

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

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

## PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 207 The Municipal Government Amendment Act, 1973

MR. TRYNCHY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 207, being The Municipal Government Amendment Act, 1973. This bill will place control of the billiard rooms in the hands of local municipalities and will provide the municipalities with the local autonomy they so desire.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 207 was introduced and read a first time.]

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly 30 Grade 8 students from Rosslyn Junior High School, which is located in my constituency of Edmonton-Caldor. The students are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Bill Gordon who also brought a large group of students from the same school out here last year.

The class is engaged in a fairly comprehensive study of governmental and parliamentary process and I would like to congratulate them for their interest. They are seated in the public gallery and I would ask that they stand and be recognized by the members.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly, the Town Council of the town of Vulcan. First of all the Mayor, Del McQueen; Deputy Mayor, Dave Mitchell; Mr. Howie Klippert; Mr. George Richardson; Mrs. Graham; Mr. Ken Orchard; Mr. Gene Waskiewicz; and the engineer consulting with the town at the present time, Mr. Don Matthews. I would like them to stand and be recognized.

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted this afternoon to introduce to you and to the members of this Assembly 15 constituents from the Redwater-Andrew constituency. I commend them for their interest in the session. They are in the public gallery. I would ask them to rise and be recognized at this time.

## FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I have pleasure in tabling today the Conservation of Historical and Archaeological Resources of Alberta -- Report and Recommendations by the Environment Conservation Authority.

Also Mr. Speaker, I have a very distinct pleasure in tabling in the House today a report by Syncrude on environmental matters in regards to tar sands

development. The report is titled The habitat of Syncrude Tar Sands Lease No. 17: an initial evaluation.

I do want to say at this time, Mr. Speaker, in our extensive discussions with Syncrude on environmental matters we had requested and received permission from Syncrude to table a series of documents, a series of reports that they have prepared in regard to environmental matters.

We will also be tabling before too long, a series of reports prepared by the Government of Alberta in this regard, and I would just like to suggest that it is not the government's intention to disagree or agree with the contents of this report by Syncrude.

Our main intention in making it public is to make public as much information as possible on tar sands development. I think that we feel honoured to congratulate Syncrude in that they are of the same point of view, and that they feel that as much information as possible should be released to the public, so that the public and all the people of Alberta know what, in fact, is going on in this development.

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

##### Craig Case

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Premier. I wonder if the Premier could advise the House as to whether he has as yet had an opportunity to read the report on the Craig case, prepared by The Alberta Human Rights and Civil Liberties Association?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I am part way through the report and have not finished reading it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller, followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West.

##### Rural Schools Centralization

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the hon. Minister of Education. Has the government or the department put a 'freeze' on further centralization in rural schools?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Certainly not, Mr. Speaker. The question of which schools in the local area are open or closed, is one which resides essentially with the local school boards. In my view, in order to preserve local autonomy and reflect the wishes of local people, that is where the decision-making power should reside.

However, we are contemplating measures, perhaps legislative, perhaps regulatory, which will ensure that where a board wishes to materially change the arrangement of schools in a rural area, they would give adequate notice to all those parents affected, perhaps six months' notice prior to any such change being implemented, for example at the start of the school year, perhaps also acquiring a public meeting or meetings to be held for the purpose of allowing the parents affected to make their concerns known.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is there going to be a requirement for the approval of the department before final centralizations take place where there is protest by parents?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well we would not contemplate or see a change whereby the department would be required to approve a move which might be described as centralization. That is still in the jurisdiction and should remain within the jurisdiction of the local school board. But we would take such steps as are proper, I think, to

ensure that there is every opportunity to parents affected, including adequate time for them to make clear to the board their views on both sides of the issue.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary question. Will there be a special adjustment in the grant structure to permit the school boards the six-months leeway that you talk about?

MR. HYNDMAN:

No, Mr. Speaker, I don't think any adjustment would be called for in these cases.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge East, followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. Oh, sorry, Lethbridge West and then Lethbridge East.

Teachers' Strike Negotiations

MR. GRUENWALD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. How are negotiations coming in the teachers' strike in southern Alberta? I understand there is a news blackout on all negotiations. Is this true?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, the negotiations are proceeding, nearly literally around the clock. There is no major breakthrough, that I would be happy to announce to the floor.

There is a news blackout which I personally directed the Board of Industrial Relations to impose on the parties to the dispute. I did this for this reason, that while the facts that separate the two parties are public information -- and important public information as indicated in an editorial in the Lethbridge Herald, and I agree entirely -- once those facts were given, and once those facts were presented by the teachers and by the trustees and confirmed by me in this Assembly, thereafter the statements made by both parties following two meetings were of the kind that have made the judgment. Should the news media become the arena for negotiation, this would further separate the parties rather than bring them closer together.

Just to give you one example, because I think the issue which the gentleman asks about is very important, from the Red Deer Advocate reporting from Lethbridge:

Talks broke off last Wednesday with school board's chairman Ray Clark charging that teachers have an "irresponsible and frivolous attitude to the gravity of the present situation." Alberta Teachers' Association negotiators said trustees "replied with curt, close-minded arrogance in breaking off talks."

It is not my view, Mr. Speaker, and members of the Assembly, that this kind of approach is conducive to the public interest -- which is the conclusion of a strike, not a prejudice to either party, but as favourable as it can be to both parties and to the general interest of the people of Alberta which we in this Assembly represent. And so while I am on my feet and answering this question --

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. minister be able to conclude shortly. The answer is becoming more or less the equivalent of a statement which might be made on Orders of the Day.

DR. HOHOL:

Very well. I simply want to appeal in a very straightforward sense to the trustees and the teachers -- as it is well past zero hour for conclusion of a dispute that began last May -- to get on with the business and conclude the agreement.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge East, followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Highway 3 School Crossing

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Highways. Is it your intention to review a decision made by your department to refuse a request for a school crossing across Highway 3 which was ordered by your officials? The school crossing is in Barnwell.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that question under advisement and I will report to the House tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood.

McIntyre Porcupine Employees

MR. NOTLEY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct this question to either the hon. Premier or the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Can you advise the House whether it is true that McIntyre Porcupine are planning to increase their operations in April and that they are going to be bringing their employment up to the pre-layoff peak this year?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, the exact nature of the question is such that we might need additional information in terms of being that specific. The intent of the statements to us is such that I would have to answer positively and say yes to the question.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, again to either the hon. Premier or the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Has the government considered any sort of overall policy to deal with a company which makes a management decision that lays people off one month, causes hardship and considerable public expense as a result of that, and then rehires them some months later?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, with regard to that matter, I think it would quite clearly come within the ambit of the responsibilities of the Crump Commission and I will see that the hon. members's question is passed on to the chairman of the commission and that that matter is considered by them.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Can the minister advise the Assembly why, when the cabinet committee visited Grande Cache, they did not seek a formal meeting with the officers of the local union?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, the meeting that was arranged at Grande Cache was between representative Ministers of the Crown which have responsibilities with respect to the town of Grande Cache, and with representatives from the town of Grande Cache. Several groups had their leaders there at the meeting including the bargaining agents and probably other -- in fact the president of the union at Grande Cache was at the meeting.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, in addition to that matter I think it should be made clear for the record that when the Executive Council met with the Alberta Federation of Labour -- which I believe was just prior to the commencement of the session -- a

fairly significant portion of a long afternoon was spent discussing matters involved the question of Grande Cache. It was a full discussion. Representatives of the union that were involved at Grande Cache were there.

They made some representations and the most immediate of their representations, as well as that of the Alberta Federation of Labour, was to request the government to organize a public inquiry into the matters relative to Grande Cache. It was their strong suggestion and recommendation that we do that.

We followed that recommendation and of course, we are delighted that the Alberta Federation of Labour has responded affirmatively to our decision. In addition to that, of course, on the Crump Commission is Mr. David Graham who has a background in the labour movement.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood followed by the hon. Member for Highwood.

Employment Situation in Banff

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. With regard to staff shortages at the Banff Hotel, can the minister advise whether there is any coordination between the federal and provincial manpower departments to immediately overcome that problem in light of our unemployment situation? And in addition, if I just may ask at the same time, is there any requirement for UIC recipients to accept jobs when they are available?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, on direct representation from the hotel management and also on representation from people representing the hotel management, we and Canada Manpower are working together to the end that this particular facility and others in Banff and other places in the national parks have adequate staffing.

The matter of UIC is not a factor or a problem or a consideration with us. It is a matter of suitability for the particular job.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Highwood followed by the hon. Member for Macleod.

District Youth Representatives

MR. BENOIT:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is addressed to the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation. I was wondering if the minister could tell me who in the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation determines where public personnel like area youth representatives are located? Who has the final authority in the department?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, the final authority for any decision of course, rests with the government of this province. However, I am quite sure that the hon. member is referring to a situation in his constituency, in the town of his constituency. I would suggest that the withdrawal of a district youth representative from High River was caused by the mayor who asked for the removal of the district youth representative to another town, which has been done. We feel that a mayor of a town has this authority to ask and we have these people ... [Inaudible]

MR. BENOIT:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. How does the department determine where this type of personnel is placed? What are the criteria for placing personnel in the first instance?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, that is based mostly upon need, the size of the town serviced, the area serviced, and of course, especially the demand for service. At a recent meeting the mayor stated to the public in High River that it was felt the

youth of High River did not need this service and therefore he asked for a withdrawal.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Macleod followed by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

Kraft Products

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. Can you advise the House of any instructions, orders, or directions which have been issued preventing the purchase of Kraft food products for the government departments in support of a consumer boycott?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I can't. I will have to take that question as notice and check into it. Perhaps the Minister of Consumer Affairs could respond.

MR. DOWLING:

No, Mr. Speaker, not at this time but I will certainly take it as notice and follow it up for the hon. member.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Supplementary question for the Minister of Agriculture. Do you support the boycott of Kraft dairy products?

DR. HORNER:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewell.

Rural Schools

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Education. The question deals with the policy regarding school buildings in rural areas. I would like to ask the minister if he would give us some indication what guidelines are to be used in determining the service area, because, in fact, the guidelines revolve so seriously around the service area as they are set out in the new guidelines.

MR. HYNDMAN:

I think, Mr. Speaker, that would take somewhat more time than we have in the question period. But I will get the information and provide it to the hon. gentleman, or he could ask me a question later on and I could provide it for the House.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Minister. Being very specific as far as the service area surrounding Stony Plain -- does the service area surrounding Stony Plain include Winterburn?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I don't know specifically, Mr. Speaker. This is a matter which officials of my department and the elected representative there have been working on. We try to work out a joint arrangement in consultation that is acceptable to both groups. I think they have just about completed discussions regarding the possible service building area for the purpose of deciding what area would be looked at when new school building applications are received. But I will check on that and provide details.

MR. CLARK:

Another supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the Department of Education given approval to the request from the County of Parkland dealing with an additional or a new school in the Meridian Heights subdivision of Stony Plain?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I don't believe so, right at this moment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the minister if he would direct the officials in the Department of Education to give the highest priority to this particular matter because the application has been in the department's hands since December, and unless a decision is made almost immediately there will not be educational facilities in that area come September 1.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, unless the school boards provide adequate information we are not prepared to make a decision. Whether that information has been provided, I am not sure.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for --

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Have you had any representation from the representative for the Stony Plain constituency on this matter?

MR. HYNDMAN:

There have been a great number. I have been consistently advised, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewell, followed by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

#### Cooking Lake Water Levels

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of the Environment. My question is, is the government giving any further consideration to the stabilization of the water levels in Cooking Lake?

MR. YURKO:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this matter was under consideration by the Environment Conservation Authority and they produced a report and submitted it to government. In this year's budget we have budgeted \$60,000 for a fairly substantial preliminary engineering study into the ramifications of a scheme somewhat similar to what was proposed during the hearings, or perhaps somewhat different.

DR. BUCK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister been in contact with some of the people who made representations to the Environmental Conservation Authority to find out what engineering studies they had done?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, quite a few of the people from around the lake have met with me on several occasions. To my knowledge, at no time have they produced an engineering study, or I don't think even suggested that one, in fact, was done by them. So I really don't know what the hon. member is referring to.

DR. BUCK:

A supplementary to the minister. Has he been in consultation with the County of Strathcona in this matter?

MR. YURKO:

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that representatives from the County of Strathcona have seen me on this matter in regard to some of the delegations which have met with me.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood.

CKUA Programming

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. Minister of Advanced Education. Mr. Minister, have you received any representations from the University of Alberta Senate with regard to their concern with the future programming of CKUA?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I have been watching with interest the deliberations, not only by the University of Alberta Senate but by other groups in our society, concerning the very excellent facility known as CKUA.

