and they sit. And this is a group you really have to be quite cautious about, because they are well fortified. They are well fortified to protect themselves from the elements and they bring certain refreshments along to make sure they keep warm.

Now I wonder, if by some quirk of fate any one of these categories was suddenly confronted, face to face, with a moose -- I wonder who would be more surprised, or more frightened, and more disorganized -- would it be the moose or the hunter? I would have my money on the hunter.

Now talking seriously about the moose population, I'm told research indicates that in Alberta presently there are between and 300,000 to 400,000 moose. Breaking it down on a per capita basis, we find there is one moose for every four citizens; reduce that to adults and also to the adult population, and we find that there is one moose for each male adult. So I would ask the question, what are the desired criteria? What are we striving for? Are we striving for more moose per capita? Where is the happy level of our moose population? I would have liked to have heard from the proposer of the motion a schedule -- or a record of the general decline of the moose population over the past ten years -- of moose taken by hunters each year.

Of course we must also consider the other factor, the decline of the moose population due to things other than the human element. How about the predators -- the cougars, bears, wolves -- especially when they prey on the young calves? Is consideration given to the lack of pasture from time to time? This affects the population of the moose. And what about the natural death due to old age and other factors? What is the present life span of a moose? Does it stay between eight to ten years, or is this figure now coming down because of the various hazards? Has consideration been given to the study of the animal growth cycles in our province? Does the 12 year cycle still hold true, reaching a point of high population every 12 years? I would like to see the department responsible for wildlife in Alberta develop and expand on the same principle as Ducks Unlimited. Perhaps the Fish and Game Society and other interested citizens should be encouraged to contribute their thoughts and their views on this subject. I'm sure their impact, on an ongoing basis, in an in-depth study would be very useful for the preservation of wildlife in Alberta.

While I do not quarrel with the resolution, it seems to me a small and an ineffective, piecemeal effort.

I would like to look at the question of game wardens, the people who are in charge. We've heard mention of poachers, just from the hon. member across the way. How about stricter enforcement by the game wardens?

MR. TRYNCHY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. gentleman is wrong. I never mentioned the word 'poacher' once.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What is a poacher?

MR. HO LEM:

A poacher is a person who shoots a cow moose and leaves it dying on the side of the road.

But on the question of hunters and how they are patrolled. What are the qualifications of the game wardens and how many have we in various areas? Is there a dearth of game wardens? Is that the problem? I think they should adopt a 'get tougher' policy if we are to patrol these resources properly, and to eliminate the activities of poachers.

I think, Mr. Speaker, in the area of granting licences for hunters -- it is so easy nowadays for a hunter to go in and pay his eight dollars and obtain a licence. Certainly he should be called upon to fill in an examination form to show he is knowledgeable in the handling of firearms. Because, as mentioned by the hon. member, hunters nowadays are apt to be careless. They shoot anything that moves. Certainly a lot of hunters today are discouraged from going into the field because of this very dangerous hazard.

In the area of registration of firearms -- examination of weapons should be carried out before licences are issued. We must ensure that all safety features are in good working order. I believe the hair-spring trigger on rifles should be banned, because by a hard jar, the rifle may discharge -- by laying it on the ground, it may discharge. There should be minimum standards of trigger pressure on all firearms in Alberta. Before firearms are registered their safety devices should be examined. Consideration should be given to plugging the magazines in various guns, because if you don't plug the magazine, people are apt to fire indiscriminately. Any experienced hunter will tell you if you don't get the game in the first or at least the second shot, your chances of getting it at all are minimal.

I like the idea of an education for hunters -- a program. I think that grants should be given to recognized gun clubs in Alberta, to promote safety programs and safety procedures in the handling of firearms. If these gun clubs were given facilities where people could practice, where people could sight their rifles before hunting season -- certainly an education in safety in the way of handling firearms should be encouraged by the government.

