

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 206 The Family Homes Expropriation Act

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, The Family Homes Expropriation Act. This bill needs no introduction really because it was moved during the last session, and I believe the issue is very current and should be -- at least we should have a vote on it, to date. No one has disagreed with the principle of the bill and I therefore beg leave to introduce the bill again for further debate.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 206 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 15 The Attorney General Statutes Amendment Act, 1973

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Attorney General Statutes Amendment Act, 1973. The purpose of this bill is to make amendments to a number of statutes administered by the Attorney General.

The first, Mr. Speaker, is The Bills of Sale Act, and there are amendments to that Act which provide for the registration without court approval of bills of sale and also to remove, by striking sections 30 and 31 of the Act, present restrictions on the farm community with respect to the raising of money on crops.

There is also an amendment to The Commissioners for Oaths Act, which provides that students of law shall, upon becoming students of law, be commissioners for oaths. It also provides that members of municipal councils within the province will, while they are such members, be commissioners for oaths.

There is an addition and amendment to The Conditional Sales Act, which also makes an alteration in the procedure for late filing of conditional sales agreements.

The Alberta Evidence Act is also amended by providing for the admission in evidence of copies of certain documents normally in the possession of municipal corporations, school boards and bodies of that nature.

There is a minor procedural amendment to The Execution Creditors Act, and an amendment to The Limitation of Actions Act, which provides that optometrists shall be brought within that group of professionals against whom actions must be started within one year of the cause of action arising.

The Provincial Court Act is amended with respect to the Provincial Court Advisory Committee.

The Racing Commission Act is amended by extending the authority of the Racing Commission to enable them to assist in the development of horse racing in Alberta.

The Religious Societies' Lands Act is amended to provide an expanded procedure for winding up societies under that legislation.

There is an amendment to The Sheriffs Act which provides, that rather than the Provincial Treasurer, certain documents shall be retained by the Inspector of Legal Offices.

There is a major amendment to The Trustee Act dealing with the situation where money is left in trust to a person who is then of the age of majority. As the law now stands that person, despite the wishes of the testator, could call for the trust. This amendment provides for the matter to be dealt with by the court.

The Wills Act, Mr. Speaker, is also amended to enable unmarried parents of children to make wills, and there is an additional, further amendment to correct -- an oversight which occurred as a result of amendments made some two or three years ago.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 15 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 209 The Prepaid Consumer Contracts Act

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill being The Prepaid Consumer Contracts Act.

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, The Prepaid Consumer Contracts Act would require sellers to treat down payments in certain specified retail sales contracts as trust monies, which must be kept aside from operating funds of the firm until goods and services have been delivered according to the contract. Any seller who fails to treat down payments as trust funds, would be in violation of the Act, and penalties are provided for those violations.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 209 was introduced and read a first time.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me, today, to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly, 30 Grade 6 students from Pine Grove Elementary School in Edson. They are sitting in the members gallery, and they are accompanied by their teacher, Miss Wales, and the secretary of the school, Mrs. Dorothy Mercier. I wonder if they would rise and be recognized by the House.

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you, and to the members of the Legislature, 50 lovely ladies seated in the public gallery. They are here to see the Legislature in action, and just to see how we behave ourselves. The ladies are members of the Alberta Social Credit Women's Auxiliary. I'd like them to stand and be welcomed.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege, today, to introduce to you and through you to the House 17 students from the Maple Ridge School. They are Grade 10 students. They are here with their teacher, Miss Leschyshyn. I would like to ask them to stand and be acknowledged by the House.

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to you and on your behalf, to the members, 28 happy Grade 6 students from the Athlone Elementary School which is located in my constituency of Edmonton Calder. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mrs. Macnaughton and Miss Unruh and they are seated in the members gallery. I would like to ask that they stand and be recognized by the members

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to file the report of the Alberta Racing Commission for the year 1972.

CRAL QUESTION PERIOD

Craig Case

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Attorney General. I wonder if the Attorney General could advise the House whether he has made any recommendations to the federal government relative to amendments in the Criminal Code of Canada or changes in the method of enforcement as it relates to the experience with the Craig case in the Province of Alberta?

MR. LEITCH:

No, Mr. Speaker.

Mortgage Interest Rates

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, could I ask another question of the Attorney General on another matter? I would ask the Attorney General if his department is contemplating any legislation limiting the maximum interest rates that can be charged on second mortgages in the province?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, the matter to which the hon. member refers is under review. I would not think the provincial government could deal with interest rates, as interest rates are under the federal jurisdiction.

MR. HENDERSON:

Supplemental, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister then made any recommendations to the federal government on the matter?

MR. LEITCH:

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I said, the matter was under review and also under consideration are the possibilities of taking other steps to deal with the problem apart from regulating interest rates.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Criminal Injuries Compensation Act

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the hon. the Attorney General with reference to The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act. Does the hon. minister know the percentage of payments that have been made to persons who are injured while inebriated?

MR. LEITCH:

No, I don't, Mr. Speaker and I am not sure we have that information available, but if the hon. member would repeat the question tomorrow I will undertake to look into it and try and have an answer for him then.

Sturgeon Lake Seismic Operations

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Lands and Forests. I would like to ask the minister if the seismograph charges were detonated at Sturgeon Lake either last night or this morning?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, they were not detonated yesterday because they ran into instrumentation recording problems and had to get a technical expert up to fix the problem. They were however, then scheduled for first thing this morning and by now, in all probability, have been detonated.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister of Lands and Forests going to attend the meeting in Valleyview called by local residents to express their concern on this particular matter?

DR. WARRACK:

I am not aware of any such meeting at this time, Mr. Speaker, although I have had some very late phone calls, some abusive, from the area -- particularly Spirit River.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it true that the local fish and wildlife officer who operates out of Valleyview is on two-weeks holiday at this particular time?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, he had already delayed his vacation for two weeks and for that reason the officer from Grande Prairie is there, also the regional biologist from Peace River, the bicycle technician from Peace River and in addition to those three from the Department of Lands and Forests, Mr. Speaker, also a man from the Water Resources Division of the Department of the Environment.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is it true the fish and wildlife officer at Valleyview at this time is on two-weeks holiday?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I thought I agreed that this was true and that was the reason why the officer from Grande Prairie was there. There would be no other reason for this.

MR. HENDERSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister could advise the House whether the department is going to carry out a detailed inspection following the detonation of the charges that are placed now, with a view to determining the magnitude of fish-kill as a result of the detonations?

DR. WARRACK:

This is part of the planning and as a matter of fact there is a request for such a report on the Order Paper at this time.

MR. HENDERSON:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The request on the Order Paper relates to tests that were conducted some time ago and this is another one. But I am talking about the detonations that are to take place today. Presumably you are going to carry out an inspection following the detonations of the 32 charges that are placed today.

DR. WARRACK:

The answer is yes, Mr. Speaker, and I would emphasize again that the four staff members I indicated a moment ago are on the scene at this time.

MR. HENDERSON:

One further supplemental, Mr. Speaker. Is there going to be a continuation of seismic charges or detonations in the Sturgeon Lake at this time.

DR. WARRACK:

The answer is no.

MR. CLARK:

One more supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the last supplementary on this?

MR. CLARK:

Is the reason for the charges not being detonated last evening because 6 of the 29 undetonated charges were not wired?

DR. WARRACK:

The information I have is that there was a slight delay with respect to one of the recording instruments not working correctly.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Abortions in Alberta Hospitals

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, my question today is to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Is your department presently reviewing the alarming rise of abortions being carried out in Alberta hospitals?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, use of the word "alarming", of course, is a matter of opinion, but I am not right up to date on the statistics of increase if any, of abortions being performed in Alberta hospitals. I would be glad to check into it and provide the information.

MR. DIXON:

Supplementary question to the hon. Minister Without Portfolio in charge of Health Care Insurance. Is the health care commission reviewing payments, as far as abortions are concerned, in Alberta hospitals with the view of deleting coverage such as that being recommended by the Minister of Health in Ontario?

MISS HUNLEY:

I would say no, Mr. Speaker. We have reviewed the payments in an attempt to answer a question, I think, that was on the Order Paper last fall. They have been reviewed but not for that specific purpose. However, I will be interested in seeing what Ontario is suggesting.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West.

Off-Track Betting

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. Does the provincial government intend to follow the examples set by some other provinces, by urging the federal government to enact legislation permitting off-track betting in Canada in order to stem the syphoning off of para mutual monies from licensed race tracks by what has been termed by some as organized crime activities?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, while I have some personal views on the matter, I would pass this issue to the hon. Attorney General who has been dealing with the federal government on it, so that I don't have a conflict.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary then, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Attorney General. While off-track betting is illegal in Canada, messenger shops were allowed to take bets in Edmonton. Will steps be taken to stop this type of operation or will they be permitted to operate in 1973?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I will respond to the first question and then to the supplemental. Representations have been made to the federal government enacting legislation which would give the provinces the jurisdiction to license off-track betting if they so desire. That matter is still under consideration, as I understand it, by the federal government.

Now with respect to the hon. member's question about allowing people to operate a messenger service, it is really this simple, Mr. Speaker. If they are in breach of the law, then the same action will be taken as is taken in any other case where there is a breach of the law. If they aren't in breach of the law, they will of course be free to operate.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are book-making charges and convictions on the increase in Alberta as compared to 1971?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I don't have that kind of statistic or information in mind. If the hon. member would like to put it on the Order Paper I am sure we would be able to get that information for him.

MR. HO LEM:

One final supplementary. How do you intend to deal with those 'bookies' who adopt the modus operandi of not charging anything for taking bets, but on the other hand charge a fee for cashing the winning tickets?

MR. LEITCH:

Again, Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Alberta are entitled to go about their business if they are doing so within the law. Whatever activity the hon. member may be referring to, if he would like to give me some particulars we would be happy to let him know our views on whether it is a breach of the law.

MR. HO LEM:

One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view that the racing season is just one month away, will a policy statement regarding off-track betting be issued to clear the air?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, any statements regarding the policy of off-track betting are certainly premature on the part of the provincial government until the federal government deals with the matter by enacting legislation.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. Attorney General betting on the decision of the federal government shortly?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge West, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Lethbridge Administration Building

MR. GRUENWALD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Public Works. I wonder if the minister could give us some idea how negotiations and plans are progressing relative to the construction of a new administration building for Lethbridge?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, the development in Lethbridge is in cooperation with the City of Lethbridge and with Woodward Stores, also participating in this development for the centre of Lethbridge. At this point in the negotiations, we have agreed with Woodward Stores as to who the architect should be for the two so we can get coordination between the two developments, and we hope to provide a more beautiful centre for the city.

At present we have presented our needs to Woodward's and they are considering the possibility of being the developers for the total area on a lease-back arrangement with regard to the portion of it that is required by the Alberta government. If they cannot provide a realistic lease-back agreement, then we will go ahead with the usual tendering method for that part of the development we are responsible for.

MR. GRUENWALD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Do you have a target date for starting construction?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, we anticipate that we will require this facility in 1975. With regard to the target date for commencement, at present we anticipate that the planning stage will require the best part of this year and it will therefore be sometime in 1974 that we will be commencing the actual construction.

MR. GRUENWALD:

One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the lease-back arrangement that you referred to common practice for government buildings, or is it a bit of a departure from what you are used to?

DR. BACKUS:

This is very definitely a departure from the process in the past. It is one that we are looking at generally throughout the province with a view to encouraging participation by local communities. I could expand on this, but probably not during the question period. I might have the opportunity during the budget.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Motor Vehicle Registrations

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Highways. Was your March 8 announcement on a decision to tighten up vehicle registrations based on a study or a report?