I cannot say, Mr. Speaker, that I have received a submission from the Senate in the course of the last few days, although I haven't gone through all my mail. I understand the Senate is dealing with this question and I'm sure that in due course they will express their concerns and opinions to me.

MR. COOPER:

A supplementary, Mr. Minister. Could the minister reassure those persons concerned with this issue and members of the House -- and there are a lot of people down my way that like this station -- that the programming format presently used by the station will be maintained?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I think my hon. colleague, the Minister of Education, referred to this earlier and suggested the proper time for a discussion of the role in the future of CKUA and other media involved in the proposed educational communications corporation will be at the time that bill is brought before the House and perhaps should be delayed until that time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question has now been asked.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Asbestos Health Hazard

MR. WILSON:

I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Can you at this point advise the House if you have received technical advice from your department's experts as to whether exposure to asbestos is an industrial hazard?



DR. HOHOL:

Not yet, Mr. Speaker. But this and other safety matters are under constant study and consideration.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, on the same hot issue, I would like to ask the Minister of the Environment if he has had the opportunity to check with his officials to see what research projects they have planned for this year in this particular area.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I think in replying to a similar question one or two days ago I indicated that my memory wasn't too clear but I thought perhaps an application had been made to the Environment Research Trust for research in this area.

I haven't had the opportunity to check this, but I wish to state this: that the jurisdiction of Alberta wouldn't find itself amenable to doing a tremendous amount of research on a matter as broad as this. We would rely to a much greater degree on the voluminous research being done in the United States, the European countries and Canada as a whole for guidance in this area.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Labour. Did your department reject amendments to The Workmen's Compensation Act to include asbestos-related diseases among asbestos workers as an insurable illness?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, now honestly I would have to say that I have neither accepted nor rejected. The matter of The Compensation Act is currently under review.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Premier. Would you consider the establishment of an ad hoc cabinet committee to examine jointly the multi-implications of asbestos on the general public?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member recalls, within the Speech from the Throne there was an observation there of some significance that the government intends to announce shortly relative to the whole question on occupational safety and occupational hazards. I would think that matter would be involved in the total announcement which will be coming in due course.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question. Has the Minister of Education had an opportunity to do the checking into asbestos clay and its effects?

MR. HYNDMAN:

This investigation is now being done, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

#### Sturgeon Lake Seismic Operations

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Under what authority were seismic activities permitted on Sturgeon Lake?

DR. WARRACK:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the authority for seismic operations falls jointly within the Department of Lands and Forests, and the Department of the Environment when the seismic operations that are contemplated are over a water body. It was within the responsibility of these two departments, Mr. Speaker, that these authorities were granted.

MR. LUDWIG:

A supplementary to the minister. Did his department then in fact approve the activities over the lake?

DR. WARRACK:

Yes.

MR. LUDWIG:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Were there any consultations with the Indians in the area as to their concern about the seismic activities on the Sturgeon Reserve?

DR. WARRACK:

No.

Amendments to Canada Pension Plan

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Premier as a follow-up to yesterday's question that I made. The question was with regard to amendments to the Canada Pension Plan and as to how they affected, or made it possible to exclude certain groups that protested involvement in the Canada Pension Plan because of religious reasons.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I am now aware of the import and nature of the question asked by the hon. member and have referred it to the hon. Provincial Treasurer this morning. I'm not sure when, but we hope to have an answer in a day or so for the hon. member.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd appreciate that answer as soon as possible.

While I am on my feet I was wondering if the Premier has had an opportunity to put together the transcript of his remarks on the steps of the Legislature and could table them in the House?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have them. I intended to bring them into the House today, but I'll table them tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway, followed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

Women's Overnight Shelter

DR. PAPROSKI:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. I wonder if the minister could tell me whether the department intends to continue to increase funds for the operation of the Women's Overnight Emergency Shelter in Edmonton which is serving such an important need?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, this subject has been made the subject of a brief by the organization concerned and the department has not yet finalized its consideration of it. In the normal course of events what would be done is that the response to the brief would be made directly to the people involved and after that be made public.

DR. PAPROSKI:

One supplementary question, Mr. Minister. Can I have assurance that this will be done as expediently as possible because their need is apparently very urgent.

MR. CRAWFORD:

I have no hesitation in giving the necessary assurances, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Clover Bar, followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

Cooking Lake Water Levels (Cont.)

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of the Environment. Just in case I missed something, Mr. Minister, did you say there would be a date when the engineering studies would be completed on the Cooking Lake project?

MR. YURKO:

No, Mr. Speaker, I didn't say that there was going to be a date established.

DR. BUCK:

Fine. I would like to know if your department has changed the percentage of local participation that would be required in a project such as this, as you mentioned in your lake stabilization program last year.

MR. YURKO:

No, Mr. Speaker, the project would come directly under the policy announced by this government in terms of lake stabilization. This policy was announced, I believe, last November.

DR. BUCK:

Another supplementary, Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister inform the House what representation he has received from the Edmonton MLAs regarding the importance of this project?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of Edmonton MLAs that continually prod me on this project.

MR. LUDWIG:

Prod him or goose him on this one?

DR. BUCK:

A final supplementary to the Minister of Lands and Forests. Has he considered this area as a provincial park?

DR. WARRACK:

Not at this time, Mr. Speaker, although my understanding would be that it may very well be a very useful area to consider for that purpose in the more distant future.

Timber Harvesting Study

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I do wish to answer a question that I had agreed to seek out the answer to just a few days ago, with respect to the Environmental Effects of Timber Harvesting Study that we are having done. One question was whether there had been from among the formal proposals, any proposals from Alberta firms and the answer is yes. There were three proposals that were separate from Alberta firms and one that was in combination with a firm from British Columbia. So the answer to that question is yes.

The second question was had there been consultation with members of the Alberta Forest Products Association whose areas would be directly involved, and the answer to that question is also yes.

Rather than go into the matter in great detail, Mr. Speaker, I would table the news release. It gives additional information in that regard.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Criminal Injuries Compensation Act

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I, as requested by the hon. Attorney General, repeat the question that I asked yesterday? With reference to The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, what percentage of payments have been made to persons who were injured while inebriated?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I have received some information from the Chairman of the Crimes Compensation Board and it is his estimate that approximately 60 per cent of the people who received payments from the board were injured in an instance where alcohol was involved either on the part of one or more of the people involved.

I should add for the House's information that it is the practice of the Crimes Compensation Board when hearing these applications to ask the applicant the extent to which he had been drinking. If they form the opinion that the amount he had drunk had something to do with the incident, there is a reduction in the amount awarded by the board as compensation.

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Attorney General. I wonder, did I understand you to say 16 or 60?

MR. LEITCH:

60, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Snowmobile Death Statistics

MR. COOKSON:

I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Highways. In view of the recent report of the Snowmobile Association in Ontario of the death of 36 people using snowmobiles, have you any statistics now on the 1973 season here in Alberta?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, we have not received any reports yet from the Canada Safety Council in regard to the number of people who have been killed throughout Canada. Last year there were 116 deaths reported through the Canada Safety Council.

MR. COOKSON:

A supplementary, perhaps to the hon. Attorney General. In view of the rather stringent regulations that we have in Alberta, I was wondering whether you might have information as to whether national insurance companies use the figures across Canada for their calculations in insurance rates?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to check with the Automobile Insurance Board before responding to that question.

As I have indicated earlier, it is my view, and it is my understanding the board is following this practice, that the rates for insurance paid by the people of Alberta ought to be based on Alberta experience and not experience elsewhere in Canada.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

#### Education Finance Plan

MR. NOTLEY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Education. It follows questions I raised yesterday with respect to the grant structure for rural school jurisdictions. Can the minister advise the Assembly what formula is used to compute the additional or supplementary grants to those jurisdictions which have a sparse population?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well, there are no sparsity grants as such, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before. This year for the first time in some four years there is a very generous \$2.4 million available to the more remote rural jurisdictions to help them over problems relating to small schools, jurisdiction, and population.

I think if the hon. gentleman would put that question on the Order Paper relating specifically to the school jurisdiction he is interested in, I could give him details regarding the method of calculation. Certainly we have stated and invited any school board which feels it has a special local problem to come to the department to see if there should be some change in the general regulation, which, because it cannot apply to 120 school boards, is available for changes for reasons of equity.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, then, for the sake of clarification, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise me whether it's true that the \$2.4 million then is the amount allocated for all divisions in the province which, because of extraordinary local conditions, make special submissions to your department? I believe that this was announced in your January 26 announcement and that \$2.4 million is for all of them, including urban school divisions as well?

MR. HYNDMAN:

No, Mr. Speaker, that is not a special grant allocated for that purpose. Those monies were added to the school foundation fund when the fund went from the old cluster system of arriving at pupil grants, which was very difficult to comprehend and which also caused very real disadvantages and problems to smaller school jurisdictions. So when the plan went to a per-pupil grant, apart from the cluster grant, in order simply to do that, the \$2.4 million was necessary. The reason for that, some of the smaller rural jurisdictions in remote parts of the province will be getting up to 15 per cent increase this year over last year in the monies from the fund.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Calgary Millican, followed by the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray --

MR. CLARK:

Just a supplementary question to the minister. Mr. Minister would it be possible for you to provide to each of the MLAs the calculations from the department as to the revenue that school districts in their constituency will be receiving from the foundation program?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I'll consider that, Mr. Speaker, and if it is possible and desirable, I will certainly do so.

Insurance For MLAs

DR. BOUVIER:

To the minister who is in charge of the policy on the MLA disability policy. Are there any plans on the part of the minister to renegotiate this policy with a view to eliminating the discrimination that now exists against MLAs who pilot their own planes?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, in answering that question, first of all you recall that last year, for the first time, we felt there was a need for life insurance for members of the Legislature, because of the fact that, generally speaking, the civil service has group life insurance policies and it would seem fair to provide the same kind of coverage for all members of the Legislature, regardless which side they sit on.

As a result the policy was set up originally with the insurance coverage being provided in the event that the member of the Legislature was on government business. In the case of our hon. colleague, in the unfortunate accident he had, it became confusing. As you know for all members of the Legislature their duties in their constituencies, and in their personal life, frequently blend, Mr. Speaker, and it is very difficult to determine whether in fact an MLA is on a trip performing a combination of business as a member of this Legislature, and some personal things. So we feel, for the minimal cost involved, which is an additional \$800 or \$900 per annum, that we should not have this condition on the policy, and all MLAs should be provided with a basic life insurance regardless of whether they are on government business or not.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Gas and Energy Policy

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I have two questions for the hon. Premier today, regarding gas and energy problems.

My first one is, is the province, Mr. Premier, investigating the suggestion of the Independent Petroleum Association that governments accept gas production rather than cash royalty on gas produced in Alberta, and the suggestion follows up for asking the federal government to do this, and I wonder if Alberta is going to follow suit.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, that is a subject that has been worked on by the Minister for Mines and Minerals, and I would refer that question to him.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, the idea of taking royalty in kind has been one of the approaches that has been considered in working out the details of our natural gas policy statements. There are certain advantages and disadvantages. It has also been discussed, in our review of our natural gas royalties. At this time a decision has not been reached.

MR. DIXON:

Thank you, Mr. Minister. Now to the Premier. Has the Premier any indication from Ontario, following yesterday afternoon's Throne Speech, that Ontario is going to declare war on Alberta regarding the energy policy announced by the Premier?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I together with other Albertans will be listening with interest to the remarks made by the Premier of Ontario, when he comes to Alberta to speak to the Canadian Petroleum Association, on April 3. I think the war is probably -- I have not read the Throne Speech in Ontario -- I doubt whether they use the exact word -- but as I mentioned earlier in the House, on a couple of occasions, we recognized the concern that they have. I, of course, will be planning some return engagements in the Province of Ontario, so that the message is clearly developed across all of Canada.

[Applause]

MR. DIXON:

I am pleased to hear that, hon. Premier. Mr. Speaker, my further question then, have you any indication as to what Ontario means by their statement that they are going to take initiatives against other governments in Canada with this new policy initiative program in the energy field? You have no indication then, as to what action they are going to take?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, we are well aware, from careful reading of Mr. McKeough's speech, of a number of matters they are considering, and of course one of them was the question of the three-price system of gas, and I have previously dealt with that in the House.

There are a number of matters that are under active consideration by the Government of Ontario as well as by other governments. We, of course, have established our position here in the House and we have confirmed it on a number of occasions. We are satisfied that our position is not only in the public interest of Alberta but, for that matter, in the public interest of all of Canada.

We are quite prepared to continue discussions and we anticipate we will be continuing discussions with the Government of Ontario and with other governments with regard to our gas policies insofar as it affects their provincial governments.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Mines. In the absence of an army or a provincial police force, would the hon. Minister consider, if we are attacked by Ontario, using lumps of Drumheller coal to protect ourselves?