The hunting industry in Alberta is certainly a big industry. And we in this province must recognize this. Last year, there was a total of 41,000 big game hunting licences issued. There were 537 non-resident licences issued at \$100 each. The average stay of a non-resident hunter in Alberta is five days, and the average spending of these hunters is \$100 a day. So you can see, each season the non-resident hunters who come to Alberta spend nearly a quarter of a million dollars -- in addition to the 40,000 local hunters, who are engaged in this sport. Last year, according to the date I received from the department, there were 14,000 moose bagged. So when you take that into consideration, out of a population of 400,000 that isn't too bad.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I oppose the resolution, but not on the principle which it is attempting to purport. My opposition is based on the belief that many of our regulations incorporated in the various provincial acts, and in this particular case The Big Game Act, are conceived by reason of insufficient research through lack of consultation with interested citizens and professional groups. I would therefore suggest to the mover and the seconder that they should scrap this piecemeal effort and bring back to the House a reasonable, practical, logical and more sensible resolution based on professional input at a later date. At that time, I'm sure all of us would be glad to support it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Mr. Drain followed by Mr. Appleby.

MR. DRAIN:

My first remarks, Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself to this motion are in the nature of a philosophy. I'm sitting back here, Mr. Speaker, and I'm thinking that legislation equals curtailment of freedom or an attack on the customers, and certainly in this motion the area of freedom is being attacked.

Although I certainly sympathize and concur with the mover and the seconder of this motion in their concern in regards to protecting the wildlife we have in this province, I have a question in my mind whether any type of legislation can be so encompassing that it can do properly the things it is expected to do. I can see reasons for carrying firearms in the bush, even on service vehicles, but there are two things that do not go together. Certain things go together like men and women, and mustard on ham, and so on, but two things that do not go together are hunting and working. I speak of this from experience, because I've worked out in the bush and there's no way -- What do you do with a day when you go hunting and you're supposed to be working? You foul it up. You neither achieve a good job of working, nor do you achieve a proper job of hunting. So this, probably, is one of the main reasons why the owners of service vehicles and commercial vehicles are not permitted to allow their personnel to carry any type of firearm or indulge in hunting. It's certainly not conducive to efficiency. Nevertheless, there are reasons for carrying firearms on any particular vehicle.

One: I would think of it as a common right accepted in Canada as part of our freedom. In the United States it is written into the constitution that the right of the people to own and have firearms is part of their rights that are so written. This of course is, I suppose, a recognition of the freedom that we have in the new world and that we did not have in the old.

I remember picking berries last summer -- and I do pick berries because I like climbing mountains -- and in this particular place, an area where quite a

number of campers pulled in, there were children and women. I came down off the mountain, and there was a bear, about a 3 year-old bear. The kids were engaged in throwing rocks at this bear.

Now I know enough about bears to be frightened by them. I'm frightened by them because at one time I viewed them from the same viewpoint as the kids, but they taught me a little differently. There were five or six kids involved, their ages were from 7, 8, 9 or 10, and they were engaged in throwing rocks at this bear. Now had that bear so decided to attack those children, what means of protection would we have had? Would we have been able to attack that bear with our bare hands? Now we did not have any rifles there, but our options would have been limited, hence there is a point that can be thought about.

I remember one time sending a guy out to pick up a catskinners up in the north. He went out on this line and he took the wrong line and he kept driving until he ran out of gas. There's not much daylight in winter there and we weren't able to find him until the next day. By the next day his feet were frozen and we took him into the hospital at Fort St. John. I said, "Why didn't you walk? You could have walked. At least this would have possibly saved your feet," He said, "I was afraid of the Arctic wolves," and you could well believe why, because you see these big black things running along the sides of these seismic lines and, boy, they sure look big. I don't know whether they've eaten anybody or not; there are people who say they never do. But at least it was enough inducement for this fellow not to have the courage to walk down this particular line because he had no means of protecting himself. So there you have two reasons, insofar as the matter of protection is concerned.

Now another thing that enters my mind in relation to banning these firearms is the matter of signalling. We know that these are used when somebody is lost in the bush and it could well be that a truck would break down. Remember, that at least in excess of 40 per cent of Alberta is still wild, wilderness, muskeg area.