MR. COPITHORNE:

It was the decision of March 8, and tightening up on highway registrations and motor vehicles was based on reports and requests and factual information which was derived from many sources, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Were these reports which you indicated prepared by your department or outside agencies?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, we get reports from outside agencies, from letters from individual citizens stating the problems they are having with purchasing vehicles from car dealers which turn out to be stolen from some other jurisdiction, and the police reports. That is one of the bases on which we derive our information.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. To your knowledge, has the RCMP prepared a report on the influx of stolen vehicles in Alberta?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, in arriving at the determination of the need for such a policy we certainly did talk with the RCMP on many occasions.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Would you be prepared to table some of the reports on the incidence of stolen vehicles coming into Alberta?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether information that the hon. member is trying to seek would show up, because in a report of stolen vehicles, or stolen trailers, or bicycles, they all show up as stolen vehicles, as I understand, in the police reports, and it would be very hard to show.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker --

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the final supplementary on this topic.

MR. WILSON:

Does your department now have a system of exchanging information on stolen vehicles with other provinces and with states in the United States?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

Education Finance Plan

MR. NOTLEY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Education. What provision is made to deal with sparse populations as recognized in the report of the Minister's Advisory Committee on Educational Finance? Will some form of 'sparsity' grant be continued in the new grant structure?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, for the first time this year in the grant structure, there is the sum of approximately \$2.4 million which is largely directed to the smaller jurisdictions and the more sparse rural jurisdictions of the province.

Previously there was what was known as a small jurisdiction allowance in the sum of, I think, about \$400,000 and that has been increased substantially and is for the very purpose of assisting those jurisdictions which had odd remainders of students, and for the very purpose of slowing down the pace of centralization.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Had the rural jurisdictions been advised of this \$2.4 million fund? And -- well I'll leave it at that.

MR. HYNDMAN:

They were so advised in mid-January, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY:

A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is there any provision beyond the fund that you announced to deal with the special problems of those rural jurisdictions where the enrolment is actually dropping?

By way of explanation, Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the Spirit River School Division where at the present time there has been a cutback in staff and there is a possibility that one high school may be closed down as a consequence. So is there any provision made for rural jurisdictions where the enrolment has dropped or is dropping?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, there is no special provision where the enrolment has dropped because essentially that is a process which is taking place all over the province.

It should be borne in mind that essentially the question of the expenditure of educational resources in the school jurisdiction is basically the decision of the local school board by recognizing their local autonomy in the matter. But certainly with regard to the new finance plan, we have taken the position that if there are special, extraordinary, unusual circumstances -- bearing in mind a look at the last three years of the financing plan -- that the department would be prepared to sit down and talk with the board and, if those special circumstances are present, to consider such changes as may be necessary over the next three years, particularly in relation to the supplementary requisition column.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it true that the department in considering the unusual circumstances for requisitioning beyond the amount set out in your statement -- is it true you are using a bench mark of a teacher-pupil ratio of 22 to 1?

MR. HYNDMAN:

The general bench mark is somewhere in the neighbourhood of 20.8 to 1, Mr. Speaker, which I am informed is the lowest in Canada.

FR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, an additional supplementary question. Can the minister advise the House whether there is any unofficial guideline for teacher-pupil ratios for the complete educational plan or a grant structure as outlined on January 26?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, we would be, in effect, taking away the authority of boards if there was a prescribed pupil-teacher ratio in the province.

With regard to the number of teaching staff available and the number of pupils over the entire province, as I say, it is about -- hypothetically and internally -- a 21 to 1 ratio. However each school board has the jurisdiction to decide what kind of mix and what different personnel it wishes, and which kind of pupil-teacher ratio it wants, bearing in mind the other demands on the school system and the requirements and wishes of the local population served by the school board which is elected.

MR. NOTLEY:

One final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, this time to the hon. Minister Without Portfolio in charge of Rural Development. Has your department considered the impact on rural development of the closure of any more rural high schools?

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

I'm not aware of that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Two-Price Wheat System

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Is it the feeling of the government that the pamphlet and questionnaire, "Prairie Grains Policy Two-Price Wheat", tends to prejudice answers in favour of an acreage payment?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the pamphlet that the hon. member refers to is the responsibility of the hon. Otto Lang, the federal minister in charge of the Wheat Board, and I doubt whether it comes under my purview at this moment.

AN HON. MEMBER:

At this moment?

[Laughter]

MR. SORENSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister of Agriculture made any representation to the federal government regarding contents of this pamphlet?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I've had numerous discussions with the federal minister in charge of the Wheat Board with regard to the contents and the implications of the two-price system for wheat and how we think it should be paid. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, as I've said in this House before, we think it should be paid on an acreage basis so that we don't prejudice other growers of other grains.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Road Allowances

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. Minister of Highways. Has the minister the use of any road allowances to which the public is generally excluded?

DR. HORNER:

That's completely out of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

MR. HYNDMAN:

That is not within his ministerial responsibilities.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, may I speak to that point of order raised by the hon. member? I believe that road allowances which are not leased to a minister are there to be used by the public, and if a minister or any member may use the road allowance to the exclusion of anyone else, then this is a proper question to be asked here in the House.

The public wants these answers, and the minister can say yes or no. It is not an improper question and I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, that if questioning of this type is forbidden, then the Munsinger case would never have been proven in Ottawa.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, having some knowledge of the Munsinger case and being there when it was raised, the hon. member is completely out of order. He is still on his witch hunt and if he would live up to his responsibilities as a member of this Legislature then we wouldn't have this kind of thing.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, replying to that point of order. It is unparliamentary to refer to anyone as being on a witch hunt. The witch hunt or the attitude --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

MR. LUDWIG:

-- as to whether it is created by the Deputy Premier in trying to fight legitimate questions. He can say yes or no and he has not answered yet.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. We have the words "witch hunt" passing from one side of the House to the other and back again. Perhaps we should let it rest at that. It is very doubtful in my mind whether it is a parliamentary expression. It would appear to me that the point of order might be dealt with directly without putting that label on it. Perhaps we should let it rest at that. It is very doubtful in my mind whether it is a parliamentary expression. It would appear to me that the point of order might be dealt with directly without putting that label on it.

With regard to the question as to whether the minister may be asked this question during the question period, it is my opinion that a question to a minister must relate to his official capacity as a minister. Now, there may be dozens, or hundreds, of people in Alberta who have fenced off road allowances or have some other way of excluding the public from road allowances. They may not all be ministers of the Crown. They likely aren't. And it would seem that that sort of question does not relate to any particular person in his capacity as a minister of the Crown. And a question which is put to a minister during the question period must relate to his official capacity and not his private capacity as a farmer or occupier of land which he has in common with other

citizens of the province. So that I must rule that the question is out of order in that form.

As mentioned the other day, insofar as any of these road allowance matters may be matters of public record, however, the hon. member has other means of obtaining the information.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, might I then give a supplementary question to the Minister of Highways. Has he been able to locate any river access study maps as requested of him the other day, when he said he would look into the matter?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to inform the hon. Member for Mountain View that I have such a study that was prepared in 1969. And I would presume that by this date it would be somewhat out of date.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary. Would the minister then, since he is saying that the map may be out of date, could he advise which road allowances on that map have been closed and which have been opened -- as I have asked him before?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Member for Mountain View would examine the township cards that I tabled in this House some time ago, he would be able to ascertain the ones that are closed.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has his department got maps of -- township maps indicating the names of owners, registered owners of land?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I would have to check with the department on that and I will be glad to do that. However, I do know that in most administration offices of any municipal council there is usually hanging on the wall, for public view, a map showing the registered ownership of each quarter of land throughout rural Alberta. I think that information is easily obtainable by anyone.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I was just wanting to know whether the minister had any of these maps in his department. I know where to get them in municipal offices. I wanted to know whether he has got one.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That's public information.

MR. LUDWIG:

It isn't public information.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I did indicate that I would check with the department to see if those maps are on record.

MR. HENDERSON:

Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. Referring back to your comments relative to the propriety of the question that was recently placed by the member, would the Speaker be kind enough to quote the appropriate sections of Beauchesne, not necessarily now, but just as a matter of record.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is in 171 of Beauchesne and I don't remember whether it is subsection (f), (x) or (ff), but it is in 171 and it's on the second page of 171.

MR. TAYLOR:

On that point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Highways must approve any road allowance closed in the Province of Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Amendments to Canada Pension Plan

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. What is the government's position with regard to proposed amendments to the Canada Pension Plan, which would permit exclusion of groups who protest participation on religious grounds?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I have to take that question as notice and give the hon. member an answer tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

CKUA Services

MR. D. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. Minister of Education. Is radio station CKUA to be part of the new provincial educational communications corporation and will this mean that the people of Calgary and southern Alberta will be able to receive CKUA programming as presently enjoyed by Edmonton and northern Alberta?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will wait for the legislation, which will be introduced in not too long a time he will find some of the answers.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking, followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

Western Canada Lottery

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Mr. Minister, in a somewhat lighter vein, is it the government's intention to become involved in a western Canada lottery, as proposed by the hon. Minister for Culture and Youth for Saskatchewan?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, there have been some interprovincial meetings and discussions regarding the lottery matter, and they have been conducted with our department but more with the Minister for Culture, Youth and Recreation, and I would ask him to respond at this time.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, the whole subject of lotteries in the western provinces is under discussion. It has been considered by a steering committee, and the ministers of the respective provinces are planning to meet sometime in April for further consideration.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Direct Distance Dialing

MR. WYSE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Telephones. What is the effective date of the change-over to direct dialing at Medicine Hat?

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I'll be happy to answer that 'wise' question on a positive note.

Mr. Speaker, it is recognized that Medicine Hat is an important industrial and agricultural market centre. Direct distance dialing will commence in the Medicine Hat area on April 1. This, includes, not only the city of Medicine Hat, but any office that has toll centres on Medicine Hat, such as Bow Island, Burdett, Elkwater, Hilda, Irvine, Ralston, Redcliff, Schuler, Seven Persons, and Walsh.

MR. D. MILLER:

Supplementary question to the hon. minister. Could you explain to us just when the Taber area will come into the picture?

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, that question is not quite so 'wise', because I have to have time to check into the information in my office, but I will inform the hon. member just as soon as I have the information.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Elimination of Grade 12 Examinations

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the hon. Minister for Education. In view of the elimination of Grade 12 examinations, are there any guidelines being sent out to the principals of high schools by the department, in order to ensure some uniformity of achievement at the end of Grade 12?

MR. HYNDMAN:

No guidelines as such, Mr. Speaker, although my recollection is the Alberta School Trustees' Association has been working with the Department of Education and certain guidelines with a view to having uniformity in evaluation have been conveyed by the ASTA to all the member boards. This has been done, and in addition it should be remembered that the question of Grade 12 departmentals is optional for school boards for the 1973-74 year. My memory suggests, I believe upwards of 70 per cent of all the students in the province, in Grade 12, have through their boards elected to not proceed with departmental exams next year.

DR. BUCK:

Supplementary to the Minister of Advanced Education. Has the minister been in contact with the universities to find out if they are going to pre-entrance examinations at the university level?

MR. FOSTER:

Well Mr. Speaker, I have had a series of meetings with the universities in this province in the course of the last several weeks touching on many subjects, but that was not one of them.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Licence Plates

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister for Highways, regarding the 1973 Alberta licence plates. Have you received complaints of poor workmanship, duplications of licence numbers, and late deliveries of licence plates in your department?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. gentleman to repeat his question again. I did not get ---

MR. HO LEM:

I would be happy to. Have you received any complaints of poor workmanship regarding the 1973 licence plates, as well as complaints of duplications in numbers and late deliveries, particularly as it affects the Calgary office?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I had one complaint in regard to the licence plates. I have had many letters complimenting the colour scheme of the "Wild Rose Country" theme. The colours and the theme seem to have certainly again caught the imagination of the public of Alberta.

As to late delivery of plates to the Calgary area, I have not heard of this, and I also would like to point out to the hon. gentleman that for eight cents any citizen in Alberta who requires a licence plate can mail the form he received in the mail in regard to his licence plates to the Department of Highways and receive his licence plates.

AN HON. MEMBER:

For eight cents?