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly the hon. member's hypothetical supplementary might be referred to the Alberta Minister for War.

[Laughter]

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid to ask who might stand.

DR. BUCK:

Supplementary to the Premier. When they are referring to the "war", possibly it is the war between the Premier of Ontario and the Premier of Alberta when it comes to the federal Progressive Conservative leadership race.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview with a supplementary.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. I wonder whether the Premier can advise us in this confrontation between Ontario and Alberta, whether Mr. Stanfield will be playing Henry Kissinger in solving our collective problems?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Stolen Vehicle Statistics

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Attorney General. Does your department have statistics on stolen vehicles in Alberta?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the department has. I am sure the various police forces in the province have those statistics, but I am not sure we have them within the department. But certainly they are available.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the RCMP not give your department regular statistical reports on stolen vehicles?

MR. LEITCH:

They may, Mr. Speaker, but from memory I can't say that they do.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Attorney General. If you have them, would you table them, and if not, would you give the RCMP the authority to give them to me?

AN HON. MEMBER:

That's pretty touchy.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They're not on very good terms.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I will take those hypothetical questions under consideration.

MR. WILSON:

The RCMP advise they do send the reports, and in order for me to get them I have to have the authority of the Attorney General.

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly the hon. member might just privately ask the Attorney General for that authority.

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood.

Bow River Upgrading Project

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Premier. Mr. Premier, have you received any correspondence from the City of Calgary outlining its position, and the action taken by the city regarding the Bow River upgrading project by the Calgary Zoo?



MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I have nothing at present, to my mind, with regard to particular correspondence. I would have to check into that question and respond to the hon. member.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, for a point of clarification, I understand there was such a letter.

I have a supplementary question for the hon. Minister of the Environment. Has there been any oral or written permission given to the City of Calgary to proceed with this project by you or anyone in your department?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, any program of this sort that is to proceed must have a permit under The Water Resources Act. This is a pretty major requirement. Now leading up to the point where a permit under The Water Resources Act is issued on matters of this kind which may take some years of negotiation, I don't suppose that at frequent intervals amongst the officials of the city and the department of government in discussing the nature of these very extensive projects, that such statements indicating that there shouldn't be any difficulty in a project going ahead, I may. Having been in the engineering world for quite some time myself, I recognize that engineers are basically optimists. They like to build. So I am sure that many statements of this type are made. But nevertheless the--

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, the matter of a personal opinion is irrelevant.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. YURKO:

The Acts of this government require a permit and no such permit was in fact issued, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister any knowledge of any oral permission or any understanding between members of his department and the City of Calgary that this project should be proceeded with?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, it is not a case of not proceeding with the project. We certainly are going to proceed with the project. It is when, and under what conditions. I want to make it very specific to the House, Mr. Speaker, so the House will understand. Last November the government passed a cost-sharing policy for these types of projects, and the policy is contingent upon the fact that it is submitted to the cabinet of this government and is, in fact, approved. We don't cost share after the fact, we cost share before the fact.

The second major policy that the government had established in this area is that on major projects which have environmental consequences of wide latitude, public hearings are necessary so that the people know what is being done. And these conditions, of course haven't been met.

The third requirement is that a permit be issued under The Water Resources Act, and neither of these conditions was met in this regard.

And finally, we had to receive the finalized report from Montreal Engineering and this was not available. So that in fact, neither of the four conditions were met to give this project the opportunity to proceed. But the project will go ahead; it is just a case of when and when the policies of the government are met.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. We are running out of time. Perhaps the hon. member's supplementary might be dealt with tomorrow. I have recognized the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood.

Elevator Constructors' Strike

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed again to the Minister of Manpower and Labour. Could the minister advise the current status of the elevator strike and whether it appears now that it may be necessary for him to intervene, insofar as Alberta is concerned?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I will be in touch with the hon. Fern Guindon, Minister of Labour in Ontario, immediately after the question period to get a progress report.

Our discussions last week were such that we would know late tonight or sometime tomorrow, and certainly not later than Friday, whether the arbitration position set down by the Ontario government on the recommendation of the mediation staff, with which we concurred, will be accepted across the nation. I might say that the reason why we did not move in the province before this is because the mediation staff, with our concurrence, agreed on a period of time during which both parties could accept voluntary arbitration. Should this not occur, or if binding arbitration is turned down by either party in Alberta, it is the intent and the plan of this government to move immediately and swiftly to end the strike in Alberta.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question to the minister. Has the minister recently received any concerns as to the safety of any elevator used by the public as a result of this prolonged strike?

MR. SPEAKER:

We have exceeded the time for the question period. I wonder if that supplementary might also be asked tomorrow.

Before we proceed to Orders of the Day might the hon. Member for Drumheller have the leave of the House to revert to Introduction of Visitors?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS (cont'd.)

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to the hon. members. I would like to introduce to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the hon. members of the Legislature a very distinguished Albertan in the person of Mr. W.A. Lang who is in the Public Gallery. He was Secretary of the Research Council of Alberta for many years and did some very important extensive work on coal in the research council that has benefited Alberta. Mr. Lang is in the Public Gallery. If he would stand I am sure we could give him a hearty welcome.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to introduce a prominent citizen from North Edmonton, Mr. Alex Chobotuck, who just returned from Hawaii.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS  
(Third Reading)

Bill No. 2  
The Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, 1973

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Attorney General that Bill No. 2, The Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, 1973, be now read a third time.

[The motion was carried, Bill No. 2 was read a third time]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable The Lieutenant Governor will now attend upon the Assembly.

ROYAL ASSENT

[The Lieutenant Governor entered the Assembly and took his place upon the Throne.]

MR. SPEAKER:

May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Alberta has, at its present sitting thereof, passed a bill to which, in the name of the said Legislative Assembly, we respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

CLERK:

The following is the bill to which Your Honour's assent is prayed: Bill No. 2, The Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, 1973.

[The Lieutenant Governor indicated his assent.]

CLERK:

In Her Majesty's name, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor doth assent to this bill.

[The Lieutenant Governor left the Assembly.]

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair]

\* \* \* \* \*

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair.]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of the Whole Assembly will now come to order.

Possibly, if I could just bring to the attention of the members of the Assembly, in last night's debate Hansard was having difficulty recording some of the off-the-cuff comments. Would the members please try to get their remarks into the microphones as otherwise they may claim that the comments were intentionally left out, and I doubt if the staff of Hansard had this intention.

Secondly, you may have noticed the pages walking in front of the desks. I have arranged this with both sides of the Assembly. Sometimes when the members of the Assembly have pushed their chairs back it is difficult for the pages to get by, so don't construe this as a flagrant discredit to the Assembly. The pages may just walk in front of the front rows here.

MR. HENDERSON:

-- remarks that I wasn't speaking loud enough last night?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

It was some of the comments that you, I believe, made, and others while sitting down that were not recorded.

[Interjections]

MR. COOKSON:

Mr. Chairman, Subcommittee B has had under consideration Vote 29, the Estimates of Expenditure of the Department of the Environment and begs to report the same. I therefore move, seconded by the Minister of the Environment, a sum not exceeding \$16,439,390 be granted to Her Majesty for the year ending March 31, 1974, for the Department of the Environment.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Minister.

MR. YURKC:

Mr. Chairman, I think I would like to just make a few brief comments before we get into the meat of the department's estimates.

A number of things have happened to the department during the last year. The first was a pretty major reorganization, and an identification of the role of the department. I think an identification of the role is sufficiently important for me to read it into the record, seeing that the Department of the Environment is barely two years old as yet.

The role is identified and approved by government as follows:

The role of the Alberta Department of the Environment, within the context of the total function of Government, is to promote a balance between resource management, environmental protection and the quality of life. This role will be achieved through interdepartmental Government planning of policies, programs and services. These will generally be initiated and coordinated by the Department of the Environment in co-operation with other departments and agencies of the Alberta Government, other governments and non-governmental organizations including industry and the private sector.

In essence, the role of Government is to emphasize prevention rather than treatment on the basis that this principle is logical, practical and more economical. With environmental matters, this means that the Government needs more co-ordination, more comprehensive input, and more long-term planning. Thus the people of Alberta can be better assured of the development of the province's resources to enable a good quality of life in 5, 50 or 500 years from now.

It was in relation to this role that the department was organized effectively into three basic units of service to the public of Alberta. The Estimates reflect this reorganization, not only in terms of groupings but also in terms of identification of the various appropriations by numbers.

I would also like to suggest that in terms of this reorganization to provide better services to the public, certain changes were made in regard to accounting practices.

First, all the water resource wage people that were deemed to be full time employees were transferred to staff. Secondly, all such people and their ongoing expenses were transferred from capital accounts to income accounts.

I would also like to suggest that we undertook a major \$1 million winter works program this winter. It reflected to a large degree on the efforts of the department. I would also like to suggest that we put forth a number of major cost sharing policies in regard to programs with respect to cost sharing between the provincial government and local levels of government.

I would just like to give the committee some idea of the rationalization of manpower in total, and we'll do it with respect to each appropriation as we go.

In 1972-73 there were 284 full time staff positions in the Department of the Environment. The new 1973-74 appropriation reflects 638 full time staff positions. I would like to suggest how this 638 comes about; 181 of these people were transferred from wages. These were people who were on the

departmental rolls, some were on for as long as 15 years. Then 133 positions were transferred from capital appropriations, that's the salary pool and capital appropriations, to income appropriations or income accounts. And the department reflects 42 new positions this year.

Now I might also say two positions were expanded into four positions from the 1972-73 appropriations so in actual fact, instead of having 282, which I think was in last year's appropriations, we actually ended up with 284.

I think with those brief comments, Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to accept any and all questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Any further questions -- comments?

MR. STROM:

I think the hon. minister suggested that there were 133 positions transferred from capital appropriations to salaried positions. How were they shown in capital?

MR. YURKO:

In the capital appropriations of last year, Mr. Chairman, these appropriations were in the salary pool shown under Appropriation 2999. This was the salary pool for Water Resources Capital Appropriation.

MR. HENDERSON:

They were really still part of the Department of the Environment though? It was just internal -- it wasn't transferred in from another department?

MR. YURKO:

No, Mr. Chairman, they weren't transferred in from another department. They were on the department's payroll, but they weren't shown in income account. If you looked at the manpower associated with the income account last year in terms of the Department of the Environment, you would only have seen 284 staff positions. This year you will see, I think if you add them up, 638 altogether. The reason for that is, as I said, 181 were transferred from wages, 133 were transferred from the capital appropriations to the income appropriations and there are 42 extra, new positions in this year's appropriation.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, dealing with Appropriation 2902, I have a question I would like to pose to the minister.

Some complaints were brought to my attention by people in the consulting field who argue that in setting up the environmental studies and ecological studies under the department, not enough emphasis is placed on the biological implications in environmental studies, and that these studies tend to concentrate on physical or engineering aspects.

In particular this one firm felt that in the the study on the route in from Fort McMurray, insufficient emphasis has been given to biological implications. I wonder if you would comment on that?

MR. YURKO:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would be very pleased to comment. My first comment would be that we simply can't please everybody. We have had a number of biological studies given directly to biologists, and I did pass around a sheet of studies during the subcommittee. Anyone can pick out the actual biological studies.

In regard to the transportation corridor, we had, I believe, over 20 submissions in regard to companies which felt they were qualified to do the major corridor study. We reviewed these submissions from a number of different standpoints, one being, of course, the opportunity for the main company to cross-tie itself with other companies, to engage other companies for very specific studies. And, in fact, this was what was realized in the company we did choose to do the major study.

I would also like to say in this regard, I tabled in the House today a Syncrude report, which was really to some degree a base line study in regard to biological and bird life in the area and that private enterprise, to a large degree, is doing a number of studies in this regard, which I hope to table in the House.

However, in regard to this corridor study, in our estimation the biological aspects of this study weren't the primary criteria establishing the selection of the company that was going to do it. There were many considerations and the biological consideration was not the primary one. Where, in fact, the biological consideration is a primary one, perhaps the key one, then we would tend to lean very strongly towards a company with considerable strength in this area. But this wasn't the case in this study.

MR. NOTLEY:

I'd like to follow that up a bit then. I take it, Mr. Minister, that with respect to the corridor study the major biological input then would be the incidental work that Syncrude has done in their study. Or will there be some biological study related to the corridor study, albeit in a very supplemental rather than a basic nature?

MR. LUDWIG:

In commenting on the hon. minister's little report that he read to us, he advises us that they now have a definition or explanation of what their department is all about. I would like to comment on that matter because it appears that it explains how the hon. Premier was able to announce in Calgary -- in a very major press release that received a lot of coverage and was never retracted -- that this government set up the Department of the Environment. And then a further little political pamphlet that was circulated at the Conservative convention -- among other untruths in that pamphlet, it also relates that they created a Department of the Environment.