Then too, the problem -- and I think now of the bit salesmen who go up to the north, and wherever a crew goes a bit salesman goes. I don't know how this is accomplished because you can get as far out in the wilderness as you like, but sooner or later a bit salesman will show up on the horizon. So if one of these fellows had something to shoot, a porcupine or a ptarmigan, it might mean the difference between being able to cook something or not being able to cook something. So this is another reason why I would say it would present difficulty.

The hon. Member for Whitecourt also referred to farmers, and I think if you want to talk about the people who pack rifles in the cabs of their vehicles, the ratio of farmers is about 20 to 1. Of course we all know from the hon. Minister of Agriculture that farmers are always good guys, therefore there should be no problem in that particular area.

Possibly if we looked at the problem of the reduction of game it would relate more to the accessibility that is now available to us because of the roads -- people getting into these far out areas. Then another habit that is peculiar to moose, especially when there is a snow, is travelling on a ploughed road. This is the only species that will do that, but a moose will get ahead of your truck and he will just stay there and trot down the road. You can stop and wait for an hour or longer and sure enough, you start up again and there is the moose trotting ahead of you. He'll keep this up until he gets enough of trotting and then he will turn around and put down his head, and if you don't get out of the road he'll charge you, and I've had this happen.

[Interjections]

Yes, I have. I remember one time in a particular camp that we were operating. A nightshift truck came in and this moose that I am referring to, the demise of which I must tell the hon. members about, because this moose has been on my conscience for quite a while. This particular moose ran down the road for nine miles. I was fortunate enough to bypass him, but when the nightshift truck came back he pulled himself on the road and trotted another eight miles up the road.

MR. HENDERSON:

Did you give him a medal?

MR. DRAIN:

That's enough. There he stood with his head down and he wasn't about to let this truck go by and the snow had piled up six, seven or eight feet on each side. There was no way for these guys to get past. So anyway, the upshot of the story was, the next morning when I went up to the camp I went up there with a power wagon and a moose was on the side of the road. He picked himself up and he belted right into this power wagon as hard as he could go. It didn't hurt the power wagon but it didn't do the moose any good. I noticed this moose had a broken leg so I was pretty irked about that and I went up to the cabin and said, "You know, you fellows ran into that moose, you deliberately broke his leg, therefore I feel I should treat you exactly the same way you treated the moose. So unless you can give me a satisfactory explanation I feel that we should part company here and now." But they did have a legitimate explanation and the explanation was that this particular moose had kept them out there -- it was about 30 below zero -- waiting for him to make up his mind to get off the road. Finally when they realized that they were going to run out of gas -- there were three of them in the truck -- they said, goodbye moose. They tried to drive by him. When they tried to drive by he let go, he broke his leg, and that's the story of the moose. The rest of the story is that the ranger came up, shot the moose and made hamburger out of him.

Our problem in relation to game management in our part of the country is not the summer range. The problem is the limitations that we have insofar as winter range, the competition between the winter range for wildlife, the grazing of cattle and the encroachment of the farms or the ranching areas on to the natural winter ranges of the wildlife. Now this isn't something that has just occurred. This occurred many years ago when the boundaries in the green areas were laid out. This was not taken into consideration and the reason probably was that at that time, and this may surprise a lot of people, there was far less game in the province than there is right at the present time. So there's a point for management.

Talking about moose then, I realize also that a moose on a road presents a tempting target to some people. I remember driving down the Simonette River one time, which is somewhere up in the bush north of the Macleod and the Smoky. It was winter and we came around a curve and there was a moose standing on the side of the road. And this was a cow moose. We stopped because the moose didn't move and the reason why the moose didn't move was because he had been shot by somebody -- or she, probably, it had no horns anyway so I presume it was a lady moose -- and had fallen over and had frozen. This person with a rather weird sense of humour had lifted the moose up, or someone had, and there stood the moose on his four legs for the edification and the joy of the hunters. And I noticed that there were many, many holes in this moose so many, many hunters had been beguiled by this tempting target. But anyway, in spite of all the holes, there stood the moose for a long time.