MR. COPITHORNE:

We are also holding special hours in the Calgary and Edmonton area in the main offices of the Highways Department to issue licence plates up to 9:00 o'clock on Thursday and Friday nights.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, hasn't the minister received complaints that the Conservative colours tarnish rather easily?

DR. BUCK:

Supplementary to the minister. Have there been increased outlets in the rural areas, as you promised you would be looking into it last year?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, if we had any more increases in outlets throughout the province of Alberta for licence plates we would have just about everybody in the province an issuer.

DR. BUCK:

Supplementary to the Attorney General. In view of the fact that there are some complaints about the workmanship, could he possibly look into the fact that the people in my area are not getting paid sufficiently to produce the licence plates?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question has been asked.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Stolen Vehicles

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Highways. Would you be prepared, sir, to table the statistics on the number of stolen vehicles brought into Alberta?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, if I have that figure I would be happy to table it.

Pollution - North Saskatchewan River

MR. YURKO:

Yesterday during the question period I had indicated that I would file the report on snow disposal in Edmonton and Calgary and I would like to do so now.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, before we close the question period, could I rise on a point of order once again to return to your ruling on the propriety of the question placed by the Member for Calgary Mountain View because I am unable to find an appropriate section in Beauchesne that relates to your ruling. I do see one that refers to: "Deal with an action of a minister for which he is not responsible to Parliament or with matters not within his official knowledge." Since closure of road allowances can only be done with the approval of the Minister of Highways, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the question is in order, the question that was placed by the Member for Calgary North Hill. I don't wish to pursue it at this time, but rather you take the matter under advisement if you would sir?

MR. KING:

Speaking to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, if I may? This is the third time this has happened this afternoon and the second occasion during the session, and I would respectfully draw the attention of the hon. members to annotation 72(1) on page 62 which says: "The Speaker's actions cannot be criticized incidentally in debate or upon any form or proceeding except a substantive motion." It goes on at some length to say that regardless of the possibility of error in the rulings of the Speaker, that they are, once made, the property of the House, that they are not upon any occasion to be commented upon or debated upon unless the person is willing to move a substantive motion, either appealing the decision of the Chair or censoring the Chair for having made the decision.

MR. HENDERSON:

Speaking to the point of order, Mr. Speaker. I don't take exception with the remarks just made by the hon. gentleman opposite, but the Speaker has not quoted a reference from Beauchesne on which his judgment is based. And when the Chair states it is his opinion then it is in order to ask the Speaker to quote the chapter and verse on which his ruling is based, because if it is not challenged without the establishment of precedent it then becomes a precedent in the House and is binding on the House in future, according to my understanding of Beauchesne. I suggest that when the Speaker simply states it is his opinion, without quoting the appropriate reference on which his opinion is based, the matter is subject to discussion from the floor.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, that is totally wrong and my hon. friend is not very well versed in parliamentary procedure when he even suggests it for a moment. And furthermore, his earlier statement that it was the responsibility of the Minister of Highways -- that wasn't the way the question was framed on this occasion or on previous occasions. If my hon. friend from Mountain View can't frame a question properly after being in this Legislature for so long, it is certainly not the fault of the House or the Speaker.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order, I believe that the question was loud and clear but the answer was somewhat lacking, and I am going to persist. I believe I am within my rights.

Road Allowances (Cont.)

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. With regard to the ruling of the point of order, I must respectfully agree with the comments made and the reference made by the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands. And the hon. Leader of the Opposition is correct insofar as he may be interpreting -- I think it is our Rule 43, I have forgotten the number, it is thereabouts -- which requires the Speaker to state the precedent or rule to which he is referring or on which he is relying when he deals with a point of order.

At the moment when I was giving the ruling I was unable to refer specifically to the section in Beauchesne. It is covered in 171 in a variety of ways and although it may be true that the closure of a road allowance requires the approval of the minister, that is not unique to any road allowances concerning which the minister may be interested. That would apply, if it applies at all, to all road allowances which are closed and which ultimately come under ministerial scrutiny before they are finally closed.

And in addition to what I have said previously on the point, might I also refer to Clause (n) of 171 of Beauchesne. The question, as asked, dealt with any road allowances in which the minister himself might personally be interested. Now unless those road allowances are in any way officially or legally unique to a minister, and thus distinguishable from road allowances over which other people might enjoy certain privileges or which they may have closed off from the public, I must reiterate that the question is out of order.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just comment briefly that the problem --

[Interjections]

-- I am trying to solve a problem, Mr. Speaker. You are not the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the question that I have --

MR. SPEAKER:

Please. I am unable to say whether the hon. member is out of order until we hear at least part of what he has to say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, the question that confronts me and a lot of people in this province is not about legally closed road allowances, but road allowances that are fenced off illegally and are stolen from the people.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. That is a matter which has no bearing on the point of order.

MR. LUDWIG:

It's a valid question.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to make an announcement of some significance to the House. It relates to an important area of treatment of patients who may suffer from cancer in the Province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, the Province of Alberta has adopted a policy position paper on a cancer control program in Alberta. I will file a few copies today in order that hon. members opposite may have one or two copies today, but by the end of the week it is my intention to have copies available for all hon. members.

I want to cover just a few highlights of it, Mr. Speaker, and of course will not read the full text of the position paper.

Today is the day upon which the government also announced a research grant to the Provincial Cancer Hospitals Board in the sum of \$40,000 to be used in research in an area of priority that would be selected by them. Both the allotment of that particular grant and the publication of the position paper today are meant to be a reflection of not only the concern of the government in the area of cancer treatment programs, but also the government's awareness of the whole field.

Mr. Speaker, cancer is the second leading cause of death, ranking behind only degenerative and vascular disease. Sad to say, among children too, it is the second cause of death following only deaths caused by accidents.

A major breakthrough in the treatment of cancer has not occurred, and most experts believe that improved control will come gradually rather than by dramatic discovery. However, the cure rate for cancer has gradually improved in North America from 20 per cent in 1930 to 35 per cent in 1970. It is estimated that one-half of the cancer patients could be cured if optimal therapy were available to all.

A few comments, Mr. Speaker, on the treatment program in existence in Alberta at the present time. Going back to the time the Alberta program was established, treatments available for cancer were restricted to radical surgery and medium-energy radiation therapy. The development of super-voltage therapy, such as the Cobalt 60 unit and the Linear Accelerator, cancer chemotherapy and new surgical techniques, have radically changed the requirements for optimal cancer treatment.

One of the features in regard to the coordinated cancer program that the Alberta government is bringing forward at the present time relates to an increased emphasis on research -- more of which is covered in several sub-headings in the position paper -- and as well an introduction of an improved residency-training program for radiation therapy. The difficulty of recruiting radiation therapists and the need for a strongly supported provincial training program in radiation therapy is recognized.

Temporary space for the Calgary Cancer Clinic will be provided in the renovations being made in the Holy Cross Hospital in Calgary, and this project has been authorized and gone to tender in January, 1973.

There will also be an increased emphasis on outpatient services. That would relate to cancer facilities generally, and in respect to the Calgary facility it is hoped that a day hospital of 12 to 16 beds will be provided.

For the day hospital to function at full efficiency a home-care program should also exist so families may be able to withstand the stress of caring for a patient at home, providing they have access to help and regular visits from trained professionals.

The reorganization of the outpatient department of the Dr. W. W. Cross Cancer Institute has begun in September, 1972. A coordinated consultative service will encourage a changing design for outpatient clinics, so that general practitioners and physicians from a variety of specialties may work together in regard to certain types of cancer.

Further, Mr. Speaker, -- just in passing, without going into details -- the current emphasis on nuclear medicine as a cancer diagnostic aid is an area where new attention and much continuing attention will be given. In respect to medical services, proposals have been developed in cooperation with the medical

profession and represent a plan for uniting and coordinating the actions of the public and private sectors.

The care and follow-up of patients must be streamlined with the elimination of unnecessary consultations and procedures and consequent improvement in patient comfort, the expedition of patient care and financial saving.

Cancer patients will no longer need to attend the clinic in every case for examination and registration, nor for follow-up purposes. This feature is being introduced in the cancer program in order to show greater consideration for the patient than has been possible under previously existing procedures.

As part of a prevention program a registry of six pre- and para-malignant conditions will be established. The follow-up system will ensure that persons at high risk of eventually developing malignancy will be carefully watched so that any developing malignant disease will be treated at its earliest stages. The Provincial Cancer Hospitals Board will establish a follow-up program for patients which may be undertaken through the clinics of the board, or through the offices of private attending physicians.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, the details of the proposal have been approved by the board of directors of the Alberta Medical Association and endorsed by the medical association itself. We do enjoy a wide consensus of approval among the profession, and the government believes that this reorganization of medical services represents an innovative approach to ensuring that provision of expert care for cancer patients will be provided in Alberta.

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

CLERK:

No. 188 standing in the name of Mr. Cooper.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, from my interpretation of the wording of questions 188, 199 and 204, they properly belong on the list under Motions for a Return, if you would examine them. Therefore, I suggest they should be dealt with as Motions for a Return.

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

(1) What are the names and addresses of all contractors hired or awarded contracts for advertising by the provincial government, or its departments or agencies, since April 1, 1972, showing the terms and costs of each contract, allowance or remuneration covering same?

(2) How many public tenders were offered, and who submitted bids, for provincial government advertising and public relations services indicating the amount of each bid, and the name of the successful bidder, since April 1, 1972?

(3) What amount of money was paid to each daily newspaper in Alberta for advertising placed with them by all provincial government departments or their agencies during 1972?

(4) What amount of money was paid to each Alberta television station for advertising placed with them by all provincial government departments or their agencies during 1972?

(5) What amount of money was paid to each Alberta radio station for advertising placed with them by all provincial government departments or their agencies during 1972?

MR. GETTY:

Agreed.

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

Regarding the Lesser Slave Lake Provincial Park, from September 10, 1971 to date:

- (a) Who put up the snow fences and how much did they cost?
- (b) Who installed all signs on Number 2 Highway as to its closure?
- (c) How much government money was spent in Spruce Point Park?
- (d) Who administers Spruce Point Park?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table the answer.

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

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.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I move to amend, seconded by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, Motion for a Return No. 188 by adding the following words, "excepting intra and interdepartmental memoranda."

[The amendment was carried.]

[The motion as amended was carried.]

199. Mr. Ludwig proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Dixon:

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

With respect to the increased liquor prices, as established as of January 1, 1973:

Copies of the study and figures used in determining the necessity for a price increase.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I have a few more words I'd like to say in connection with this particular item. The Legislature, the Government of Alberta, in fact, all governments of Canada, including the federal government, is very concerned about the effects of inflation. And one of the difficulties of inflation is the rise of prices of goods which immediately means that people must secure the wherewithal to meet those rises. So there is a continual round of increase in wages until it gets down generally to the working man and then normally a 'holler' goes up about inflation. We sometimes forget about that when people are in the higher salary brackets and we think about it mostly when we get down to the working man. But the working man can't meet the rise in prices and continue to live a normal life unless he does get an increase in wages.

The point I am getting at is that if there is some way of justifying the increase in prices, it would probably go a long way toward stopping the unprecedented rise in the cost of living. And while the cost of liquor does not affect the cost of living for many people, it does, on the other hand, affect the cost of living for many others who consider liquor as part of their normal diet.

I would like to point out that the government in this case has an excellent opportunity, not of establishing wage and price controls, but of demonstrating the reason for the increase in the price of liquor. And that is what the Motion for a Return is asking. I can't see how this can be embarrassing to the government because there must be some particular reasons for raising the price of liquor. It may have been the price of liquor at the source. The price may have gone up and the Alberta Liquor Control Board has to pay more, so in order to maintain their same level of profit they increase the price. Or the

transportation may have risen. If it was transportation, then that. If it is simply a desire for more profit, then the people should know that too.

But I would think that the justification for this increase in the price of liquor is more than simply a desire for more profit. I would certainly hope that was the case. And if that is the case, then I can see no reason why the government should hesitate to give the reason for the increase in the price of liquor so the general public will know that its business is being conducted in a husband-like way and that the facts are not being hidden in any way.