I think I was perhaps a bit too critical of the Premier when I challenged the truth of his statement, and quite successfully. But I think we should give them a little more latitude, that since they only found out what their department is all about, perhaps in their confusion they are probably right to assume that they perhaps created a Department of the Environment.

MR. YURKO:

I think, Mr. Chairman, without getting too excited it would only be fair if I did comment on that. And I rather resent the remark a little bit ...

MR. LUDWIG:

You should.

MR. YURKO:

...because of the fact that the department, and the people involved in the department, have really worked so hard in the last 18 months to organize, reorganize, redirect -- and hire all sorts of new people and new equipment in certain areas.

I don't doubt for one minute, Mr. Chairman, that when I took over as Minister of the Environment the department was put together and had been together for several months, but there was a great job that had to be done, policies to establish, roles to outline, planning to do, budgeting to examine in a very meaningful way.

All of this has been done in the last 18 months and the total budget of the Department of the Environment, in fact, has more than doubled. This has been accomplished in the last 18 months.

Now I don't deny that the concept and the act was passed in the previous government -- not without, I would say, some prodding on the part of a very lively opposition in those days, which sometimes it might be said, led the way -- but I don't deny for one minute that it was the previous government that did set up the Department of the Environment and, in fact, passed some major legislation in this area, being The Clean Water Act and The Clean Air Act. I think I don't say that as often as I should, but I certainly recognize it.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the hon. minister's remarks and I wish he would communicate them to the hon. Premier because a fact is still a fact, and truth is still truth, and the opposition really is not doing its job if it permits remarks which are not true to pass by without taking issue with them. And the hon. members who are on this side know exactly what I mean.

So I appreciate what the minister has said, and I commend him for it, because I think he is one of those who will call a spade a spade and if something is true, it's true, and if it's not true, then let's get the facts. So the Premier was very remiss in trying to take credit for something that he, in fact, did not do.

I believe that has now been established beyond any doubt, as Hansard will show. When I challenged the Premier he simply had to sit there and keep quiet or retract his statement, and he simply doesn't like retracting statements.

I'd like to point out to the hon. Minister of the Environment that, notwithstanding the fact that the budget has doubled and tripled since he got into the department, that is not necessarily the end of all things. The taxpayer is very concerned about these kinds of increases and is more interested in results rather than how big the budget is. Because these big budgets in all departments, including the one of the Deputy Premier, are beginning to hurt.

This has sort of negated once more a very, very eager and enthusiastic effort by the hon. members when they were over here, that they were going to cut the fat from the budget. Never has there been a worse letdown as far as the taxpayer is concerned than this propaganda that they peddled all over the province: "We're going to cut the fat from the budget, we're going to reduce the bureaucracy."

What have they done? They've reversed themselves to the extent that certainly their words could not be given much credence in light of what has happened. They could plead ignorance now and say, we didn't know. The honest thing to do is admit that you didn't know. Now things are going by leaps and bounds throughout the whole government, and they're talking about cutting the fat from the budget. This is where we come in.

They said they knew the answers to inflation, they knew the answers to too much bureaucracy, they knew the answers to too much government interference, when they were on this side. In fact, they knew all the answers. Now, we have one minister -- and I congratulate him for admitting that things aren't just the way they say they are, and so I appreciate that statement very much and I do feel that perhaps we ought to send the Premier a copy of the page of Hansard that is relevant.

Talking about spending -- that is what we are doing here. I remember the hon. member who was once a Liberal and became a Conservative, jumping up and down here and saying, "They are going to cut the budget." They forgot about that.

They are bulging with revenues now, so they can spend it, and whether they hire 300 or 400 people in a department is immaterial now. Whether it is \$4 million or \$5 million, it appears to them that this is fine; we're going to do big things. The only "big things" they have done so far is, their budget is big.

It doesn't take much intelligence, much experience or much know how to increase the budget. It takes a lot of good planning and good thinking and good management, and perhaps do with less of a budget. I look at the minister's overall budget and it's 105 per cent. I wonder if he will live with it -- and it will be interesting if he does, because there is a runaway here. If anything is inflationary, this particular department is. I wonder whether the hon. minister is dissatisfied with the unemployment situation and wants to cure it himself?

Mr. Speaker, I commend the minister for what he has done and I appreciate his efforts and his concern in this important issue. We all support him. But I think you ought to tell us why they place such an emphasis on the spending, as if that is a measure of success. In fact the hon. Provincial Treasurer should be there cutting everything as much as he can; he says money is irrelevant. So we have that and the budget indicates that money is irrelevant, but to us over here and to the taxpayer it is relevant. You will be fortunate if the taxpayer doesn't organize and start telling them what he thinks of all this free spending and free wheeling in these departments.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, I really can't let that go by without some sort of response. I admire in-depth analysis very much by anybody who in fact does it, and I also admire astuteness and hard work. I don't necessarily admire off-the-cuff remarks that are based on a glance at one particular matter or another.

I think if anybody analyzed the department's budget, he would find the major increases this year are in capital works. In fact, if you want me to, I could certainly put down some of these matters. They came from a real need, they came from a real concern of this government for the welfare of Albertans.

First of all you will find in the income account -- or partially in the income and also in the capital account -- \$750,000 for a well-water program for Metis, an area that has been desperately neglected for many years and there was a dire need for some action in this regard.

The next thing you will find is \$1 million in terms of a program for assistance to the smaller communities basically for sewage disposal facilities -- the first time, to my recollection, that this province has had an assistance program for the smaller towns in terms of sewage disposal facilities.

I should like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that \$1 million in this budget really reflects a capital expenditure in terms of sewage disposal facilities equivalent to over \$10 million, because what that \$1 million in fact does is pick up the carrying charges -- that is, interest and capital carrying charges above a certain cost to a local community -- of \$150 per person. So that in itself is a pretty substantial increase in capital allocation in helping the people of the province.

I might also say, Mr. Chairman, that that program combined with anticipated water assistance programs -- and some of our assistance policies will do as much for making our small towns industrially viable and generally tend to promote some degree of growth and perhaps even stabilization than any other program that I know of, originated by any government in the last several years.

I would like to say we are also thinking very seriously of a similar type of program for water plants and water services, basically to our smaller communities throughout Alberta.

I would also like to point out to the hon. member in regards to capital appropriations, that for the first time we took \$1 million and spread it throughout this province into all kinds of communities to do river management works and creek works that have been sitting in abeyance for many, many years. I have a complete list of the thrusts this government has done in this regard.

I would also like to suggest that, through this government's work, a total of \$16,645,911 was appropriated -- not all of it was approved -- last year in terms of sewage plant construction under CMHC loans, and it takes people to review these and in fact approve these.

Again, if you examine the capital part of the program, because this is where the major increases have in fact occurred in this last year, you will find that Gull Lake is being stabilized with appropriations. Again, a project that is going to assist Albertans in a major way: the Cold Lake dam is being completed. There is a Grimshaw project and I could go into some detail as to what is involved there. The Fiddle River project, phase 2 of it; \$250,000 for alleviating flooding of this important water way.

And I can go on and on and on.

And then again I would like to say that we have in this budget \$808,000 for operation and maintenance in a capital way for headworks, irrigation headworks mainly, anticipating, as I might suggest, the signing of the Irrigation Rehabilitation Agreement with the federal government and the transfer over to this government for the responsibility for this maintenance work.

I might also say that we have \$1.5 million basically for land purchases and we are purchasing land on a number of bases throughout the province. So I feel that the department has certainly accomplished something in this regard. It has stated publicly and privately and within government that the size of the department is basically being stabilized and this is why we have adjusted the accounting. And with this stabilization our major considerations and thrusts in the future are going to be into capital appropriations.



We think we have now got a department of sufficient scope and complexity to handle the environmental matters in this province. There will be increases in the future but they won't be substantial. But there will be increases in the capital appropriations with respect to sewage facilities, water services, river management, creek management, recreational lake stabilization programs and so forth.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a brief comment or two. I would like to say that I certainly agree with the minister when he says he has an excellent staff, really dedicated men. I am not saying that just because they are sitting up there. I am saying that because I believe it is true and if I thought they were sloughing off I would tell them the same thing. But I think they are trying to do an excellent job and I would like to compliment the minister on pulling these people together into one department because I think it is the right direction.

At the same time, I would like to bring to the minister's attention that when I asked him the question this afternoon, had he consulted any of the people in the Cooking Lake area, any of the people who had done any feasibility studying, I would like to read something out of his own report just to sharpen up his memory a little bit. This is in the Environment Conservation Authority First Annual Report, 1971. On page 65, in case you want to look it up, is set up the petition from the citizens requesting a study:

The Authority requested the Conservation Utilization Committee of the Alberta Government to provide information as to feasibility of water importation from the North Saskatchewan River and other water management measurements, measures which could be initiated in a lake restoration program. A consultant was retained jointly by the Water Resources Division of the Alberta Government and the Authority to prepare a report on the engineering and economic feasibility of a lake restoration stabilization program.

Now I don't know whether this \$60,000 is just a sop for the hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewill who is responsible for looking after the affairs of the constituency of Clover Bar, but if that's what it's for, I think maybe they could use the \$60,000 as money better spent.

And also when the minister comes out and tells the people, well if you just come up with a paltry \$2.5 million, -- you know, you can find that kicking around in an old sock some place -- we will put in another few million dollars, and the county puts up another few million dollars and we will put water into your lake. All he is really saying is, forget it fellows because we aren't going to do anything for you, when he comes up with a program such as that, because he knows and I know that there is no way anybody is going to come up with \$2.5 million to put water into Cooking Lake. So let's not try and kid the troops, hon. minister.

I would further like to reiterate to the members for Edmonton that let's hear them. This is a prime recreational area. It could be a prime recreational area. It has the potential to be that and I want to hear from the hon. members from Edmonton because they have an interest in this and they should show a little interest in it. So when the hon. minister tries to pacify us by telling us he is going to spend \$60,000 on a feasibility study, let's get a little action in this 'go-go' government of theirs.

Now I would like to just say a word or two about the programs on the lakes and streams. I am sure the hon. minister has seen this issue from the Alberta Fish and Game Association.

It says, "One Million Dollars to Turn Our Rivers into Sluice Boxes." And I would like to read for the attention of the hon. members, Mr. Chairman, the article the president wrote because I think it's really very, very valid. I think it just might make the minister take a look at what direction he is going every once in a while, because he is so busy riding off in about 12 different directions that he sometimes forgets to see the forest for the trees. It goes on to say that:

The government has announced that we have a wonderful bonanza for Alberta. One million dollars in federal winter works money to turn our rivers and streams into sluice boxes "to cut down the flooding". The first area to feel the benefits of this tremendous program, sponsored by Water Resources Division of the Department of the Environment is the Sturgeon River near St. Albert. Local farmers were sold a bill of goods by sweet

-----

talking representatives of the Department. Many signed releases permitting what they thought was some minor clearing of debris cut of the stream. In moved the crews and everything up to eight inch trees is being cleared from a wide swath of river valley, in some places up to seventy feet wide.

According to the Minister the clearing is only to be to the high water line. The high water line they are using must be the record flood levels going back to 1885. Then the trees were piled on the river ice and burned. When they didn't burn too well our eager government authorized the use of oil to help the fires. ALL THIS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT.

Last year the Paddle River was straightened alleviating the flooding in some areas but transferring the problem downstream. What will happen to Lake Ste. Anne when the Sturgeon is cleared? Most foresters feel that the way to hold back water and slow flooding and melting is to increase tree cover. Why the change? Our water resources department was cut back to size on the P.R.I.M.E. Project. Are they releasing their frustrations on a smaller scale by fouling ten times as many smaller rivers to make up for being cut off from the Clearwater and other major east slope rivers?

Apparently the Vermilion and other rivers in the Vegreville area are marked for salvation.

If you want our rivers saved, alert your neighbours not to fall for fast talking sales pitches about "clearing a few trees and cutting down on the floods."

Renewable Resources did a \$125,000 survey last year on the Sturgeon River. Water Resources are going exactly contrary to the results of that study. Are we that desperate for winter works programs that we spend \$125,000 for advice, then \$75,000 doing exactly what we were told not to do?

This appears to be an instance of a Minister not knowing what his department is doing. Water Resources ran the show for so long they probably still feel they don't have to report to anyone.

I hope the Minister, Mr. Yurko, will see that someone has some answers.

Now I don't agree with all that stuff, hon. minister, but I think there are some things in there that you should inform the House about . . .

MR. YURKO:

May I ask the member a question while he is on that?

DR. BUCK:

Certainly.