So how do you come to a solution of this problem? I think there are two areas that you can tackle. One is the area of hunter education, the realization of true sportsmanship and, of course, the ultimate weapon which is stricter game enforcement. I would say probably a combination of the two.

The hon. Member for Whitecourt mentioned the encroachment of the Indians and I think this is a real problem in this area although it wasn't in ours to any great degree until the roads were built in order that they could get comfortably to -- they did have a little trouble with the sheep, but not to a great degree.

You know, this surprised me, too, because I remember picking up an old Indian, and this was quite a while ago. He was about 85 at that time. Then you know you relate in your mind, you look back to that particular era in which he was born and then you have the impression that this was the time when the Indian, the noble red man lived in the true cultural manner of the red man. This man's name by the way was Charlie Walking Eagle which made us, of course, blood-brothers on account of us both being Charlies. So I said, "Charlie Walking Eagle" -- of course he gave me a little trouble because he said, "You white man, you stole our land." He said, "What are you going to do about that white man?" Well, I said, "Charlie, nobody stole it, it is still here." It was too. But anyway, I asked him about hunting and I said, "I guess you hunted many times when you were a boy and you were a greater hunter." And he said, "No, do you know I have never hunted in my life." And I said, "Oh, is that so?" Well, I said, "How did you live?" He said, "I get government cheque." He said, "You get government cheque?" I said, "No, I don't." He replied, "Too bad, too bad". So when you have Indians, I don't think that seven moose per Indian family --

DR. BUCK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, does the member not get a government cheque?

MR. DRAIN:

When you talk about seven moose per Indian family I don't think you are talking about an excessive number of moose if they utilize them. Although we may feel it is not right that the Indian should hunt, I certainly would be the first to stand up and defend this right, because after all what else have they got left of their aboriginal rights that they had in this country?

If the Indian is given the opportunities for a better standard of living I would think this would be the answer. It would not be in taking what little he has left for himself, the matter would be more education, enhancing a standard of living, and the Indian will then naturally prefer T-bone, because I have yet to see anyone who prefers wild meat if they have eaten enough of it. I can assure you I don't want to ever eat any more wild meat; that went with the '32 Depression and if I never eat anymore that will be enough for me.

I think the biggest hazard the wild game has is the hunter with the sophisticated equipment he has to hunt with. In my short lifetime you have seen the evolution of hunting from the old 32-40 nearly smooth bore rifles, and then finally the super-rifle, the 33 Winchester, and then the answer to all rifles, the 306 that would take a load from 110 to 240 grains, then finally the nicked-down magnums, the 300s and the 375s that would shoot 700 yards flat with only a drop of one or two inches. Then the development of binoculars to the ultimate in perfection, the spotting scopes, the four-wheel drives, all-terrain vehicles, a mass of roads that will take you practically anyplace in the province where you can ride from here to there -- total accessibility.

We have now taken all the natural protections, or a greater measure of the natural protection away from the wild game, so how do we bring this back on the basis of equality? I have a suggestion to all these true sportsmen on both sides of the Legislature, and this is a suggestion I am sure you will all welcome, and that is that we go back to the bow and arrow hunting. Put things back on an even keel and there would be all kinds of game. You wouldn't have to worry about hunting. Eliminate the rifle, lock it up, let them pack their bows and arrows in their service vehicles and they will still have the means to survive, the means to protect themselves against the bears and the wolves. They will be able to shoot a ptarmigan or whatever species --

MR. COOKSON:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if the hon. member is for or against the Motion.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, what I want to do is cast some light on whether an obscure and ambiguous motion, which is not too clear to me, and which I know is well intended by the hon. members -- I could say that I'm in favour of any motion that has anything to do with the improvement and protection of our game population. In that principle I buy it.

However, there are many intentions which do not properly come out in the wash in the manners they should. We have all heard about the 'primrose path' and the 'road to hell is paved with good intentions' and possibly this is one of the troubles with this particular motion, Mr. Speaker.