Now the arguments against revealing the reasons for raising prices can, I think, lead to some pretty serious thoughts on the part of the consumers because the consumers then are left to reach their own conclusions as to why the price is going up. And everyone will likely come to a different conclusion, but none of the conclusions will probably be to the credit of the people who are raising those prices.

So I really think this is an excellent chance for the government to demonstrate to the merchants and the industry and business of this province that it does believe there should be justification for an increase in prices of food and goods. If the government sets the example here by giving the reason why these prices have risen, then it will certainly go a long way towards helping industry and businesses to think twice before they raise the price of goods, particularly if it is simply for more profit -- perhaps an unfair high percentage of profit.

But whatever the reason is I think the government and every member of this Legislature must be aware of the concern, particularly of the people in the lower income brackets of this province who are concerned about the rising cost of foods. While liquor in my view isn't a food unless you are on a very heavy liquid diet, and the working people don't get into that category, nevertheless it does illustrate what is going on in the stores and in the places of business where almost every week there are increases in prices and seldom decreases in prices.

When the federal government announced that it was taking off the tax on certain goods in the last budget, I immediately saw signs in several windows in the City of Edmonton stating why they were suddenly reducing their prices. This was excellent. They gave the reason why. I wish I could see the same thing when the price goes up -- as to why the prices are going up and why this is being increased, and while this is not applicable to foods in that sense, the principle is the same. And I would urge the government to reveal the reasons for the increase in liquor prices as an example to business and industry generally in this province.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make two brief comments. Several weeks ago I was in Regina sitting in on the sittings of the Legislature down there, and several of my friends who happened to imbibe came back with assorted goods. They were amazed at the amount of difference between the liquor prices in Saskatchewan as compared to liquor prices in Alberta. And the quality, it seemed -- it was watered down less than the product we have here. Mind you this was hearsay, I couldn't verify this.

But in view of the fact that the price is considerably lower in Saskatchewan than it is in Alberta, I certainly would like to have the information as to why the prices were raised. If they have been raised so that there would be a larger amount of money going back from the liquor industry into treating alcoholics, treatment centres, then I agree.

And also this government seems to be so proud of the fact that they are not raising any direct taxes, but they certainly are socking it to you indirectly. And this is just another example of how they are collecting indirect taxes. So I certainly agree with my colleagues that we would like to have the information on this side of the House as to why, and whether there is a justification for the rise of prices in the province as far as liquor goes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are you ready for the question?

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to --

MR. KOZIAK:

...close the debate please.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, in relation to some of the comments that have been raised by the hon. Member for Drumheller with respect to the increase in the price of liquor, I think we have to consider this matter somewhat separately from food.

DR. BUCK:

Seventy-five calories an ounce.

MR. KOZIAK:

I don't think we can use alcoholic beverages and relate them in any way to a food. They, of course, are liquid but the problem that the government must concern itself with in determining a price for an alcoholic beverage --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The understanding of the Chair is that the hon. Member for Clover Bar, although he did get into the field of whether or not there should be an increase in the price of liquor related mainly to the question of whether the information should be produced. The hon. member, as I understand it, is now debating the relationship between the increase in the price of liquor and the increase in the price of food. The topic for debate under the motion is whether or not this information may be important enough to warrant an Order for a Return.

MR. KOZIAK:

Well, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order that has been raised by the Chair, I am pointing this out in terms of the statement itself. The Motion for a Return says "copies of the study and figures used in determining the necessity for a price increase." And I am directing my argument to that specific aspect of the Motion for a Return, having regard to the points that were raised by the hon. Member for Drumheller and the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

The reason I say this, Mr. Speaker, is because the necessity for a price increase in the areas of alcoholic beverages may be completely different from the necessity for an increase in the areas of food where costs of goods may go up. What we are dealing with here is policy, not necessarily areas where there are studies, where there are figures.

I would like to relate to the hon. members some of the information that has been developed and propagated by the various people knowledgeable in the alcohol world. Particularly I might refer the hon. members to a comment which was made by Dr. Wolfgang Schmidt when he was in Edmonton some time ago. Dr. Wolfgang Schmidt is from the Addiction Research Foundation in Ontario. He said that "if you increase the price of beverage alcohol by 100 per cent so that the end result is that it's twice as high as it is now, the consumption in the province would reduce by 40 per cent."

Now the important thing about such a statement is that if consumption decreases by that amount, the problems related to the consumption of alcohol will also decrease considerably. Figures and studies show that the rate of alcoholism in a given area is directly proportionate to the consumption of alcoholic beverages in a specific area, so as the overall consumption increases, so does the overall number of alcoholics in that area.

So the determination of whether or not the price of an alcoholic beverage should be increased may have nothing to do with a study that relates to cost of production, or what have you. It may be a policy decision that is made in a specific area. For this reason I would have to state my objection to the motion as proposed.

MR. B. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a comment or two with regard to this matter. I think I can certainly agree that the matter is one of policy determination. What we are attempting to establish by requesting this Motion for a Return is how that policy was determined, and if there are some basic statistics or figures that led up to the policy that is before the people of Alberta, then they should be made available. If there are not any, then certainly this Return can be answered in that manner. But there is no reason in my mind why the request cannot be granted; and this Motion for a Return should be approved.

I think it is of much concern to me that many people in Alberta -- I'm sure we could show from 70 per cent to 90 per cent of our population -- have had a drink of liquor at one point in time in their life, and at the present time I'm not sure what the percentage of drinkers is, but I'm sure it is over 50 per cent of our adult population in the Province of Alberta. If that holds true, we must admit that this extra cost is a tax on all of those people. I think as members of the opposition, members of the government, we must be concerned as to why the prices are increased and why there is an extra taxation. We have to have that information. Every minister who makes a decision or brings a policy forward that is supposedly for the good of the people of Alberta -- and we must know why it is for the good of Albertans.

Mr. Speaker, I'd certainly urge that the government support this Motion for a Return so we can have that information, and we can answer any questions of doubt. We can either support the move that has been made by the government, or we can reject it as we see necessary.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, if I could reinforce again that if you start -- as I said on the point of order originally, in my view this Motion for a Return is out of order, and you are now calling on the government to produce all their working papers in relation to their budget, in effect, because it is only an extension of that from what the present one is to the next time saying the necessity of any change in the budget. With respect, this is a debatable point and therefore it should be dealt with in debate on policy, and there are a great number of opportunities in this Legislature to do just that. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we reject this motion on principle.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, speaking on the question of the principle the minister alludes to, it's amazing that he's discovered principle all of a sudden, because when he sat on this side of the House there were numerous questions and Motions for a Return put on the Order Paper --

DR. HORNER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. Opposition leader debating the motion, or is he on a point of order?

MR. HENDERSON:

I'm on the point of order the minister raised. That's what --

DR. HORNER:

I didn't raise any point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair accepted the remarks of the hon. Deputy Premier as being debate and not a point of order.

MR. HENDERSON:

I'll raise a point of order then, Mr. Speaker. The question of tabling inter-departmental correspondence --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Order please. The advisability of whether or not the Return is to be made is the point of debate, and the only kind of point of order that would seem to be likely to arise would be whether the motion is in order or whether anything that was said in debate is in order, but not whether anything said in debate might be disagreed with on the basis of precedent or otherwise.

Could the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View close the debate?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Good try, Jim.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, this motion produced an awful lot of beneficiary side results. We found out today that the key to solving heavy drinking is within the power of the government. All you have to do is raise the prices a bit higher.

I am surprised by the Deputy Premier's objection because I remember a couple or three years ago we raised the price of liquor by a rather small amount. He was on this side and kept on and on that this was a sales tax and we don't need a sales tax. It was like a tribal incantation, like a broken record -- "It's a sales tax" -- and repeated himself a thousand times. And I am saying --

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, at least I was smart enough to do it in the debate and not on a Motion for a Return.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting how a hit dog always howls the loudest and it doesn't matter what we say, if he doesn't like it, it's out of order.

I am saying that if this is a sales tax the reasons ought to come before the House and we are debating that very matter. I am saying that this information should be given to us. It's in the public interest and of course if the government hasn't got it, it's easy to say we haven't got any because I presume they haven't got much of a study but it is up to us to ask them whether they have one or not.

I think when you hear a minister stand up in the House and say: "We raised it because other provinces raised it." Other provinces all have sales taxes on all sorts of things and are we going to do the same because they did it? This is the most ridiculous statement I have ever heard in this House, the minister saying why they raised it.

So therefore the question came up, why did the government impose a sales tax on a commodity on which they already made \$64,500,000 profit? I am saying that this talk by the Progressive Conservatives that there is no tax in the increases in Alberta is not true. This is a tax and it's going into general revenue and it's going to be used for whatever purpose the government wishes to.

I'm not saying that an increase is not justifiable but the government has not justified it, the challenge is theirs and I believe they would be very remiss in turning this motion down, Mr. Speaker.

[The Speaker declared the motion defeated.]

[A number of members rose, calling for a division. The division bell was rung.]

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided as follows:

For the amendment:

Anderson	Dixon	Ho Lem	Sorenson
Barton	Drain	Ludwig	Speaker, R.
Benoit	French	Mandeville	Strom
Buck	Gruenwald	Miller, D.	Taylor
Buckwell	Hendersen	Notley	Wilson
Clark	Hinman	Ruste	Wyse
Cooper			

Against the amendment:

Adair	Doan	Hunley	Peacock
Appleby	Dowling	Jamison	Purdy
Ashton	Farran	King	Russell
Backus	Fluker	Koziak	Schmid
Batiuk	Foster	Lee	Stromberg
Chambers	Getty	Leitch	Topolnisky
Chichak	Ghitter	McCrimmon	Trynchy
Cookson	Hansen	Miller, J.	Warrack
Copithorne	Harle	Miniely	Young
Crawford	Hohol	Moore	Yurko
Diachuk	Hcrner	Paproski	Zander
Dickie			

Totals: Ayes - 25 Nces - 45]

[The motion was defeated.]

204. Mr. Wyse proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Clark:

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

The 20-page working paper formula used to determine the unconditional incentive grants to municipalities.

MR. WYSE:

There are just a couple of points I would like to make, Mr. Speaker. I believe this is a reasonable request.

The hon. minister has already stated that in fact there is a 20-page formula or working paper, but he is trying to simplify it so that the local governments and MLAs can understand it. As I said on Friday, I don't buy this and I don't think the local governments buy it either. It was some weeks ago that we asked the hon. minister regarding this and we still haven't seen any sign of a working paper. So it seems to me that it is only right and proper that the local governments be given the opportunity to assess the formula for themselves.

But, of course, we still have the question before us: why are Lethbridge and Medicine Hat not receiving their share of the unconditional grants? The minister said the grants were not based on population, but I did a bit of calculating this morning, taking into the account the populations of the cities in Alberta. When we look at the figures, in Lethbridge the grant works out to be approximately \$2 per capita. Of course, we go over to Medicine Hat and it works out to \$2 per capita. We go up to Grande Prairie and find out that it works out to \$7 per capita. Red Deer works out to \$7 per capita and Wetaskiwin works out to over \$7 per capita.

So if we are going to have equality, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me Medicine Hat is being denied some \$140,000 and Lethbridge something around \$200,000. If it's not based on population, then what is it based on? Possibly it's based on where you live in the province, I'm not sure.

But I think the local governments have a right to know what it is based on. So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the government to stop stalling and present the formula so everything will be above board.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid that if we were able to comply with this request the hon. member would be none the wiser.

There are some things that should be pointed out here. The last time I got up to speak about a Motion for a Return, it was commenting on one I had written, myself, five years ago. And this one, of course, is practically incoherent it's so botched up. But we will try and get at the root of what the hon. member is seeking.

First of all, he seeks a 20-page working paper formula. The formula, in fact Mr. Speaker, is three lines long and that has been common knowledge for some time.