MR. YURKO:

I would just like to ask you, Mr. Member, if that is the extent of your reading or investigation into this project? Have you come into the department, have you attempted to really look into what was going on? Have you read more than just that? Have you talked to anybody besides that article?

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, for a government so proud of consultation with people at local levels and asking for input, I think that when we see an article like this that goes throughout the Province of Alberta to fish and game people then, surely, you must have been doing some consultation with the people in this matter. And when you go ahead and impose your will from the advice you have received from your experts without consulting these people, I don't think I have to be the expert on this because you have the expertise in your department. You are the one who is going to provide the answers and do the work, not me.

So my advice to you sir, if you are going to carry on this participatory government that we always hear so much about in the media, is get down and ask these people, is it a good idea or is it not?

MR. YURKO:

I think I would just like to make a couple of comments in regard to the member's statements.

First of all, I would like to say that with respect to the Sturgeon River you can also read a fish and game report which is a very glowing report with respect to the projects, or you can read any number of reports you wish. It's by nature the news media's and the fish and game's intent to be controversial. We laid some pretty definite guidelines down in this program and we had a biologist directly associated with it, and the program doesn't involve channelization which the member is indicating.

However, I want to suggest something in regard to Cooking Lake because I know it concerns him, and it concerns a lot of people . . .

DR. EUCK:

Did you say "does" or "doesn't" involve channelization?

MR. YURKO:

Doesn't involve channelization, no. If you had taken the trouble to look into it, you would have found this out, and you would have found that we had a biologist right on top of the whole program. There were some pretty substantial guidelines made before any work was done. I don't try to belittle the news media because the news media does in fact make us tow the line in a lot of areas where, in fact, we might get a little rambunctious.

However, I want to say something about Cooking Lake. You know, I am glad that the hon. member did bring something to my attention because it is pretty difficult to remember everything that goes on. In fact it is pretty difficult to remember all the reports that cross my desk, much less everything that is going on.

But he should recognize, and if he had read the policy on multi-stabilization in considerable detail, then he would have found that there are a number of methods open to the people around Cooking Lake as well as the local municipalities to, in fact, change the entire nature of input by the provincial government with regards to stabilizing that lake.

There isn't anything that says somebody can't bequeath to the government a good part of the shoreline, or that a municipality can't in fact buy it and toss it in as public land, or, in fact, any group of citizens or any town or any village, so that the amount of publicly owned shoreline can be upgraded very substantially and up to 25 per cent, for not very much money so the government then can undertake the entire load of stabilizing the lake.

We purposely structure these policies in this regard to put emphasis in the local areas to see how much they desire to have something done to their particular lake, so the policy doesn't apply to Cooking Lake only. It applies across the province -- to George Lake and to lakes in southern Alberta. If there is a desire at the local level to do something with their lake then they can do all sorts of things to have a major input by the provincial government.

Now I didn't say anything about a feasibility study, an engineering feasibility study. I said something about an engineering study. We are also establishing a pretty major committee in regard to Cooking Lake involving the federal government representative, and involving some very wellknown hydrologists, involving biologists, and there are a number of other schemes beside what the authority, for example, have suggested. One scheme that has been suggested by Dr. Laycock at the University of Alberta, is that we drain a number of outlying lakes and increase the drainage area into this lake so that, in fact, some form of stabilization can be accomplished this way, without pumping from the river.

So again I say, if the hon. member is really interested in what goes on in his constituency, and I know he is interested in Cooking Lake, he can take a look himself at all the alternatives that are, in fact, available to make this a reality in the shortest possible time. If he did this, then perhaps it would become a reality in a very short time.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Henderson.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few general words. I think firstly, Mr. Chairman, it is to be appreciated that a new department such as this which has been set up is bound to have in its initial years a rather substantial growth.

Of course, when you look at the growth pattern of it relative to the total expansion of the public service in the form of salaries and wage earners, and on the basis of the arithmetic which is in the Estimates, it initially does give some cause for concern.

I certainly do not want, in any way, shape or form, unless necessary, to get into a repetition of last night's exercise. But there is something that the minister has said that doesn't seem to fit with the understanding that I had out of the Provincial Treasurer last night in relationship to the fact that the Estimates booked for this year -- it shows the 1972-73 Estimate, and then it shows the 1973-74 and the number of positions for wage earners and salaried positions.

I gathered last night that the Estimate books included this year all of the wage earners in terms of equivalent manpower. Now I gather, however, from what the Minister of the Environment has said, that in relation to his department in this year's Estimate book, insofar as the 1972-73 positions were concerned, they did not include staff that had been involved in a capital account within the department previously.

So how many other departments are there where the estimates for manpower that is in the book for 1972-73 or even for 1973-74 does not include manpower, wage earner or salary by virtue of the fact that they just happen to be in a capital account, as the minister outlined? Is this the only department where this has occurred? Because when I look at the arithmetic that I've worked up I find there are 357 additional positions this year. Now again I'm not going to quarrel, maybe I'm out plus or minus ten, but the way the arithmetic worked out in this one -- and I gather the minister has said that all but 42 of those were wage earners transferred in from this capital account.

MR. YURKO:

Right, 356, the rest were transferred.

MR. HENDERSON:

Yes, right, so we're consistent on that figure.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I wonder if we could have these figures in the microphone because I am sure Hansard didn't pick it up, Mr. Minister.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, I didn't wish to interrupt the hon. Leader of the Opposition because I gave those figures at the beginning and they are in Hansard.

MR. HENDERSON:

Now what I am asking the Provincial Treasurer -- are there other departments where because of this capital account where it is Estimates that are under the department, that there is manpower in the 1972-73 figures which has not been included in the account that is in the book? Or is this just a unique situation in this one department?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, for the very reason the hon. Leader of the Opposition and also the hon. minister had mentioned, it is unique to the Department of the Environment. As a matter of fact, I'm sure, as the hon. leader realizes, the department was relatively new and it was our view, and also the hon. minister's view, that it was somewhat surprising when the department was formed that the provincial auditor had allowed some of these appropriations to be categorized as capital account. But in any event that had happened.

My hon. colleague, in reorganizing the department and also working with the Treasury Department on the proper presentation of the budget, felt that many of the items which had formerly been categorized as capital account should now be income or operating account.

So the positions in the current year's Estimates are included. I wasn't sure that I caught one comment, as though you were suggesting that some wage positions were not included. All wage positions are included this year. But if you compare the capital account of the department and the income account of the department, basically what my hon. colleague has stated is correct, that this

number of positions were formerly in the capital account of the Department of the Environment. They are now in the income account of the Department of the Environment.

MR. HENDERSON:

This is unique for this department? There is nothing similar to this, for example, in the Department of Highways? Just this one?

MR. MINIELY:

Yes.

MR. HENDERSON:

OK, so that brings us down to basically 42 new positions when this transfer is taken into account. Fine.

Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to go on and ask a question or two and make a comment or two on the matter of the Cooking Lake program. I would just suggest to the minister -- and I know the problem he has, so far as trying to get the funds available, that he'd like to do all the work. But surely in any project of the nature of what the Cooking Lake one would be, if the government placed a priority on it, one cannot expect to make any progress in a meaningful sense without a greater degree of initiative on the part of the provincial government.

I'd like to compare it, I think, to the park that the government has created at Fish Creek in Calgary. Now obviously, if one went out and waited to try to get landowners to bequeath their property and creek banks and so on and so forth with a view to trying to set that park up, one would never do it. It simply wouldn't come about.

So what I'm really asking the minister is, can he envision as a matter of government policy, the question of Cooking Lake? If there is to be a meaningful measure or steps taken relative to the question of stabilization, preservation of that particular feature offered by those lakes and the enhancement of the recreational facilities, surely the government is going to have to take a greater degree of initiative than is forthcoming at the present time under the guidelines he has allowed, under his department, as far as policy on water lakes management, water stability. It's quite possible that the prospects of improving and developing Cooking Lake as a recreational facility simply shouldn't fall under his policy relative to water level stabilizations.

So I guess it gets down to where, really, in overall government priority does the improvement of Cooking Lake stand? Because if the government doesn't place a high priority on it, they can simply leave it under the water management policy as it stands now and all the problems relating to local participation and say, well, we can't go ahead because this and that is not being done. Support isn't coming from private people, they are not bequeathing their property, donating lakeshore lines and so on. But if the government does have a higher priority, then clearly it can be developed outside the guidelines that simply relate to water stabilization management.

I have some other questions on some other matters the minister commented on that I would like to ask him about. But I would like to hear him respond to this question first.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, the government does have a high priority on Cooking Lake, but certain matters have to be done before rationalization of the situation can take place. To suggest, or to lose sight of the fact that the government itself can, in fact, buy shoreline property and come up to the 25 per cent factor if it wishes, this is an option certainly open to the government and it's on the government at every particular lake.

It is not only the local community that can upgrade the category with respect to the policy, the government itself can. And I have to suggest that we have been looking at property on Cooking Lake for some time now, so we can take this kind of initiative and upgrade it ourselves, and we are, in this particular case.

But I want to suggest that we are not at all happy or satisfied with the engineering and the cost analysis and the cost-benefit analysis that have been done with respect to the environment conservation hearings. Those were hearings indicating a demand that something had to be done.

We have a lot more groundwork to do from an examination of the total moraine, with the federal government, with in fact some of the local municipal districts around the place. We have groundwork to do with regard to the engineering and fixing down exactly where the water would come from, the total cost of the system, what the fill rates, in fact, should be as against what they might be.

All this work has to be done and we are trying to do it as fast as we possibly can with the resources we have at our disposal. We felt we needed some engineering assistance in this regard and that is why the \$60,000, so we can directly put in some additional effort besides the departmental effort.

MR. HENDERSON:

I have no quarrel with the minister's statements in that regard, and that wasn't really the basis of my question. The basic question is, is the government prepared to look to using public funds to acquire the necessary property in order to get on with the show? It doesn't matter which way you go about doing it; once you decide to do it, everything the minister has referred to in the form of engineering work has to be done anyhow. So I am not questioning that.

I wonder if I could turn just briefly to the question of sewage disposal assistance in smaller communities, the \$1 million that is in the fund for that. I think it would be worthwhile to have on record in greater detail what that specific program would consist of.

MR. YOUNG:

...[Inaudible]... if I could before we leave the Cooking Lake situation. A few minutes ago the hon. Member for Clover Bar managed to rise in his place, a most unusual circumstance in this Assembly this year. It's the first occasion I have seen him rise, except on about five for inconsequential questions. Most comments have been made from a prone position.

DR. EUCK:

[Inaudible]

MR. YOUNG:

Sometimes I think he has tried to communicate from his constituency rather than his chair, even from the prone position.

But anyway I should like to say to the hon. member, since he is concerned about the lack of attention that the Edmonton members are giving to Cooking Lake, in his opinion, that to this date I have not received any communication from him, verbal or written, indicating to me the desirable characteristics of Cooking Lake as a park for the Edmonton area. And I would remind him --

[Interjections]

I would remind him that as a government we have announced an urban parks policy, the first one that has been in the House, a provincial urban parks policy.

AN HCN. MEMBER:

Hurrah.

MR. YOUNG:

In fact, as government members, we have an ideal way of making our input to the ministers responsible for that kind of program we have been invited to do so, we have done so, and in fact, I made my communication known to the Minister of Lands and Forests some two weeks ago with respect to the location of an urban park in the Edmonton area.

So, just to set the record straight, hon. member, perhaps if you have a real concern we can look forward to your more active, participation, especially more active thoughtful participation, from a standing position rather than a prone position in the future.

MR. HENDERSON:

His remarks, I think, are of some concern, when a member seated opposite stands up and makes the suggestion that there is some obligation on the part of

a member on this side of the House to make his representation to the government through a Conservative backbencher. Because that is exactly the way I interpret the words of the Member for Edmonton Jasper Place. There is some reason that the Member for Clover Bar is supposed to make his representations to the Member for Edmonton Jasper Place. Now how ridiculous can this situation get? That is exactly what he has been asked for, and surely to goodness, he isn't serious in the suggestion that it is beyond the prerogative of a member of this House to stand up directly with the minister, without going through one of the Conservative hacks in the backbenches.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, I am amazed that the hon. leader of the Opposition considers the hon. Member for Clover Bar unable to fend for himself now, and has come to his rescue. This really surprises me, and perhaps indicates the degree of confidence placed in that hon. gentleman.

I would like to reiterate for the record, hon. leaders and Mr. Chairman, that in no way in my remarks did I suggest that the hon. member had to proceed through the backbenchers. He made the statement, as I recollect, that the members for Edmonton were not doing a very effective job for arranging for parks for the Edmonton area and that we had, in fact, overlooked the Cooking Lake facility.