So I would urge the hon. members, if they are true sportsmen, to think of giving the wildlife a chance if they develop the bow and arrow hunting, because after all the English longbow was capable of piercing a knight clothed in chain mail at 100 yards, and this 100 yards is a pretty fair go. Any hunter who can't get within 100 yards of game is not very good at sneaking around. The hon. Member for Calgary McCall has already given several very vivid illustrations of how you can properly achieve success in hunting. So, if the hon. members have any doubts about the ability of doing it with a bow and arrow, they can research the hon. Member for Calgary McCall's speech in Hansard, and they will be enlightened. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. APPLEBY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well we have covered a lot of territory already and we have had some very innovative suggestions. However, Mr. Speaker, as a

member who does come from a constituency where there is, or has been until recently, a considerable moose population -- and a number of elk as well -- I do appreciate the opportunity of entering the debate on this particular motion. I know, Mr. Speaker, there has been a considerable amount of concern among hunters, not only in the Athabasca constituency, but throughout the province, on the matter of the declining game populations -- in our constituency, not only the declining moose and elk population, but also the deer and cariboo as well. This has also been a matter of considerable concern to the outfitters and guides as well because this, after all, is the livelihood of many of these people and this is a justifiable concern.

However, Mr. Speaker, while I certainly support the motion and the view that there has been a decline in the population of both moose and elk in recent years, and possibly the carrying of unsealed firearms in service vehicles in the green areas during the hunting season is one of the causes for this declining game population, I also feel, Mr. Speaker, there are many other contributing factors to this decline.

Unlike the hon. Member for Drayton Valley, I do not hunt myself. I prefer to see the animals alive, but I respect those who like to hunt if they are true sportsmen and if they do respect the game regulations as we have them in the province.

My information, Mr. Speaker, from many sources, is that in actual fact predators play probably the largest part causing this decline in the moose and elk population and, of course, the deer and cariboo as well -- in the last two or three years particularly. Actually, when I think of predators, I am thinking of wolves, and these have been mentioned here before by previous speakers this afternoon. But there is also the matter of bears and also the matter of coyotes. The wolf problem has been very acute over the past two seasons in the area from which I come, and the neighbouring areas also, where the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray comes from. And the hon. Member for Slave Lake, and the hon. Member for Barrhead have been aware of the moose problem in all of these areas. The number of wolves has increased in these areas at a very alarming rate.

Many hunters and other observers have mentioned to me the fact -- and one of the other speakers mentioned this afternoon -- the number of dry cows among the moose population in the last two years. This lack of calves has been very, very noticeable. Of course, to this can be attributed a considerable amount of the reason for the decline in the population of these animals.

Many of these hunters and many of these observers have expressed the view that it is because of wolves that these animals have declined in numbers. One of the factors that enters the picture here is that at the present time we are at the peak of the decline in the rabbit population cycle which repeats every number of years. This has caused a hardship for the coyotes and the wolves and they have to seek other means of sustenance.

In the spring of the year the newly born calves of these animals are most vulnerable to these predators. This is because shortly after the calves are born, the female animal, the mother has to leave them to graze and to seek drinking water, and at this time the predators can move in, the kills are easy, the young animals have no way of defending themselves.

It is also this time of the year, in the spring, Mr. Speaker, when the bears emerge from their winter hibernation. They come out of their dens and they are always awfully hungry and there isn't much available in the way of what is their regular diet during the summer season, grubs and berries and this sort of thing. And if there are some young calves around, moose, or elk, or deer, or fawns, or what have you, the bear will turn to these as a food supply.

MR. DRAIN:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker, that's wrong because a bear for the first eight weeks lives on a vegetable diet because his stomach is contracted.

[Laughter]

MR. APPLEBY:

I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, my idea was that they lived on a liquid diet and that this is why they wanted the blood of the animals. But this could be verified by the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest too, I suppose.

Another thing I'd like to mention, Mr. Speaker, and this has also come out, the fact that because of the scarcity of rabbits, many of these predators have moved into the settled areas and have become a problem with livestock as well. There have been some considerable losses in the area that I represent and in neighbouring areas as well.

However, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to recognize the fact that the Department of Agriculture has set up a predator control system which is working very well and that the Department of Lands and Forests, through its wildlife branch, is also doing much to try and eliminate this problem. I know that in the Athabasca constituency, alone, in recent weeks there have been 20 to 25 timber wolves taken in the settled areas by these people. Also, outside of the settled areas a number of licenced trappers have taken a considerable number of timber wolves this winter because the timber wolf hides, if they are prime, this year are worth about \$150. However the problem still remains that the wolves have been of considerable concern to the people who raise livestock, especially on the outer edge of the settled areas.

One more thing, Mr. Speaker, that I feel has contributed to the decline of the moose population, besides the other things that have been mentioned here this afternoon, is the timing of the hunting season.

The hon. Member for Whitecourt has spoken to you and to the members of this House about hunting in the mating season. Hunting has been permitted in some areas in early September when the weather is warm, when there is still considerable leaf cover, when the muskegs are not frozen, and they are difficult, of course, to travel on at that time. During this time many animals are wounded, even for the most experienced tracker they are almost impossible to find, and many of these animals, while they get away, do not live afterwards. That same hunter can go out later and shoot another moose, or another elk, and of course this helps to reduce the game population of the province.

So, Mr. Speaker, while I do support this motion in principle, I feel it's too restrictive in that it indicates only one reason for the decline of the moose and the elk population. Because of this, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move the following amendment to the motion:

Moved by myself, seconded by the hon. Member for Smoky River, Mr. Moore:

That the motion be amended by striking out all the words after "moose and elk population."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to second the amendment proposed by the Member for Athabasca, I want, first of all, to commend the hon. member who initiated and the hon. member who seconded the original motion. The amendment, in actual fact, does not deter at all from the original motion, but opens up the entire question of the various areas we might be able to move in with respect to maintaining an adequate moose and elk population in the province.

I first of all want to say a couple of things, Mr. Speaker, about some of the areas in which the Minister of Lands and Forests and his department have, in fact, moved during the last year with respect to maintaining an adequate population of moose and elk.

First of all, all members should recognize that there were considerable changes during the last hunting season with respect to the number of animals that were allowed from one end of the province to the other. Individual hunters were required, prior to buying their licences, to determine whether, in fact, they were going to hunt elk or moose, and the hunting pressure was spread to various parts of the province instead of being concentrated in those areas where both elk and moose were available. That situation however, Mr. Speaker, was perhaps not without its faults.

We had a good deal of concern in the northern part of the province in big game zone 1 where there are, indeed, a considerable number of non-Canadian hunters involved. We had a considerable concern about the restrictions which had been placed on individuals hunting there. They went from a situation where in 1971 they were allowed, in fact, three animals, two moose and an elk, to a situation where they were allowed only one, and they had to determine what that was beforehand. So we are hopeful that in certain selected areas of the province, Mr. Speaker, where there may be adequate, in fact more than adequate,

moose for the pasture involved, we will have some changes to allow perhaps further hunting for our residents.

The other area, Mr. Speaker, in which the Minister of Lands and Forests, in my opinion, has moved very dramatically, is the introduction of the "Buck for Wildlife" Program, a program which, in its infancy, will probably not do that much with regard to moose and elk habitat, but in the long run I'm convinced that the moose and elk population figures in Alberta are directly dependent not on the amount of hunting pressure there is, but on the amount of habitat that is, in fact, available for these animals.

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

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. Member for Smoky River have leave to adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the motion for adjournment by the hon. Government House Leader, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House will stand adjourned, in a moment, until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

May I draw hon. members' attention to a change of venue for Subcommittee B, which is moving, for this evening, into the library. I take it we have the consent of the House to limit the operation of the library to that extent. So Subcommittee B, under the chairmanship of the hon. Member for Lacombe, will meet this evening in the library instead of where they met last night.

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

[The House rose at 5:27 o'clock.]