Secondly, of course, the hon. member has had -- as have all members -- the formula for the incentive grant in his hands since January 16 when I mailed the formula, in the statement, cut to all hon. members of the Assembly. So I would see very little purpose in submitting it again, if it is, in fact, the formula for the incentive grant the hon. member is after.

I sense it isn't. I think what he is after, is the formula for the assistance grant, not the incentive grant. I rather worry about the constituency the hon. member is trying to advise and represent in this matter if that is his understanding at this time in the year -- that he has not yet determined the difference between the two grants because there is a substantial difference. We had pointed that difference out in our information kits to all MLAs and had asked them to work with their local councils in trying to determine what problems there may be.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, because of a specific reference to a 20-page working paper I assume, despite the fact the hon. member doesn't appreciate the difference between the two grants, what he is in fact after is the working paper for the assistance grant. I have said many times that is a government working paper. It will be made available to the municipalities. I repeated that message to the executives of the two municipal government associations, and the information is coming. We have given that commitment and, of course, we intend to proceed with it.

But in the meantime, because we are dealing with an intergovernment working paper I think, on principle, this motion should be defeated.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the Motion for a Return. I do acknowledge some of the comments of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs that the motion could perhaps be worded in such a way that we get at the question of the Municipal Assistance Grant.

But I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that this is a matter of some very considerable concern to local government officials throughout the province. It will continue to be a matter of concern until we have the working paper tabled. I am sorry that when the minister took part in this debate he did not at least give some clear-cut indication as to when that working table will be tabled. Will it be two weeks? Will it be a month? Will it be two months? Will it be six months? I think that local government officials really need to have some indication as to when this information will be tabled in the House.

I look over the municipal assistance grants, Mr. Speaker, and I find some rather startling differences. For example, the town of Peace River, a town of approximately five and one half thousand people, will have a municipal assistance grant of \$11,600. On the other hand, Spirit River, a town of one thousand people, will have a municipal assistance grant of \$21,000.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I pointed out to you before that I consider this motion to be out of order. We now have the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview debating the question of municipal assistance grants when the motion doesn't refer to them at all. It, in fact, refers to unconditional incentive grants. I don't want to interrupt the hon. member in making his pitch with regard to municipal assistance grants, but again I do believe the motion is out of order. It should be withdrawn and placed in a proper way on the Order Paper and then the debate can carry on in a proper manner. But to allow the debate to go on now on municipal assistance grants when the motion specifically talks about incentive grants is -- you know -- we are either going to have some rules or we are not.

I again point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that you have cautioned us that once an order of the House becomes an order we have to follow it to the letter. Does that mean that if the typist in typing it out the next time around gets 21 pages we can't table it because we no longer have a 20-page working document? Or maybe she will double space the next time and you have got a 40-page document. It's just a silly motion for a Return which wasn't well thought out, and it should be withdrawn, and then we can have a reasonable debate on these other matters.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview deal with the subject matter, which is whether or not this Motion for a Return should be made or passed with regard to unconditional incentive grants.

With regard to the other point of order implied by the hon. Deputy Premier, it is true that if there were a 22-page working paper or an 18-page working paper, that might be sufficient to defeat the Motion for a Return. But it is the opinion of the Chair, with all due respect to hon. members, that it is not for the Chair to decide whether or not such a paper exists in putting the motion on the Order Paper. If the hon. member who places the motion on the Order Paper has specific information or specific reason that there is exactly a 20-page paper of this kind, then unless the matter can be indicated to be out of order on any other grounds, it would be the opinion of the Chair that it must be allowed to appear on the Order Paper.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, the reason I discussed the municipal assistance grant was that the hon. minister in making his presentation on the Motion for a Return made some considerable reference to it. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that the broad intent at least of the Motion for a Return was to try and obtain the information relative to both the municipal assistance grant and the incentive grant.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You've spread yourself too far.

MR. NOTLEY:

However, Mr. Speaker, we accept your ruling on this. Just to carry on with the reasons why I think the information should be tabled with respect to the incentive grant, I recognize that information was mailed to members in mid-January on the incentive grant. But there is still a good deal of uncertainty about this, Mr. Speaker, not just on the part of members of the Legislature but equally, if not more important, on the part of local government officials in the province.

Therefore, the Motion for a Return, in spirit at any rate, is in my judgment the kind of motion which calls for information which should be tabled in the public interest of the province. I think anything we can do, Mr. Speaker, at this level which will make it easier for local government officials to deal with their rather vexing and difficult problems at the local level -- we should undertake those things which make it easier. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that making the working paper available will do just exactly that.

[The motion was defeated.]

206. Mr. Barton proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. R. Speaker:

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

The Regional Economic Expansion agreement of 1972-1973 affecting the Lesser Slave Lake Special Area including all amendments and correspondence relating to this agreement.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, the government has no objection to Motion 206 other than the normal suggestion that this would require the concurrence of the other party to the agreement, the federal government and the correspondents.

MR. SPEAKER:

Unless the House wishes to unanimously direct the Chair to do so, I'm reluctant to accept an amendment in that informal way.

MR. GETTY:

I'll let it stand then.

MR. HENDERSON:

Order, Mr. Speaker. There was a recommendation came from the Chair -- the motion has not come before the House -- I think it was 35(a) that was suggested by the Chair that would deal with this matter of approval of other parties. That motion has not come before the House yet?

MR. SPEAKER:

That's correct. As I understand it, the proposed amendment to the rules which would cover this kind of situation in a routine way and make all these amendments unnecessary has not yet been dealt with.

MR. HENDERSON:

So we'll have to have an amendment on it then to straighten it out.

MR. GETTY:

Let it stand.

MR. HENDERSON:

What for?

On the point of order, isn't it only a matter of having the amendment in writing, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. Minister for Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs wishes to move an amendment and get a seccnder, I think we can deal with it with great dispatch.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the motion be amended after the words "agreement" "subject to getting the concurrence of the other parties", seconded by the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development.

[The motion as amended was carried.]

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

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

A copy of the contract and agreements relating to the loans made by the Government of Alberta under the Industrial Incentives Act to the Boyle Forage Processors Ltd.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, while we accept Motion No. 207 for a Return, I would like, for the information of this House, to point out two differences to my comments on Motion for Return No. 109 in which these two differences pertaining to this particular motion are, in effect, as follows: in Motion No. 207 it was granted under The Alberta Incentives Act and it involves a forgiveable loan. I think that is certainly information for all and for this Legislature. For that reason we will accept Motion No. 207.

MR. SPEAKER:

I didn't quite hear what the hon. minister concluded with. He didn't move an amendment.

Are you ready for the question on Motion No. 207?

[The motion was carried.]

208. Mr. Barton proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Mandeville:

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

Copies of all correspondence from September 10, 1971, to date between the Government of Alberta and the Slave Lake Chamber of Commerce, Town of Slave Lake and Lesser Slave Lake Advisory Committee with respect to the plans and studies on Lesser Slave Lake Provincial Park.

MR. BARTON:

I would like to spend a few minutes justifying the time and the seriousness of what happened to our particular area. And in starting off, I will read the resolution from the TIAALTA, 73, which was passed and it sets up the basis of why I am requesting the letters on the committee report, Lesser Slave Lake Advisory Committee. It reads that:

Be it resolved that the Parks Branch allow for participation and advice as an input into parks and planning and to take into consideration the interests and views of various groups before effecting any changes.

Mr. Speaker, the Park Advisory Board or the committee was never advised of the closing of the park. We did receive a letter from the hon. minister on Question No. 194 outlining the Chamber of Commerce, myself, and the mayor. But in that letter at no time did they say they were going to install \$10,000 worth of fencing. They were just going to close the Lesser Slave Lake Provincial Park for overnight camping. In the meantime, we've lost 23 miles roughly of shoreline where fences were --

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who stole it?

MR. BARTON:

I'm getting to it. Don't worry about it. Keep your time. We've lost this productive area for fishermen, the culverts were dug up by the parks department, fences were put up without any knowledge. This committee has been sitting in limbo for 18 months. And I would appreciate some sort of decision, as it is a regional park in our area. We, as citizens of Slave Lake, and constituents, would like to have some input as to the direction. We have been turned down on several occasions for the park plan for this particular park.

This is one of the reasons I am requesting all this information as it would, I hope, clear up some of the doubts in the area as to the intention of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests and the parks department as to which direction we are going towards helping develop the area as constituents and as merchants. And as people of Slave Lake we feel that we should have some sort of input into this particular park. Thank you.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker -- Oh, perhaps the seconder would like to speak first. He is not here?

Mr. Speaker, we are very pleased, of course, to accept this Motion for a Return. At the same time I accept it in pointing out a certain number of facts. One is that this matter was discussed during the question period last year. As I pointed out at that time the MLA who just spoke received copies of the letters in question, and he could, from that information, have carried forward his responsibility locally. This will be one of the letters that we will again be tabling so the hon. member will have several copies at his disposal.

The park at Lesser Slave Lake has not been closed. The Marten Hills Campground, in particular, had reached a point of almost irreversible damage from overuse. It was essential to close it so we could redesign the campground facilities in that provincial park and make it into the proper kind of facility that it should have been made into in the first instance, before, in fact, those campgrounds were opened. So the campground was closed for that purpose in order to repair it and design it properly. We are, at this moment, Mr. Speaker, planning to continue that work in the coming fiscal year. We have arranged for an alternate campground site to be available so that there will be camping facilities available in the accommodation in the area.

Certainly if the hon. member has any positive suggestions, and I have heard none positive so far from him, we would welcome them.

And thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure I could arrange to spend those dollars elsewhere in Alberta if the hon. member would prefer.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, that was an intimidation and the hon. member should withdraw it. It is entirely unparliamentary to intimidate or to threaten anybody in the House and the hon. members know it.

DR. HORNER:

That's nonsense.

MR. SPEAKER:

I am unaware of the rule that covers that expression. I am unable to say that it is unparliamentary.

Are you ready for the question?

[The motion was carried.]

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I see the Minister of Municipal Affairs is not in the House. But if the government would like to have this held --? Very good. I move, then, Motion No. 210 standing on the Order Paper.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, we accept the Motion for a Return with the following amendments at the end of the motion "subject to concurrence of the parties involved." I move that, and seconded by the hon. Minister of Public Works.

MR. SPEAKER:

You have heard the amendment. Would all --

MR. CLARK:

I wish to speak to the amendment, and we appreciate the government making this amendment. Would it be possible to get the consent of the municipalities quickly, because it will be essential for us to get the information to have a meaningful discussion on the Municipal Affairs Estimates when they come to the House.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I think I should comment, since it is rather vague when the amendment says, "subject to the approval or consent of the parties involved." Does that mean parties other than the government? The way it would read, "parties" would include the government.

MR. HENDERSON:

I was listening to the static from the Deputy Premier, and I wonder if the minister would kindly repeat the answer because I would like to hear the facts instead of the noise.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, my amendment referred to the list of agencies, named in the Motion for a Return.

[The amendment was carried.]

[The motion as amended was carried.]

211. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Ludwig:

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

A copy of the reports relating to tests conducted in Sturgeon Lake on Friday, March 9, 1973, evaluating the impact on fish of seismic detonations on or below the lake bottom.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, with regard to Motion for Return No. 211, there is not at this moment a report on this matter, but it is our intention to develop such a report, and at such time that it is completed, I would be very pleased to table it for the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Under the circumstances, would the mover and the seconder like to have unanimously that the House do withdraw the motion?

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, no. The minister who made the statements when questioned in the House as to what they were going to do about the question of detonations in the lake, said they had reports relating to the test under examination. On that basis they would determine whether the operation would continue.

Subsequently, 32 detonations or charges were placed in the lake and are being detonated today. I am only going by the minister's previous statement, when he said there were reports they were studying, with a view of determining what further course of action to pursue. I am asking for those reports. Is the minister now saying that there are no such reports?