The Minister of the Environment answered that in his earlier remarks, so I considered it not necessary to reiterate the fact that we do care about the Cooking Lake facility. I did suggest, however, if the hon. member feels that he has an excellent, an outstanding -- as apparently he does -- park location for Edmonton, he might bring it to our attention, which he has not done. It is in his constituency. I have already said that on the basis of the information I had, I had made my recommendations known to the minister.

MR. TAYLOR:

I suggest that we get on with the business and forget the confessions.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to put a question to the minister about the sewage disposal program. Does he choose to pursue it now?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Possibly the hon. Members for Clover Bar and Edmonton Jasper Place can settle that between the two of them.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, I think if I might take the occasion I would have to read a couple of paragraphs from our policy, because I would read it with more clarity than stating --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

This is in answer to Mr. Henderson?

MR. YURKO:

That is right. I would like to do a little bit of talking about this policy.

The formula developed for this equitable program is detailed in the attached report. Basically, the formula is based on the per capita sewage treatment debenture load being carried by the municipality, less a pre-determined amount.

In other words, the first thing that's being said is the program is retroactive -- from this day forward, it is retroactive.

Presently, yearly assistance will be made available to a municipality when their current per capita capital debenture load for sewage treatment facilities exceeds \$150 -- which debenture load is being carried at the average interest rate of 7 3/4% per annum. The Municipal Sewage Treatment Assistance program will utilize as a basis for their program the guidelines currently used by Central Mortgage & Housing Corporation for their sewage treatment assistance program under Part VI B of The National Housing Act.

Based on a debenture interest rate of 7 3/4%, an annual per capita outlay of \$13.76 is required to retire in 25 years a capital loan equal to \$150 per capita.

The important figure is the \$13.76, because \$150 can vary and the 7.75 per cent can vary, but the \$13.76 is pretty well fixed.

It is therefore the policy of the Government of Alberta to provide yearly assistance equal to the difference between the total current debenture cost of a municipality for all its sewage treatment capital costs and \$13.76 on a per capita basis. Such assistance will be carried by the province on an interest-free basis.

Conversely [this is the second feature of this that is important] as the population of the municipality increases so that the current per capita debenture maintenance drops below the predetermined amount, then the municipality shall return to the government on an annual basis the difference on a per capita basis until the municipality has returned all the assistance back to the government, or the debenture is retired.

If the population doesn't go up and the per capita loan doesn't drop, then the government carries that for the full time of the debenture. If, in fact, you have a municipality where they are just below the \$150 and their population went down and they went above the \$150 then the government would pick up this \$13.76, so there is some fluctuation. This is really a revolving interest-free fund, if you wish to put it that way.

Now, the grant portion of all CMHC loans for sewage-treatment facilities should not be considered to be part of the debenture load of any municipality in qualifying for assistance under this program. This goes on to say: "The pertinent aspects of the program are as follows: First, the Municipal Sewage Treatment Assistance Program will become effective in the fiscal year 1973-74", this fiscal year. That is why \$1 million is allocated.

The cost of the program to the provincial government initially will be approximately \$1 million a year. Thus far we have determined that the actual retroactive costs may be more like \$700,000 to \$800,000 so there will be in the order of \$200,000 to pick up debenture-carrying capacity for new approaches in this year's budget. But this is something we are now in the process of detailing in considerable detail to know which communities, in fact, are going to qualify for the retroactive aspect and which communities are going to be qualifying under the new part of the program.

Now, as I said earlier, the million dollars over 10 years, over 10 years really is a \$10 million program, over 20 years is a \$20 million program. The program has self-liquidating aspects based on the ability to pay off a municipality and is not a grant program.

It is an attempt to halt the degradation of some of our smaller communities so that in our smaller communities, as people leave and they have an expensive sewage system -- and I had an excellent example at Vulcan today which we reviewed in some detail -- the carrying capacity gets greater and greater per person and there is a tendency to evacuate and sort of abandon the thing or, in fact, declare municipal bankruptcy. This is an attempt to prevent and halt this sort of thing.

I indicated again that we are working hard as a department to see if we can't structure a program of this sort for water systems tied in to the agricultural service centres program. This is why there has been some delay in that program. The maximum yearly cost per capita for the provision of sewage-treatment facilities will be presently established at \$13.76, but the government can in fact change that as we go along. Sewage treatment capital costs will be spread more evenly over future populations.

Six, a degree of cost equalization for the provision of sewage treatment facilities would be provided throughout the province. The program will help prevent financial hardships on the people who originate sewage treatment facilities but which are also utilized by future populations.

Eight, the program considers the per capita costs necessary to provide secondary sewage treatment and to set a maximum per capita contribution for liquid waste treatment.

Nine, a per capita cost of \$150 is approximately the cost required for providing private sewage disposal systems, assuming an average family of four. This doesn't mean to say we are extending this into septic tanks. It is just an



indication that the costs are basically the same that an average family of four would pay for septic tanks.

Again, I hope that everybody has a clear understanding of what this program is. It is not a million dollars worth of grants at all. It is related to a much larger program and it is related to a program of carrying the principal plus interest charges and monies borrowed for building sewage disposal plants and trunk line sewers. There is a definition here in regard that we accept the definition here as the Central Mortgage and Housing accepts, so it is an attempt to provide these carrying charges for an indeterminate period of time so that a community can in fact put a sewage disposal facility in.

However, every such system must be first approved by the provincial government so that a town of 50 people can't come in and say, "We are going to grow, we are going to put in a million dollar sewage disposal system to attract industry and will maintain the first \$13.76 and let the government pick up the rest of the charges." So that it must be initially approved by the government, and of course, we don't intend to approve projects which have a massive distortion factor of this type. I hope that is adequate, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HENDERSON:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the minister used the words, "small municipalities". Am I correct that it was small municipalities?

Is this policy applicable across the board to all municipalities?

MR. YURKC:

Yes.

MR. HENDERSON:

Just general throughout the province. OK.

DR. EUCK:

I would like to just clarify the record, and Mr. Chairman, there is no way I will rebut anything the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place said because I wouldn't stoop to that level of debate.

But I would like to apologize to the House and correct a statement that there were no Edmonton MLAs who were concerned with this project. I would like to say that the hon. Deputy Speaker and I were in with a delegation speaking to the minister on the Cooking Lake Project.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words and get the minister's reaction in connection with certain waterways and dams, and I believe it is Vote 2924. Some of it may overlap into 2920.

To begin with I would like to pay a tribute to the people of the Water Resources Branch. I have had the privilege over a number of years of bringing a number of projects to them and I have always received the most courteous hearing. They aren't always able to do what one wants done, but they leave nothing to be desired in regard to courtesy and in endeavour to try to help in connection with this project.

And I would like to say that one of the difficulties in the Water Resources Branch as I see it, now and for a number of years, is, -- I was going to say reluctance -- to give this branch a sufficient sum of money to do the tremendous job that faces the department. Now I realize that there is difficulty in allotting the highest possible amount of money to every department and every branch. But I have always felt that the Water Resources Branch receives the short end of the stick and has for many years in connection with provincial revenues.

And I say that because the Water Resources Branch is doing things that affect people directly. They have a direct bearing on the lives of people and on the lives of communities. I think we should view this as one of the very essential elements of keeping our towns alive, at least keeping some of our towns alive, because without good water and without reasonable recreational areas that are reasonably close -- let me put it this way: when there is a good water supply and recreational areas reasonably close, then these are real incentives for a town to stay alive.

I would plead with the hon. Provincial Treasurer and the cabinet that when money is being allotted more consideration be given to the Water Resources Branch. I say that because I think it affects more people and has a wider impact on the lives of people than many, many other departments that are receiving possibly more consideration than what the Water Resources Branch receives.

Now I would just like to mention two or three items with which the Water Resource Branch is concerned and again I appreciate what they are endeavouring to do.

First of all, there's the Crowfoot Dam near Standard, which is part of an overall study of the Bow River Basin. Some of the objectives of this Crowfoot Dam are to supply water to the existing irrigation projects, to encourage the flow augmentation and for recreation. The feasibility of constructing this Crowfoot Dam is reasonable. These studies have been completed and whether the proposal will be proceeded with or not depends on the amount of money voted to the department.

But I would suggest in connection with Standard -- particularly in regard to its water supply -- at the present time one of the difficulties in that town is the lack of water for vegetation, or gardens or for trees. The water supply is too cold for the vegetation. They have their own domestic water supply but it's not too big a job to put in a dam and to pipe the warmer water into the town. Even if the dam didn't fill up every year, it still would not be serious because it would be used for the trees and gardens and so on.

This is an important item in a town. Hundreds of women, and men to a lesser degree, like their gardens, their flowers and vegetables and so on. It does make quite a difference in a town.

I'm mentioning the Crowfoot Dam as one item the Water Resource Branch has studied. I think the preliminary engineering has been completed, but again there is that matter of the necessary supply of money.

I would then like to refer to another possible dam that has been examined by the Water Resource Branch near the Danish colony known as Dallum south of Wayne. This is a colony -- we call it a colony. It's a lot of individual enterprise farmers many of whom came originally from Denmark, but now it's the children and grandchildren who are living there, and it's a tremendous community. But they have no recreational area within easy reach. There is a possibility of a dam being built there that could probably be done at a maximum of \$150,000 or \$160,000 that would provide for excellent boating and fishing with a depth of water that would maintain fish all year round.

Again, the only difficulty -- at least the major difficulty -- is the amount of money required.

I then refer to water supply in a recreational area in the town of Rockyford. Rockyford could secure a tremendous boost and it is a good town, and a viable town. But it could secure a tremendous boost if there was a dam built on the Serviceberry Creek, which is just about a mile away. This would give a fresh water supply to the town as well as a recreational area to that particular part of the province. This has not yet been engineered but the Water Resource Branch, I believe, has it on its list. Again this would be a real boost to keeping it a viable town now and keeping it alive. It would be a very important item. The engineering still has to be done but I think it is a reasonably -- or at least I'm sure it's going to be done.

The other one is a very important item in connection with keeping a town alive. I now refer to the town of Hussar. This project could bring life into, you might say, the old gray mare. The Village of Hussar is built around a lake known as Deadhorse Lake. This lake covers about four square miles of land area. It has a sodium alkali base. The water is unsuitable for consumption, and it is too corrosive for use as a water supply or for recreation. So the fact that they have four square miles of water area there today is a detriment to the village and the surrounding community rather than an asset. It is within easy reach, however, of Calgary -- about 65 miles, and about 40 miles from Drumheller. If this could be made into a fresh water lake every hon. member would see the boost it would give to the Village of Hussar, to say nothing of the recreation for the people of such places as Calgary and Drumheller and Strathmore, because the other recreation facilities in that area are badly overtaxed, such as Chestermere Lake, Bassano Dam and so on. But it is not the recreation I am emphasizing right now, although that would be an important asset.

The present limits of the land to the banks could contain 15 feet of water depth without difficulty, and without interfering with the village or with any property. It has an accessible intake from an existing intake, from irrigation ditches and from Serviceberry Creek in the Tudor area. It is also an outlet to the south east area through the Crawling Valley essential to the Red Deer River. So it is in line as a possibility of a real good fresh water lake. To provide water supply, and if this water could be brought in, it would cost a little money and that is what I want to deal with right now.

If you extend the irrigation system that already exists the 20 miles from the Tudor area west into this lake, and provide it with an all-year-round supply of water would cost in the vicinity of about \$.5 million or \$500,000. This is the type of project I would like to see accepted and perhaps done over a two or three year period.

I realize \$500,000 on one project all at once is difficult for a department to handle when their total budget for this type of thing is so small. But the engineering has been done. It has been done by a private firm and, I believe, confirmed by the Water Resources Branch. I am not sure of that but I think it has been. Here we have the possibility of really bringing life to a town by putting life back into this Deadhorse Lake and making it a fresh water supply.

Some of the other things that would result if this was done: it would first of all provide a water supply, for all purposes, to the village. That I think is number one.

Secondly, it would bring a supply of fresh water within reach of many rural residents, and that is very important to that very excellent farming area.

Then it would develop recreation -- camping, boating, swimming -- because it has an excellent sandy bottom -- fishing, et cetera. The water supply could be brought by concrete pipe. It would cut evaporation to a minimum and would be laid largely underground. Then, of course, another objective would be the conservation of wildlife, and Ducks Unlimited, I would think, would have a very vital interest in contributing towards such a project.

Well, Mr. Chairman, to sum up what I am trying to say, this branch, I feel, is dealing with a vitally important item -- vitally important to the people of the community. It's a people's vote. Everything it does involves people. It is for the benefit of people, either to stop flooding or to bring fresh water or to create dams for fresh water supply or for recreation or for other purposes.