DR. WARRACK:

What the hon. member is saying is quite right, with the exception of, not 32 additional charges but rather 29. If you will check Hansard, you will find that is correct. All I was saying, Mr. Speaker, is that the report on these tests that I had referred to, is in the process of being developed and I would be very pleased to table it. We are accepting the Motion for a Return.

MR. CLARK:

Before we vote on the matter -- vote 211 -- it is my recollection that when we dealt with this matter of questions of the minister, he indicated that the officials in his department had done studies already. Looking at Sturgeon Lake, with a view in mind of seeing the situation prior to the seismographic explosions, that information would be used in comparison to the further studies carried out by the department after the seismograph work was done, to, in fact, see if there is a difference. Certainly, I believe it's that information the motion certainly refers to and is the minister now saying that he doesn't have those kinds of reports? Because they had to be completed before the first explosion went off, or there is no sense in carrying on with the work now.

DR. WARRACK:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to make it clear for the third or fourth time. The explosions, the detonations and the seismic work referred to in the Motion for a Return are with reference to March 9. On March 9 there were two detonations that occurred and those were done in separate ways so as to test with two different examples what impact, if any, there would be on the fish habitat. This report in report form is being compiled at this time, it is what would be asked for by this Motion for a Return, and I would be pleased to respond.

MR. SPEAKER:

It would seem that an Order for a Return worded as this one is could relate only to existing information and not to information, or to documents rather, that have not yet come into existence.

[The motion was carried.]

212. Mr. Dixon proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Barton:

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

A copy of the study done for or commissioned by the Government of Alberta, its departments, agencies or boards verifying the ability of the Peace River country to sustain two rapeseed crushing plants.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, with regard to Motion for Return No. 211, there is not at this moment a report on this matter, but it is our intention to develop such a report, and at such time that it is completed, I would be very pleased to table it for the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Under the circumstances, would the mover and the seconder like to have unanimously that the House do withdraw the motion?

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, no. The minister who made the statements when questioned in the House as to what they were going to do about the question of detonations in the lake, said they had reports relating to the test under examination. On that basis they would determine whether the operation would continue.

Subsequently, 32 detonations or charges were placed in the lake and are being detonated today. I am only going by the minister's previous statement, when he said there were reports they were studying, with a view of determining what further course of action to pursue. I am asking for those reports. Is the minister now saying that there are no such reports?

DR. WARRACK:

What the hon. member is saying is quite right, with the exception of, not 32 additional charges but rather 29. If you will check Hansard, you will find that is correct. All I was saying, Mr. Speaker, is that the report on these tests that I had referred to, is in the process of being developed and I would be very pleased to table it. We are accepting the Motion for a Return.

MR. CLARK:

Before we vote on the matter -- vote 211 -- it is my recollection that when we dealt with this matter of questions of the minister, he indicated that the officials in his department had done studies already. Looking at Sturgeon Lake, with a view in mind of seeing the situation prior to the seismographic explosions, that information would be used in comparison to the further studies carried out by the department after the seismograph work was done, to, in fact, see if there is a difference. Certainly, I believe it's that information the motion certainly refers to and is the minister now saying that he doesn't have those kinds of reports? Because they had to be completed before the first explosion went off, or there is no sense in carrying on with the work now.

DR. WARRACK:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to make it clear for the third or fourth time. The explosions, the detonations and the seismic work referred to in the Motion for a Return are with reference to March 9. On March 9 there were two detonations that occurred and those were done in separate ways so as to test with two different examples what impact, if any, there would be on the fish habitat. This report in report form is being compiled at this time, it is what would be asked for by this Motion for a Return, and I would be pleased to respond.

MR. SPEAKER:

It would seem that an Order for a Return worded as this one is could relate only to existing information and not to information, or to documents rather, that have not yet come into existence.

[The motion was carried.]

212. Mr. Dixon proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Barton:

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

A copy of the study done for or commissioned by the Government of Alberta, its departments, agencies or boards verifying the ability of the Peace River country to sustain two rapeseed crushing plants.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I move Motion No. 212 on the Order Paper. The reason for doing this, Mr. Speaker, is in order to clarify the situation. There has been some concern in the Peace River area that there is going to be a drop in the planting of rapeseed this year, and also there has been some discussion from other towns in the area who feel they should have been given the opportunity -- they feel that two plants would not be supported by the Peace River area. For that reason I hope the information will be forthcoming in the motion as asked for.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are you ready for the question?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[The motion was carried.]

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. Dr. McCrimmon proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Farran:

Be it resolved that the Government of Alberta give consideration to the establishment of additional fish hatcheries in Alberta, to be used for restocking the lakes and streams with sport or trophy fish.

DR. MCCRIMMON:

Mr. Speaker, in bringing this topic before the House I am concerned not only with the sport fishing situation in Alberta, but also with the direct effect it has upon our tourist industry.

The tourist industry in Alberta is considered our third largest industry after agriculture and oil. It is the only industry where no reciprocal concessions are required to be made, such as balance of trade, tariffs and money spent outside the country to balance money spent in the country. Therefore the money spent by tourists accrues directly to the people of Alberta whether through trade, taxation, applying of accommodation, meals and services and so on.

At present tourism brings to Alberta between \$3 and \$4 hundred million annually. The hon. Mr. Dowling has set a goal to bring this figure up to \$1 billion over the next few years. I hope this can be done, it's going to take a lot of work. To achieve this goal certain requirements will have to be met. Due to the fact that the majority of tourists will not come to Alberta for scenery alone, it is in our interest to provide other attractions and facilities. I believe that on the top of the list comes sport fishing. It is estimated that 30 to 40 per cent of the cars crossing our borders from the south during the tourist season have some type of fishing equipment in them. This means that between one third and one-half of the American tourists coming to Alberta are looking for someplace to have sport fishing.

At present I know of no place in Alberta where a person can drive a car and take his family and have a reasonable chance of catching a few trout. I feel this is a deplorable situation in light of the fact that we are on the eastern watershed of the Rockies with literally hundreds of lakes and streams that are the natural habitat of these game fish. I feel that when the Calgary hatchery comes into production as it will very shortly, this will help to alleviate to a certain extent this problem. The Calgary hatchery is a new, modern hatchery which will increase our production in Alberta considerably. Now, why one large hatchery was built in a major city, I don't know. I know there have been questions and arguments over this for the last two or three years. However, the fact that it is in production now, or will be within the next few weeks, is a major help to the tourist industry. But there is one fault that I can see with this. With 700 miles of the eastern watershed of the Rockies, I see no way one major fish hatchery can service this great extent of territory.

Distance alone and tank hauling of the fish preclude the northern section of the province being serviced from one central hatchery. British Columbia has three hatcheries and one summer staging station in their planting system. I

believe that British Columbia is actually several years ahead of us in their game fish program and it shows in the statistics. In 1971-72, British Columbia had a revenue of \$1,150,000 from fresh-water game fishing licences sold. In Alberta for the same period of time, the revenue was \$480,000.

During the last 20 years British Columbia has poisoned 160 lakes to remove coarse fish and restock with game fish and trout. In the same period Alberta has done 39. We have been remiss in the past in our game fish stocking programs, however it is not too late. The fact that the three to four day week is just coming in, as well as longer annual holidays and so on, have a great bearing on the volume of people enjoying our fishing and recreational facilities in Alberta.

With the expected influx of tourists and greater use by Albertans of our provincial recreational facilities, an orderly development must take place with regard to picnic areas, campsites and grounds, trailer parks and facilities, motels, eating establishments, service stations and so on, with a road program geared to this development. To follow this program there will, no doubt, over the next few years, have to be considerable adjustment in the tourist budget and the budget of the Lands and Forests Department. I sincerely believe that every dollar spent in this direction will be returned ten-fold to the province.

You may wonder, where do all of the fishermen come from? The states to the south of us, Montana, Washington, Idaho, and Oregon are reasonably well serviced in regard to game fishing. However, California with a population of over 20 million, and the central states over as far east and south of the Great Lakes have little or no game fishing in their whole area. In California alone with over 20 million people, every time a stream is opened which has been restocked, the fishermen are shoulder to shoulder along that stream and that stream is fished out in a period of three days to a week. And every one of these fishermen is a potential Alberta tourist.

I realize there are those who will say we do not want or need the tourists or the people of Alberta on our lakes and streams. However, I feel that under a well-planned, well-regulated program, use of the God-given facilities of our province does not by any means necessarily mean abuse.

One further point I would like to make and that is in regard to the Banff-Jasper National Parks. Of necessity, our tourist program is closely tied in with the park and the fish-planting program in the park is a pitiful effort. The average plant per year over the past five or six years has been about a quarter of a million fish from one small fish hatchery just outside of Jasper. This fish hatchery has a production each year of about 86,000 enough to do about three relatively small lakes properly. Yet that is all that is available for the hundreds of lakes and streams in the park.

The estimated number of tourists entering the park each year -- those going through the gates -- is estimated at 1.5 million. Those buying fishing licences is estimated at 18,500. I feel that with these facilities there is absolutely no way the tourists can be properly serviced with regard to the sport for which so many of them come up to this northern country.

If we don't get some cooperation, some development in the tourist set-up in the fishing industry or the fishing program for the national parks, a great deal of what we can do here and probably should do and will do will probably be nullified. So I'm hoping through our Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and our Minister of Lands and Forests, and perhaps a bit of prodding from the federal government, that we can get a little more action in the national parks with regard to updating the facilities that are so essentially needed.

One point I would like to emphasize here is probably the most important point of all. We have so far stressed the tourist and the tourist dollar. But basically and more important are the citizens at home -- the average person in Alberta. There are between 300,000 and 400,000 potential fishermen in the province -- people who go to our lakes and streams on weekends and holidays, take their families and enjoy the outdoors, the fresh air and the advantages of nature that Alberta is so fortunate to be blessed with.

At present, many thousands of these people are going to British Columbia for their holidays and fishing, because at present British Columbia is ahead of us. There are more fish in the streams, and a tourist going out of Alberta into British Columbia is just as important to British Columbia as one coming in from the States, and it works the other way around. If we develop our program here we can have them coming in from British Columbia and the surrounding provinces. Let us properly plant our lakes and streams with game fish to keep our own people in Alberta, and to keep them happy and healthy.

There is another area or two that I would like to dwell on for just a moment. We have been speaking about the areas that we have under servicing facilities now. However, this year there will be a new road hard-surfaced to Fort McMurray. This will open up another tourist area in the north. The hon. Prime Minister has stated that there will be a road up the Mackenzie Valley to the north. I understand this priority has dropped somewhat over the last few months, but it will come, there is no question about it, over the next few years with the development of oil and natural resources in Canada and in the Northwest Territories.

However, with this development and the tourist industry that will follow the opening of these roads and natural resources, we have to have facilities -- sport and tourist facilities go along with it. In other words, one fish hatchery in southern Alberta is not going to supply the needs of the years to come. I feel that another fish hatchery somewhere in the Rocky Mountain House or a little north of that area, and another one north of Edmonton are going to be required within the very near future. Planning will have to start very soon because it takes an average of two to three years to bring a hatchery into production, and by this time these developments will have come along and they will be required.

I look forward to comments and suggestions from members on both sides of the House in regard to this topic. I hope most people will agree that this is one point in the tourist industry where there is potential for development as an integral part of one of the fastest growing sections of Alberta -- tourism here in Alberta. Thank you.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to second this motion and to congratulate the hon. Member for Ponoka on bringing it before the House.

I love fishing and perhaps I should say, from the beginning, that my experience of fishing has primarily been in the Calgary area and southern Alberta, and not in the north where the hon. Member for Ponoka is more closely acquainted with conditions. My territory has been from Rocky Mountain House and south.

I know that fishing was a lot more rewarding 25 years ago in terms of catch than it is today. Today you have to travel far and work hard to catch a fish. I know the biggest thrill for a small boy is to catch a fish on a light rod. Few tourists come into this province, either from other parts of Canada or from the United States, who don't have a fishing rod in the car. Just as catching a fish is a thrill for a small boy, frustration of fishing all day long without a bite can spoil a holiday and can be very understandably a total frustration for that small child. If he catches a fish, he shows it with delight to his parents. He perhaps dreams about it for the rest of the year and it makes the holiday.

Now the reason for the decline in fish caught in southern Alberta in recent years is not that fishing skill has changed that much. I am not boasting now, that if sometimes I caught big ones and if sometimes I caught little ones, I was a better fisherman than anyone else. But I am just saying the main reason for the change is that our streams and lakes have become depleted through overfishing and poor stocking. This isn't only the fault of the Alberta authorities, although I do have the impression that they have been more inclined to collect the money for fishing licences than to give value in return over 36 years. I do feel, in a way, that they spend more money on wardens than they do on fish. But I think other authorities are also responsible to a degree, particularly the federal parks department.

The tourist, unfortunately, blames Alberta because he doesn't make the fine distinction between levels of government. I can remember the day 20 years ago when you could put on waders and walk up the Dogpound -- in the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury's riding, I think, or was it the hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane, I am not sure. Maybe it goes through both. You could walk against the stream and you could catch trout all the way along in the little pools underneath the bank. Today the Dogpound is fished out. The same applies to other favourite fishing spots around Calgary. Winchell Lake, Picklejar Creek, even the Highwood is overfished, and the Highwood used to have a tremendous stock of fish.

The days are gone when people could catch big three and four pound cutthroats in lakes like Marvel Lake, where fishing was fantastic when it was first opened in the early '50s. If you want to catch a fish now in the Lake Louise area, you have to go beyond Skoki Lodge. The days are long gone when you could have good fishing in Baker Lake or Ptarmigan Lake, or Redoubt Lake, or any

of those famous lakes close to Lake Louise. You have to head on up the Pipestone into the deep mountains to the lakes where people never get. I should say that in the last year you could count on the fingers of both hands the fish caught in the Pipestone south of Skoki. Close to the cities the creeks are full of suckers, and those are the only fish the boys can catch.

Yet the neighbouring province of British Columbia provides extremely good fishing. I went last year with my little boy into the country west of Quesnel Flats and found excellent fishing in both streams and lakes. And yet the number of tourists in that area is just as great as the number of tourists in southern Alberta. The difference is that the province there has looked after stocking the streams and lakes.

In Montana the streams and lakes are stocked. And those provinces, apart from using modern technology such as stocking lakes from helicopters, also still use wardens on horseback. Our wardens seem to seldom leave the road and they are more concerned with licences than with fish. They don't look after the trails any more, they don't remove the deadfall, and they know very little about game and fish. Yet this was an occupation and profession which attracted a lot of red-blooded Canadians in the past because it was connected with the outdoors. Nowadays they just run up and down the road in a pickup truck.

Part of the problem, of course, has been disease in the hatcheries. The Jasper Hatchery that the hon. Member for Ponoka referred to has had a lot of disease problems. So has the old hatchery in Banff Park. One hopes that the new, very well designed hatchery in Calgary will beat the disease problem. But small hatcheries are feasible too and you improve the odds of rearing fish without risk of infection if you spread the hatchery facilities.

I think the fish pond projects so far as farmers were concerned -- I remember a year or two ago they were talking about the possibility of farmers raising trout as a crop in sloughs and so on for sale to restaurants -- mostly failed because people have underestimated the disease problem and the careful husbandry that is needed for fish farming.

I believe that this is really one of the keys to the success of expansion of the tourist industry in Alberta, that we stock our lakes and streams. There has been a sort of theory in Alberta government circles that it's only safe to stock a pothole, and if you put fish in a stream they are lost forever, they swim down to the river and are long gone. I don't believe experience in other provinces proves this true. If streams are stocked they will continue to hold fish -- also the small pools that are deep enough for them to winter safely. The same applies to lakes, if they are deep enough to avoid winter kill, then they are good enough to stock. But if you just concentrate on stocking shallow potholes in the prairie, every winter the fish are gone. The place really to put the fish is in their natural habitat where fish grew by natural means from the beginning.

I think a lot of attention should be paid to trying to stock our lakes and streams with the fish that are most natural to Alberta -- the cutthroat, the rainbow has been extremely successful, but there are certain other breeds of trout that have not done well in Alberta. The cutthroat and the rainbow seem to be the successful ones and they are the ones behind which we should put the greatest effort.

I commend this motion to the House, I believe that the hon. Dr. McCrimmon is on the right track and deserves full support.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Fincher Creek-Crowsnest, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

MR. DRAIN:

I wish firstly, Mr. Speaker, to commend the hon. member for bringing this very worthwhile resolution before the Legislature. This fishing, of course, is something that was probably one of man's original pursuits because obviously a fish was probably much easier to tackle than a sabre-toothed tiger, for instance -- that didn't require too many implements. In fact, you can even catch trout with your hands if you know how to do it. I wonder if the hon. member who moved that resolution has ever nailed a rainbow trout with his hands, or a cutthroat. But it can be done.

So anyway, I couldn't help thinking about the remarks the hon. members made about fishing and the thought that occurred to me was, what makes good fishing?

I think basically the answer is habitat. And what constitutes habitat? Water, of course, and a considerable quantity of water. This is something we do not have in any great degree at least in the area from Calgary south, so the area for raising fish is really limited. Offsetting this is also the amount of fishing pressure you have, resulting in over-use and over-fishing of the water. Now in order to circumvent this to a certain degree, the fisheries department has inaugurated a policy of keeping one stream open for a season, and then closing it the following season. However, in spite of that, because of the water volume being what it is and the number of fishermen being what they are, they have been unable to keep pace. Therefore, what is the answer?

The answer would appear to be, as the hon. member mentioned, stocking -- an accelerated program of stocking and stocking of more mature fish. In other words, cultivating fish for the market and turning them loose where they can be caught.

However, this is not exactly ideal. And one reason why I say this is because the fish that has been raised in a hatchery environment and turned out into a stream, is a sitting duck -- not precisely a duck because he does swim underwater. But he is very unsophisticated and he is no challenge for a professional fisherman like the hon. member who moved this particular resolution. These fish can be caught just about as fast as you can drop a line into the water because they are still labouring under the illusion that they are home in the fish hatchery, that some kind person is trying to feed them. Not so, they are trying to catch them.

It is interesting that cutthroat were mentioned as a proper fish to stock. And this holds good in certain areas. By nature the cutthroat is a species of fish that thrives in a cold water temperature. He is a fish that is very much subjected to demise if the environment of the particular area he is operating in is changed to any great degree.

I remember when I was a boy in the Crowsnest River all we had -- in the Crowsnest River area if you want me to be grammatical, I notice this offended this member over here -- I found the only species of fish we had at that time were cutthroat, the Rocky Mountain Whitefish, and the Dolly Varden. And now in this particular stream at this time, the species you have predominantly is the rainbow, which I do not believe is a native fish, and a few Rocky Mountain Whitefish that have survived. No more can you see the 12- and 14-pound Dolly Vardens belting their way upstream with the idea of spawning. This is gone. And I suppose no future generations will ever see this unless we put steel fences around all the streams.

I think care of water is an important thing. And this involves more than enforcement, it involves people's cooperation. It is interesting, and it might be of interest to the hon. members, I have a report here done by the Opportunities for Youth, describing the amount of litter on one and a half miles of river. And this will astonish you. There were 866 tin cans of various sizes, 311 glass bottles and jars, 5 old coal stoves, 16 articles of clothing, 21 cardboard boxes, 12 rubber tires, yards of wire, 22 plastic bleach bottles, 1 dead cat, 3 dead chickens, 43 various steel rods and car hubs, bicycle frames, rails, et cetera, that were counted while standing on this particular bridge. Also, 1 large steel tank, 18 plastic bags, 20 bones and pieces of meat, 13 pieces of rubber hose, and numerous pieces of broken glass were seen while crossing the stream. There were 4 pieces of chain, 22 dead fish -- 18 suckers and 4 whitefish, cause of death unknown -- 4 coal cars used in the mines, 5 'you-know-whats', 1 car body, 30 pieces of paper from books, 12 chocolate bar wrappings and 22 soap boxes.

Now, in spite of all the aggrivement that this particular river has suffered, here is the result. The number of insects in this river is fantastic. Of samplings of 1 square foot of bottom, the following were found: 5 stonefly larvae, 1 snail, 2 caddisfly larvae, 6 mayfly larvae, 3 earthworms and 2 large brown grubs. The abundance of insects, combined with the water temperature, is responsible for the abundance of fish in this stream. This stream is probably the best potential stream in the entire Oldman River drainage system, and it is ironical that the most productive stream is also one of the most polluted. Both the productivity and the pollution of the stream are results of geography. It is the misfortune of the Crowsnest River to be located in the heart of one of the great coal mining areas of southwestern Alberta, yet it is due to the altitude of the stream and the temperature that the fish grow rapidly and are found in such large numbers.

Strangely enough, it would be interesting if a study was made of the 'whys and the wherefores' of the productivity per acre foot of water in this particular stream. I may astonish the hon. Minister of the Environment by

making a statement which goes something like this: there is a direct relationship between the productivity of this stream and the amount of coal that is located on the bottom. The reason for this is that the black bottom, in effect, draws the heat of the sun and increases the temperature of the water to the point where it enhances the growth of the food chain system which supports the fish.

Now in the Cordon Valley which is on the other side, when the mine was operating and the stream was being constantly polluted with coal there was a marked improvement in the fishing. As a result of the closing down of the coal mining industry, and hence the purification of the water, the water temperature...was reduced, the areas that the fish were able to survive in were diminished, the amount of food developed because of the reduction in the temperature of the water was less, and the amount of oxygen available when the sun's rays were no longer attracted by the black coating on the bottom was such that there was, in fact, a direct deterioration in the amount of fish in this particular area.

This may be surprising, but this conclusion has not been arrived at lightly. This conclusion has been arrived at as a result of a considerable amount of study, a tremendous amount of personal observation of these particular river systems and I would be quite surprised if these conclusions can be disallowed or disagreed with.

We have one particular lake in our area which has a potential for producing a tremendous number of fish except for the fact that it is too cold for the natural habitat of fish. Therefore, how do you overcome this? I would suggest possibly something like a 'thermal' power plant, which would bring up the temperature of the water and thereby allow the accommodation of a tremendous growth of fish.

In relation to the number of fish that are available, it is my understanding that this new hatchery has a potential to take care of the foreseeable utilization of fish fry for five years and can be enlarged, or increased in capacity by 50 per cent by a rather nominal amount of money being spent on an addition to this particular thing.

However, if the programs of stocking potholes, and lakes and so on were carried on to their full potential in Alberta, I am doubtful whether this particular hatchery would in fact handle the job. It would be questionable, of course, whether from the standpoint of efficiency it would be better to enlarge one particular centralized hatchery where you have accessibility from a centralized area to all points in the province or whether it would be better to have small regional hatcheries which, of course, would certainly add to the improvement of small rural areas -- if there were instead two or three of these small hatcheries developed in various parts of the province instead of a large one.

So, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this particular resolution. I urge all members to support it and I will listen with interest to the remarks they have to make on it.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few remarks in support of the motion. First, I think we ought to look back a few years and determine where we did get the stocking fish in this province. The family of J.B. Cross ought to be commended for having provided the facilities for a fish hatchery in the Calgary Brewery in Calgary, Alberta. That is perhaps one reason why the government did not move faster on a fish hatchery. For many years, while the population was smaller and the pressure for fishing was not as great, this family, through Calgary Brewery, did provide a tremendous amount of fish for planting in the lakes and streams of this province.

One thing the hon. member, Mr. Drain mentioned very effectively is that we need to clean out some of the lakes and streams so we don't stock polluted waters. The Bow River downstream from Calgary has some of the finest fishing in western Canada but the river is polluted and many people will not catch the fish, and if they do they will not eat these fish. I understand the fish have been cleared as suitable for food but many people don't like the thought of fishing downstream from the City of Calgary at which point the water is badly polluted.