Again I would strongly recommend to the hon. Provincial Treasurer that consideration be given to providing more money to the Water Resources Branch in order that it can carry out and make more progress and more rapid progress in addition to their engineering, but actually bring into being the creation of some of these dams and fresh water supplies, and fresh water lakes -- not only in my particular constituency, but I am sure a great number of other hon. members would say amen to this same thing because it is vitally important to the people of every area. So I do bring this to the attention of the hon. minister and to the attention of the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Minister.

MR. YURKO:

Yes, just a couple of very brief remarks, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to indicate that the government certainly recognizes the need in this area and the government has been moving in the last 18 months, and it is anticipated that the government will be moving to a much greater and more meaningful way into this area.

The department has, of course, attempted to structure or put together a five-year plan in this regard so that it is not a year-by-year thing, but it is a longer-range thing.

There are a number of things that bode well for this type of program. The Minister of Agriculture recently advised the House about the 50-50 cost-sharing program in regard to DREF and PFRA for multi-purpose reservoirs which can be used for recreation as well as water supplies and so forth. This was announced by the federal government on March 2. We anticipate from a departmental point of view, investigating every aspect of this system and take every advantage of it.

But in a lot of cases it has meant establishing some ground rules. There were very few ground rules in this area, and that is the reason we have established some very basic policies, one being this cost-sharing policy which tends to cover virtually every kind of water management project. It puts on the local authority a certain specific amount of responsibility with the province taking the rest. We work on the idea that if the local authority and the local people are interested in their own welfare, that town, in that area, is going to live. Then we'll assist them to the greatest possible degree. But if they don't care, then certainly the government won't go in and help them in its entirety.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a few comments with respect to the Metis Housing Program that is contained in the Department of the Environment Estimates.

While, I think, we can all appreciate that the amount of money allocated for the Water Supply Program, Mr. Chairman, is at least a start, it seems to me that an appropriation of \$660,000 for water supplies this year is really inadequate. I say this, not so much in criticism of the Minister of the Environment, but rather as a plea to the Provincial Treasurer. We really must give this whole question of adequate water supplies to the Metis colonies a much higher priority.

During the subcommittee discussions, if my memory serves me right, the minister advised us that the total cost of providing this program to the various colonies in the province would be in the neighbourhood of \$7 million. Now the allocation this year is just short of \$700,000 so that presumably means it is a ten-year program, although one can presume that the costs of providing the program would go up due to inflation. So, in fact, it may mean somewhat more than ten years before we are able to provide adequate water supplies to Metis colonies in the province.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that we recognize that the quality of water supplies in many of the colonies in this province is just completely inadequate.

I recall being at the community of Grouard which is largely a Metis colony, or Metis community anyway, in 1969. The local residents were telling me that they didn't have adequate water supplies in the community, but they had a water truck come over from a neighbouring community some 30 miles a day and that this was all added to the welfare costs of the people involved. So the actual cost of providing adequate water by transporting it, probably over several years, would in the case of that community, be as great as digging a proper well and providing proper water facilities.

It seems to me that we just have to emphasize the importance of this matter. We've talked a great deal today about a park in the Edmonton area and while I fully recognize the advantages of an urban provincial park, I really question whether or not it should have the priority of providing at least minimum water supply conditions for many communities in our province.

I understand again, if I recall the minister properly, from the committee, that some 60 communities will eventually come under this program.

Now I say to the members of the Assembly that while we have started this year, we shouldn't really pat ourselves on the back that we are going to take 10, 11, or 12 years to complete a venture of this importance to a very large number of people living in remote sections of the province.

It seems to me that there are certain basic things that Albertans should be entitled to, and surely an adequate water supply; and I should point out, Mr. Chairman, as the minister himself advised the committee, we are not going to install plumbing or running water in the colony homes by any means. What we are talking about in this program is a community well. Now surely that's not an excessive proposition at all.

And I would really question whether or not it is not time for us to decide that we are going to complete this program over two or three years, instead of a ten-year proposition. As I say, we have taken the first step, in the appropriations we are dealing with now, and I would solicit the support of the members and express the hope that the Provincial Treasurer will find the money to give this proposition the priority which it clearly deserves.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are just a couple of points that I wanted to ask the minister about on another matter before I sit down. It deals with George Lake. Since we were discussing detailed proposals in individual constituencies during a discussion of the Estimates so far, I would like to ask the minister whether or not any steps have been taken to implement the proposals of the George Lake Association. I appreciate the fact that he was out there last fall to meet with them. And more specifically, when can the community expect the diversion of the Hines Creek, the portion of it through George Lake to make it a fresh water lake?

The hon. Member for Drumheller talked about water facilities in his particular constituency and I am sure that the Minister of the Environment is aware that water facilities on the north side of the Peace are not really adequate. This is especially true from the viewpoint of recreational opportunities. The cost of the diversion is not a large cost and I would ask whether or not any provision will be made this year to complete that diversion. I think it can be done and would certainly be of great benefit, not only to the people of Hines Creek and surrounding areas, but really to people on the north side of the Peace River. Because, as I mentioned before, George Lake does have considerable recreational potential and it is one of the few areas on the north side of the Peace that really have that kind of potential.

So in summary, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to reemphasize again that the Metis water supply program really should be a matter of a higher priority in future budgets. And I would hope that next year, we can talk about completing it perhaps in a year or two and not assume that a 10 or 11-year program to provide something as essential as adequate water will, in fact, suffice.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, the assumption that it is a 10 or 11-year program is the hon. member's assumption, certainly not the government's. This is, in fact, the top priority with the government and almost at a moment's notice the government flew up into a community and drilled some wells under the most difficult conditions. But it also learned something from drilling those wells. It learned that the mountain cannot be moved overnight and that we have to establish, start the program, in a meaningful way to begin with.

And this year, it is simply a \$.75 million dollar program, that's some \$660,000 as the capital works aspect of it. The actual physical part of it -- there is some part of that in the departmental budget in Income Account.

It is a top priority program with the government. It has been from the day the Premier flew up to Janvier and we estimated the total program, and I can't say at this time on behalf of the government whether the total program would be done in two years, in three years, in five years because a lot of it will depend on the experiences we have this year in terms of the \$.75 million dollar program.

My recollection, if it is correct, is that the actual department recommended only a \$.75 million dollar year, because this is what they felt they could handle in a meaningful way as a beginning of this total program. But I suggest, without offering any assurance, that it could very well be that the allocation in this area will be substantially greater next year.

In regard to George Lake, we are starting that program in terms of winter works about the middle of March. I'm not sure it hasn't already started. About the middle of May we are going to terminate what we are going to do this year. We anticipate it will again be picked up as part of the winter works program this winter.

I can't miss the opportunity to say, Mr. Chairman, how pleased I was to go to George Lake, and how pleased they were up there to see a representative of the government, recognizing, of course, that they had so much to do with the representative of the opposition for the last several years and they haven't really got very much from the fact that he was representing them in this House. I really was surprised and amazed when I asked the people there to provide us with a petition to really give us an indication that they wanted some recreational facilities and they wanted a water recreational facility rather than a new arena or some other type of structure. They came back with an enormous petition having something like 600 or 700 names they collected over a series of months. When we get that kind of response, then certainly we're going to respond also.

I would just like to say that in regard to the 105 per cent, if we took out all the transfers and all the shifting from capital to income account, the

actual increase in the income account budget this year over last year would be 25.4 per cent.

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like some comments from the Minister on Litter Check. You are expecting municipalities to provide land to store these old car bodies, and I understand that some of the counties aren't very enthusiastic. In fact, they are not going along with it. What other alternatives do you have in case they do not provide land?

MR. YURKO:

We hope that the municipalities will cooperate with us. We are suggesting that they permit some part of their disposal sites for the storing of these vehicles, which we hope will be done on a temporary basis. I find it rather difficult that any municipality would turn us down, before I talk about alternatives.

We're doing this as a provincially-funded program with the Department of Highways and the Department of the Environment. We're putting in the money, and I find it very difficult that any municipality would even say, you're doing this program, but we won't let you have our disposal site to store them for a year or two before, in fact, we can have another company take them away to Navaho Metals or the steel firm. However, I recognize that some municipalities may turn us down. Then we must look for an alternative. The alternatives can be many. We can rent a piece of property from a farmer. We can, in fact, buy if we have to. We can see if we can deal with the municipality in terms of finding some other piece of property. But I suggest that some piece of property will be found.

MR. SORENSON:

If a private citizen offered land on a temporary basis, would this be acceptable?

MR. YURKO:

We'd find it very acceptable, just give us the name.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I note that the advertising budget of this department went up from \$2,000 to \$30,000 which is something like a 1,500 per cent jump. I believe that all the departments are having the same kind of -- well some of them have quite an increase in advertising, notwithstanding the publicity bureau which was set up with the government which also has gone into advertising in rather a big way. There certainly is good reason to believe some of this advertising, at least, could be, without stretching the facts at all, termed to be political advertising.

[Interjection]

Yes, that one bothers you, but that was about the most honest publication you people ever inherited and you've never had a better one since.

When I see them advertising and they have an ad announcing a minister who will be in Calgary and they have two-thirds of the ad representing the minister's picture and the signature and the rest of it just a short little ad to announce the minister will be in Calgary, then I think that is sort of taking the taxpayer for a sucker and the taxpayer is learning that awfully quickly, and that isn't the only case.

In fact the hon. Minister of the Environment -- I was rather amazed one day to read the Herald and I find out he had two similar ads, one on each side of the page. I thought to myself, I knew the Premier loves himself but I didn't know the rest of the ministers were entitled to the same privileges. But we will bring that one in if someone wishes to challenge my facts. I thought that was about the height of insult to the taxpayer because here -- pardon?

MR. YURKO:

[Inaudible.]

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, well still, you loved it didn't you?

Now, to get back to advertising, will this be spent through the Bureau of Public Affairs or will this be spent through your department?

MR. YURKO:

What on earth are you talking about?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

What appropriation is that you are questioning, Mr. Ludwig?

MR. LUDWIG:

I'll get it right now: 2904, advertising \$30,000 from \$2,000 and I see a tremendous amount of --

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, there are parts of this budget that I am disappointed in; one has been, to some degree, the capital part but then we think we will adjust that next year. The other part has, in fact, been advertising budgets.

Last year we spent \$22,000 in advertising the recycling program. It was perhaps one of the most meaningful things we did last year in selling the program to the people of Alberta. It directly related to the success of the program, and if in fact it hadn't been done, I suggest we would have had a lot of chaos in that particular program. Because the key --

[Interjections]

No, we don't. It's a good program and it's working. There are some people dropping out for a number of very justifiable reasons, but the program is working. The minister from Quebec is coming down to see me about the program, recognizing it is an area of considerable employment and it has created a lot of jobs and circulating money at the desirable level in any society.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, the other area that I am probably somewhat disappointed in the budget really is in our advertising program because the whole area of environment is one of public relations and selling and telling the people what in fact we are doing because that is directly related to the success of your program. If you don't sell your programs in some cases, you don't really succeed.

The other question was how -- I just might continue that for a minute. For example, in terms of the Golden Spike program. It isn't realized, for example, that presently with respect to that particular well, or that particular expansion which is being handled at a hearing, and perhaps I shouldn't say anything -- maybe I won't, Mr. Chairman, because there is a hearing involved in that area.

We established new standards of environmental quality in regard to sulphur dioxide this year on January 10. The public doesn't know what we have done. Our standards are substantially more stringent than any place in the North American continent. But we haven't sold it. The public doesn't realize we are protecting their health and their property in as substantial a way or more so than any other government in North America. And the reason they don't realize it is because we haven't told them. We haven't really communicated this across and we are going to have to communicate these standards, we are going to have to communicate a number of aspects of what we are doing. The only way it can be done is through advertising and I suggest that that is a very meagre budget of \$30,000 for advertising. It's going to be spent very, very wisely and very, very frugally.

MR. LUDWIG:

To continue, that when he advertises his recycling program to tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth and not just advertise they are recycling something that is being buried in the dirt and isn't being recycled. So that wasn't quite so.

I think that when we talk about advertising and false advertising and perhaps the worse the product, the more money it needs to have it sold by way of

advertising, that maybe the Minister of Consumer Affairs ought to check some of this advertising to see if it is genuine or whether it is good political propaganda, misleading advertising.

[Interjections]

-- yes, misleading advertising. But I would like to say something about this matter of cleaning up the province.

I know that the minister is doing a good job with some of his recycling programs. The bottles will perhaps disappear but the province is still littered considerably including the rivers. There are just as many -- well, maybe not as many bottles -- thrown out now but bottles are being thrown out, beer bottles, pop bottles, all kinds of bottles including wine bottles, all over the countryside. And even though his program is a step in the right direction it is not going to clean up this province.