I think in building a hatchery in Calgary, it should be remembered that a study was made throughout the whole province as to where the hatchery ought to go. Calgary was chosen as the most likely place at the present time. I

nevertheless support the motion which urges the establishment of more hatcheries, because it takes a certain length of time to build a hatchery. It takes a long time to build up its potential of producing fish for planting in lakes and waters, and therefore a start ought to be made as soon as possible. Nevertheless, the Calgary Hatchery will be sufficient for keeping those bodies of water which can be planted with enough fish for the Alberta fisherman.

I would like to recommend that we cooperate, or ask the federal government to cooperate with us and permit us to plant fish and to stock some of the national park lakes with fish by the province. They have excellent waters, they have excellent lakes, accessible and pure, not polluted, but they are not stocked well enough by the federal government. I am talking about Waterton Lakes, the Lake Minnewanka in Banff and several lakes in Jasper Park. These lakes could draw a tremendous number of fishermen away from those areas which could not stand heavy fishing pressure.

I think that generally speaking there are very many good fishing places in Alberta. Some of the lakes down south have been stocked heavily but they are not as accessible to people from central Alberta and therefore we need to move further north with our heavier stocking program. I am talking about stocking with game fish.

I think that the mover of the motion ought to be commended for urging the government to take a look immediately at establishing more hatcheries throughout the province and I wish to give him my support in his motion.

MR. SPEAKER:

To maintain a balance in the House perhaps we should hear from the hon. Deputy Premier, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood and then the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Circulation.

DR. BUCK:

The fish farmer.

DR. HORNBER:

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to take part in the debate with regard to the question of fish hatcheries, because of a long-time personal interest in the raising of trout and in making better use of the resources we have in Alberta in relation to water, and also the very rich supply of food that is in the waters of Alberta. Unlike my hon. friend for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, in northern Alberta there is an extensive amount of water and it isn't being used at the present time.

It might be interesting to know that fish farming, as such, is increasing around the world. The latest figures that I have for Japanese production is that something like 41,000 tons of trout were grown on fish farms in Japan in 1967. In the Scandinavian countries, principally Denmark, they now culture in excess of 15 million pounds of trout annually.

When we are talking essentially about food production in the world systems. We are talking about protein production, and fish are a very important part of that. In the United States at the moment they are producing about 8 million pounds of trout annually in fish culture and this is all part of the entire fishing operation.

While the sportsman-fisherman needs to be supported in relation to having his lake stocked, I would draw the attention of hon. members to the very great opportunity there is in western Canada in relation to fish farming itself and this can be a very viable operation once we develop or do some additional research into some of the problems that have affected this particular situation.

The Fresh Water Fish Institute in Winnipeg, which is a federal organization, has done a fair amount of work in relation to the situation in Manitoba. What they have found is that there is a substantial difference between lakes, and between provinces in the availability of water and what kind of a result you can get from planting sloughs or lakes that ordinarily don't have fish in them. The kind of result you get varies a great deal.

Some of these variables can be looked after by assessing the water and the lake before you put the trout in them, and having regard to the question of algae buildup and the question of the amount of oxygen that's available and the temperature of the water. But there is no doubt, and I can assure hon. members,

that trout will grow from fingerling size to a market size in the fall and can be harvested in a regular way.

There have been a number of interesting developments in the past couple of years in this area, in regard to cage culture...[Inaudible]... Because one of the real problems was harvesting, particularly in lakes in which there were a lot of weeds and growth, why, it became almost impossible to harvest the trout. There has been some buildup in regard to sports fishery and charging for trout fishing but this hasn't even been scratched when we look at the pits that we have around the country and the sloughs.

So we get back to the question of whether we are really going to do something with regard to a fish industry in Alberta. As such, we require a lot more information in regard not only to some of the cultural problems, but we need a viable hatchery industry in Alberta. I would like to suggest that rather than thinking about the government building another hatchery and having regard to my hon. friend for Calgary Mountain View's very close connection to the present hatchery, I only say this, private enterprise could probably supply at least five times as many trout for the price that we put into the hatchery in Calgary, and at a very reasonable rate.

Having talked to a number of the hatchery operators particularly in Montana, they can put out substantial numbers of trout and with a very modest operation. We have to look at this and I would like to suggest we allow private enterprise to have a look at it and perhaps work with some of our thermal power plants which have very substantial bodies of water that could be used year-round -- to have a look and assess this in relation to a hatchery operation. Because this is essential if we are going to do very much with regard to expanding the amount of trout that are available.

There has been some preliminary work done with regard to the water at Wabamun and whether or not it would be feasible for a hatchery. It would require the cooperation of Calgary Power which owns the power set-up there, but it might be a very useful way to take advantage of some of that thermal energy that is now going to waste.

I think there is also a possibility of a substantial hatchery operation in the Grande Cache area in relation to the thermal plant of Canadian Utilities or Alberta Power in that location. There is some feasibility being looked at there now in relation to whether or not the water would be suitable and whether the year-round temperature would be suitable to have a year-round operation in which you could produce, not only fingerlings and fry, but the hatching eggs themselves.

Once you can get a supply of eyed eggs that are disease-free then it becomes a relatively simple matter of maintaining constant temperatures to hatch them, and from there on they could be made available very simply and in a major way to farmers throughout Alberta -- and to anybody else who was interested in being a fish farmer -- and indeed, as some of the people did in southern Alberta in the Milk River situation in the dams there. The people got together and went on a joint proposal with the government to stock those lakes with rainbow trout. I haven't had a report lately from any of my friends down there as to how they got along and whether they lived over winter, but they certainly grew the first year they put them in there. Most of those trout came from Montana, from a commercial hatchery.

There have been problems, of course, developing in fish culture in relation to disease, and this happens in any livestock operation. Once you start getting accumulations of large numbers you are going to have a disease problem. I think the use of antibiotics and these other things has to be watched carefully because we are going to get into the same problem we have in some of the other matters. But they are now using, in a substantial way, some of the antibiotics to prevent fish disease and it might be useful, in any case, to prevent the spread of disease.

I would hope the government hatchery in Calgary would be able to develop a very useful sort of basic breeding stock for Alberta waters. This might be necessary to establish a commercial hatchery industry in Alberta, and they might have access to some of that breeding stock. I think we have only scratched the surface in relation to a cross-breeding program and a selection program with the breeding stock that might be best suited to Alberta. The question of how fast they grow -- all of the things, and if you can relate it there is really not much difference between cross-breeding programs and selection programs in the fish program than there is in relation to the cattle industry or the hog industry. It can be done in a similar way.

So I am all for seeing additional hatcheries built in Alberta. I would like to suggest to the Legislature that they allow private enterprise to do it because I think they can do it much more effectively and at much less cost, provided the government -- and I'm sure this government will -- gives leadership in relation to breeding stock and regulations in regard to disease and the question of the use of chemicals and all the things that are involved in an environmental way in relation to building up a really superior stock of trout, not only for our anglers and our sportsmen, but in fact as a basic new industry in Alberta, fish farming, that could be tied together with other farming operations.

I would like to see two or three commercial hatcheries built in the Province of Alberta. Certainly we are interested in it from a departmental point of view in relation to increase in the income of farmers, if they can get additional side operations they can handle and enjoy doing. Most of them who have tried it get a great deal of enjoyment out of watching the fish grow, and even though you don't get as many as you think you might get, they are particularly tasty because you raise them yourself.

So we are interested from the departmental point of view in relation to increased income for the farmer. I have had some discussions with my colleagues in the department in relation to the whole idea of fish farming and intend to do some further investigations to see, in fact, whether or not it would be feasible to keep abreast of the work that is going on at the Fresh Water Institute in Winnipeg. They in fact started the idea of fish farming in western Canada. It certainly isn't new to the world, of course, but it was here and we haven't done very much with it in Canada or in this area. It is a very intriguing area and I would hope that all members will be able to support the motion in that we could allow private enterprise to get involved in fish hatchery and commercial fish egg production so we could do all of the things we have been talking about.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, recently it happened that the hon. Minister of Agriculture stole my thunder, and he has done it again today.

However, I will proceed and at the risk of repeating some of the arguments he has used, I would like first of all, in view of the time, before I get into my debate to move an amendment which I intended to move at the end of my debate. I would like to move an amendment to this motion so that the amendment would then read:

Be it resolved that the Government of Alberta give consideration to the establishment of additional fish hatcheries in Alberta, either government or private industry owned and operated, to be used for restocking the lakes and streams to enhance the enjoyment of the citizens of this province in the sport of fishing and in the development and expansion of fishing as a tourist attraction and commercial industry.

This amendment is moved by myself, and seconded by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, Mr. Ghitter.

I think the introduction of this resolution is very timely and very important and I am pleased to have the opportunity to expand the resolution. It is timely because of the expansion of programs by this government, the initiatives this government has taken in the development of new programs in the area of tourism, in the area of secondary industry, and in the area of developing industry that can be decentralized.

And certainly the matter of establishing additional fish hatcheries is one that is not peculiar to cities or the urban areas. It is one that could lend itself very attractively to the rural areas of this province, and it would provide a number of things.

One, it would provide diversity in the kinds of industry, whether it's with a view to the tourist industry or to commercial industry. It's a new diversity or an additional one which has not been given very much thought in the past. It provides jobs in the rural areas for people who would be capable of having employment without the need for a great deal of education which is costly. It would provide jobs for people in Alberta who prefer to have the freedom of the outdoors and of working close to nature.

In thinking about the additional development of fish hatcheries, I think we need to think of more than just one variety of fish. I know that the hon. members have mentioned the very popular Rainbow Trout, but I think that if we

consider the expansion of this very viable kind of industry we can have a great variety of fish bred in these hatcheries and stocked in our lakes.

Certainly fishing as a sport provides a great deal of relaxation for young and old alike. It is not restricted to citizens who have financial abilities. It is not restricted to citizens who are very capable and very sports-minded. It really suits every type of individual. And if one could come away with some prize catch from an afternoon of relaxation, it adds and enhances that relaxation.

In the direction our society is taking today, in the work society where a great deal more time is made available for those who are employed for time of relaxation, time for doing other things than earning their bread and butter, this really can be a much more attractive method of relaxation than probably previously has been considered for several reasons. One of them, of course, is if we stock many more of our streams and lakes it would eliminate having to travel for long distances and needing two, three and more days in order to benefit from this kind of activity.

What does it do, of course, for our tourist industry? As we observe many programs that are currently seen on television, we find more and more of them are directed towards the sport and art of fishing. But always, or almost always, we observe these attractive areas are not so much in the Province of Alberta. I would say it isn't because of the lack of waters within our boundaries. I would say it is because we have not developed that kind of industry, we have not seen to it that our lakes are stocked sufficiently to make it a very enjoyable and attractive sport here. And so we view, and send our people away from Alberta for their vacations and their enjoyment to other countries or other provinces.

So what have we here to offer? We have more than dry land to offer. And I feel very strongly that certainly it needs a great deal of development and we can succeed immeasurably.

Mr. Speaker, before I get into the next topic I wanted to deal with, I would prefer to leave it for another time, call it 5:30 o'clock and adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member also call it 5:30 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, tonight the House will be sitting as an Assembly. First, at 8:00 o'clock we would propose to move second reading of Bill No. 2, The Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, 1973. Following that, we would move the House into Committee of the Whole Assembly for clause-by-clause study of Bill No. 2, the Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act. Following that, the item on the Order Paper, Committee of Supply would be called and we would then move into consideration as a Committee of Supply, of reports of subcommittee chairmen, beginning with the reports with respect to completed estimates of the Departments of Agriculture; Culture, Youth and Recreation; and Industry and Commerce.

MR. SPEAKER:

May I direct, or draw, the hon. members' attention to Bill No. 2 which should be on your Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders for second reading.

The House stands adjourned until 8:00 o'clock this evening.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 5:28 o'clock.]