I wondered whether the department ever considered setting up or permitting some charitable institution or organization in this province to undertake the cleanup of the whole province, every kind of cleanup in the cities, the municipalities, villages, towns, rivers, roads, highways and byways, on the basis of permitting them to perhaps do it on the Miles for Millions principle, where they have people or some charitable institution that may want to raise funds for perhaps the handicapped or some other good cause like that. Have them seek volunteers and sell their services on a charitable basis of perhaps \$1 an hour or \$10 an hour, whatever they can. This kind of a program would perhaps ultimately not only help clean up the province but educate all those concerned, including students and children, that it is easier to keep a country clean than perhaps to have to clean it up.

This is just a thought that I think could be looked into. Not only would we help clean up all the roads and countryside from debris, from pollution, from plastic bags to glasses, all sorts of material that lies there, tires, old machinery, but also permit some charitable institution to make money for a good cause. I believe this could be implemented if someone was keen enough to go to the trouble of doing it.

Now while I am on this department, Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to one issue that the minister mentioned the other day and that is the study of river access. I believe it is certainly a good suggestion and I would like him to explain whether this study is under way now or whether it is completed and whether we could expect him to file a report.

I am particularly concerned about river access studies in the part of the province that I come from because I happen to know that rivers in the vicinity of Calgary are not always too accessible for various reasons. Some are physical reasons, others are fences and no trespassing signs, and while it is commendable that the government can spend \$8 million to build a park -- many people love going to parks and I think it is money probably well spent -- at the same time there are many areas in the vicinity of Calgary, within 15, 20 or 30 miles or a bit more, where people like to go. They like to go out into the wilderness, they like to go to the river but they can't. And so I believe that and I hope your river access study will throw some light on the problem that we face in these areas.

Thousands of people want to go out but they have to drive along the highway for many miles because they can't get off and walk along the road or a road allowance that belongs to them because it is blocked off. I think this is a serious matter. It is a public concern and I believe that perhaps the Minister of the Environment, when he does get his study, might supply us with a report of the study so we can continue the struggle to be able to use that which is ours, that which the public wants to use. We are entitled to use it.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, we are way ahead of the hon. member in terms of litter. We have established this year a project called Litter Check, a non-profit foundation which we are funding with a grant, but it is an organization which is going to use to a very large degree voluntary help. As a matter of fact it has a board of directors of very distinguished Albertans on it, one is Dr. Johns, the former President of the University of Alberta.

I thought I had the information here, but I would be very glad to circulate to all the members the structure of Litter Check and what, in fact, its terms of reference are and so forth, and what the organization is going to do. It is, in



fact, directly related and associated with this beautification week that we are having between the end of April and the first week in May.

In regard to river access studies, I haven't had the opportunity yet, Mr. Chairman, to discuss this with the department to see just what information there is, but I will and will take it under advisement.

MR. JAMISON:

Mr. Chairman, if I may do a little fast mathematics like our Leader of the Opposition does, I think the appropriation of \$30,000 for advertising is peanuts when you consider that the magazine, costing in the neighbourhood of something like \$900,000, is something like 30 years of advertising and it's called, Land for Living.

And remember Land for Living was pointing out all the beauty spots of Alberta, but I think this \$30,000 is now going to clean up some of those spots and make it more beautiful.

I might also add to the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View that this job of \$30,000 is a factual type of advertising and is informing the people what they can do with the bottles. I think every week there are many groups in every town and village in Alberta that put on bottle drives and do a tremendous job.

[Interjections]

MR. DRAIN:

I gathered from the hon. minister's remarks there is some program projected in the matter of inspection of water courses which would be part of the total environmental package. So that was one particular subject I was going to explore.

I also wanted to express my appreciation to the minister, and Water Resources, on the kind of cooperation that we did receive in the Crowsnest Pass and the beneficial results we did achieve for people.

However, this particular program was beneficial to people and very hard on fish, but you have to put the fish ahead of the people.

I was wondering if I could possibly sell an idea of rectifying this situation to the fish and game organizations in my constituency, and whether the Water Resources Branch would be receptive to the idea I have in mind which is basically, the river, of course, which over a period of time has been straightened and dredged with the result that you now have what is called the sluice-box effect. So in order to overcome that I would think installing riffles would be the proper answer. These riffles would act as a means of slowing down the speed of the water and creating an environment where fish would stay.

My idea of doing this would be in the matter of putting logs on a basis of probably every 20 or 25 feet suspended by cables which, of course, would go up and down with the water and at the same time would have the effect of digging into the bottom of the river and thereby creating the effect of having the proper environment for fish. I was wondering, if I did sell this idea, if the department would be receptive to it.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, the gravity and import of some of the suggestions the hon. member makes are, without question, often some of the finest so we will take his suggestions under advisement.

I did want to indicate the literature on Outdoors on Litter whose motto is Litter Check, and indicate who is on the board of directors; Dr. Johns, Mr. W. Sharpe, Mr. R. Wood, Mr. Wisner from our department and Mr. Van Weem.

The program is Alberta Litter Check sponsored by the Department of the Environment and held yearly, an educational campaign in schools throughout Alberta, a monthly publication to keep schools and interested groups and individuals up to date on environmental problems and constructive programs, a film library, a public awareness campaign aimed at educating people, and, of course, the great cleanup once a year.

There are possible memberships available to joining this. Individual memberships are \$5 per year, sustaining memberships for individuals are \$25 per

year, associate non-profit organizations are \$10 per year, corporate sustaining \$500 and over, supporting \$250 and over, and contributing \$150 and over. We intend to interest as many corporations as possible so that this is an opportunity or an attempt, not to do something by government itself because it so frequently fails, but to attempt to set it up on a somewhat private enterprise basis and involve industry, the schools and the entire public in a litter control organization.

MR. BENOIT:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In checking through the annual report, I don't find anything in connection with The Environment Conservation Authority. Is there a purpose for leaving it out? Is it considered that the annual report of the authority itself will suffice?

MR. YURKO:

Yes, Mr. Chairman. The Environment Conservation Authority is not a part of the department. The Environment Conservation Authority is a separate entity entirely from the department. It reports through the minister to cabinet, but it is not a part of the department at all. It is a separate entity. So it is not -- that is right I am the minister the authority reports through to cabinet or government, but it doesn't come under the department.

MR. BENOIT:

One more question if I may, Mr. Chairman. Then do you sometimes find that the Conservation of Historical and Archaeological Resources of Alberta which is part of the Environment Conservation Authority overlaps with the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation in some areas?

MR. YURKO:

Primarily that responsibility is that of the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation. Most departments are involved with preservation of some form of archaeological and historical sites, be they natural or man made. However, the authority was asked to conduct a series of hearings in that area. It is not a continuing responsibility of the authority at all. They were asked to conduct a series of hearings, come up with a report, suggest some legislation and then their task is finished, and then the department takes over.

MR. BARTON:

Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank the hon. Minister of the Environment for the cooperation he extended to myself and the constituency and for all the departments he has returned phone calls. I appreciate that very much.

I also appreciate his approach to petitions because I received one this morning. It has to do with the Swan Valley. I know there is concerned effort by the oil companies and I was wondering if there were any results of the work that is going on in the Swan Valley and especially in Swan Hills because the petition is here with some 150 names which I will be forwarding to you.

They would like to have a little local input. I think a year ago I requested that somebody from that area sit on this particular committee and I am sure it would be advantageous so that the people in the area do know there is a concentrated attempt and if you could give us a report at this time as to the Swan Hills situation. Secondly, I would also urge the minister to continue finishing the east and west prairie project as it is just about completed, and I am sure this year we will see that.

The third part, I was wondering if your department is conducting any study on the environment or ecology of the Lesser Slave Lake area, and particularly the lake area for recreational purposes? We had a decision by the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests that the environment was in serious damage in some areas. I agree with him but in certain areas half of it was just cleaned out the previous year and it could have been utilized a little bit.

In talking about studies, I would request that your department do a study as to the recreational potential of the Swan Valley, especially so we can have some sort of direction for the people of the area. One end of it is quite low, and the other end goes up into the Swan Hills, and it has a great potential.

I was wondering if your department were going to create any studies in that area?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, last year we did call in all the industries involved in the Swan Hills area and indicated to them that we needed a much accelerated program of erosion control in the Swan Hills area on reforestation and revegetation where necessary.

We established -- again my memory is just a little hazy on this and I'd have to dig out the details -- but we went on from there to establish, I believe, a series of task forces with the companies and government representatives with the prime objective of reversing the siltation trend within five years, or stopping it or decelerating it and then eventual reversal.

I know programs are being set up through these task forces. I don't have the details but if the hon. member wants the details we can certainly -- perhaps he can drop a note to my office and I'll see he gets the details directly.

In regard to the Lesser Slave Lake area, I don't think we have a total recreation study. We are retiring some farm land in the area, buying it up for conservation purposes on a program basis, particularly land that was being flooded and it was determined that the best solution to this problem was, in fact, to repurchase the land, it never should have been sold in the first place. So we have this program going on.

I think the actual Lesser Slave Lake area will be touched on or be included in the Environment Conservation Authority -- no, I guess it doesn't go quite that far -- though there would be nothing wrong with people making submissions to the authority hearings in terms of development of land use and resource development in the eastern slopes. If any group wanted to make submissions in that regard for recreational development, they certainly could. However I don't think we have any kind of a major recreational study in the area. I will check on that though.

MR. BARTON:

Could I just follow that up? Would you entertain an extra man on your committees out there so the local area has some input in it?

MR. YURKO:

I would suggest that you write to us suggesting that and we'll certainly take it under advisement.

MR. BENOIT:

I believe this one comes under 2934. I'm raising the question of licensing of water well drillers. Has the department done anything regarding that, and what is its intention in the future?

MR. YURKO:

It's about a year and a half ago since I dealt with that problem, and it is another one that my memory is somewhat hazy. I think the water well drillers wanted to form an association and sort of restrict, in a very meaningful way, members to this sort of tight-knit group and I vetoed that. This area had to be left wide open.

However, we have established some standards, I believe. And these are available in booklet form so if the hon. member wishes, we can certainly get him a copy of the booklet with regard to standards.

MR. BENOIT:

There is no act or binding law upon the water well drillers now, and no systematic government inspection whereby to control the abuse of water well drilling?

MR. YURKO:

Well we have this set of guidelines and this is as far, I think, as we have gone.

MR. BENOIT:

Can they be enforced?

MR. YURKO:

Well guidelines are always difficult to enforce, but you know, you can do it through trade. You say that fellow is no good and get somebody else. We are to some degree using some of these ourselves so I think there is some measure of control that way. But no legislation or regulatory control that I remember.

MR. BENOIT:

I'd like to set those guidelines.

MR. DIXON:

My question to the minister is regarding the Burns feed lot in Calgary. I was wondering if the minister -- he probably hasn't got the information at hand -- I was wondering what action has been taken. There have been complaints sent to him and I was wondering if he would look it up and maybe next time we go into Estimates he could give a more detailed plan on what action is being taken. I understand it has been asked to move. Actually, I think negotiations are underway. Maybe he could find out so I can inform the residents.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, I am sure the department has certainly been discussing the matter and negotiating with Burns about the Burns feedlot. We are actively investigating the establishment of a policy of grants for assistance to move industry, particularly small industry to a large degree related to feedlots for example, and smaller private industries. Lethbridge is a problem in this regard, a pretty substantial problem, and we have had discussions with City Packers, for example, in terms of moving them out. We have investigated sites with them, and assisted them to a very large degree in this regard.

But we recognize that there is some need for some kind of relocating allowance or relocating grant for certain types of industries. I am just saying the government has this matter under active consideration right now. How soon we can resolve this and what type of assistance might be forthcoming, I don't know. But from a personal point of view, I believe very strongly this is one of just a very few instances where government should assist in terms of pollution control directly. In regard to relocating, because society has grown around the industry and not through the industry's fault at all, it has caused constraints on industry which then impose additional costs to move it out of the area. I might suggest this is one of the very few areas where, in my own mind, there is justification for the government assisting an industry directly.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Are you ready for the question before 5:30? Mr. Barton.

MR. BARTON:

During July there was a university student from Ontario who backpacked the north shore of the lake and camped out. I was wondering, she worked from Shaw Point around to the Lesser Slave Lake area. And I had the misfortune of missing talking to her; my brother did talk to her. I wonder if this was directed by any department in government. She was doing some sort of foot utilization study of people as to what concentration the area would hold. And I was wondering if that was done by your department?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, not to my knowledge. But if I had known, I would probably have joined her.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

In view of the fact that several members still want to question, or raise questions, I believe we would have to adjourn on this debate.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise, report progress, and beg leave to sit again.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Mr. Diachuk left the Chair.]

\* \* \* \* \*

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration certain resolutions, begs to report progress and begs leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[The House rose at 5:31 o'clock.]