

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Thursday, April 5, 1973

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 33 The Municipal Taxation Amendment Act, 1973

DR. McCRIMMON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 33, The Municipal Taxation Amendment Act, 1973. This bill is to bring The Municipal Taxation Act more in line for changes in the taxation structure for the reduction plan.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 33 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Public Works, that Bill No. 33, The Municipal Taxation Amendment Act be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 27

The Livestock and Livestock Products Amendment Act, 1973

MR. FLUKER:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Livestock and Livestock Products Amendment Act, 1973. This bill is mainly meant to tighten up on some of the regulations for licenced livestock dealers in the Province of Alberta.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 27 was introduced and read a first time.]

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, that Bill No. 27, The Livestock and Livestock Products Amendment Act, 1973 be transferred to the Order Paper under Government Orders.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 32 The Public Health Amendment Act, 1973

DR. McCRIMMON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 32, The Public Health Amendment Act, 1973. This bill ensures the purification of water and ice for public consumption.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 32 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of the Environment, that Bill No. 32, The Public Health Amendment Act, 1973 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 29 The Fire Prevention Amendment Act, 1973

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Fire Prevention Amendment Act, 1973.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 29 was introduced and read a first time.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation, followed by the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly Mr. Waldemar Siber, a member of the board of directors of one of the largest industrial companies in Europe and in fact, the world. Mr. Siber is here returning a visit I was privileged to pay on behalf of this province last August. Herr Siber ich moechte Sie in unserer province auf's herzlichste willkommen heissen und innen alles gute wuenschen.

Mr. Siber is accompanied by Mr. Loewenich from Montreal. May I ask them now to rise and be recognized.

[Mr. Farran and Dr. Hohol rose simultaneously.]

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair has already recognized the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities.

MR. FARRAN:

I don't mind yielding, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce to you and through you to the House some 150 Calgarians who belong to the Golden Age Club in our city. They met the Premier earlier at lunch and are here to see their elected representatives at work. I think I can speak for everyone in the House, Mr. Speaker, when I say that we are proud of senior citizens such as these pioneers who laid the foundations of Alberta. We should all remember when we pass legislation directed at senior citizens for relief from Medicare premiums or education tax or senior citizen accommodation that it only represents in small measure a payment on the debt owed by all Albertans to the founders of this province. I ask them now to rise and be recognized.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to introduce to you and through you to this Assembly two visitors from the Province of Ontario. We have in your gallery, sir, Mr. Bruce Jarvis Legge Q.C., the Chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board of Ontario. And without intent to embarrass him, I do wish to indicate that those of us who are involved and knowledgeable about workmen's compensation agree that he is the foremost authority on workmen's compensation in North America. With him is Mr. Kenneth B. Harding, the associate secretary of the Workmen's Compensation Board of Ontario.

Those of us who are in your special legislative committee on workmen's compensation had the distinct pleasure of visiting with them for the better part of two days. I should like to ask them to rise in the Speaker's Gallery and be recognized by this Assembly.

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and to the members of this Assembly the provincial president of the Social Credit Ladies' Auxiliary. Mrs. Doris Oliver is seated in your gallery, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask her to please rise and be recognized by the House.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to file Sessional Papers 100 and 213.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table Motion for a Return No. 128 ordered by the House.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. On Monday, April 2, in response to a Notice of Motion for a Return No. 112, I tabled a reply. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, a typographical error occurred in respect to item 5 in the reply. Item 5 requested the number of fatal accidents involving snowmobiles, and my reply indicated that there were 14.

Mr. Speaker, this should have read four fatal accidents, and I wish to apologize for any inconvenience this error may have caused.

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it the House approves the amendment of this Return in the manner indicated by the hon. Minister of Highways and would the House also agree that a subsequent question or motion which is on the Order Paper based on that Return may be similarly amended?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to file Return Nos. 159, 220, 149, 198 and 127.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Recommendation to National Energy Board

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Mines and Minerals. I wonder if he could advise the House as to whether the recommendations that he made yesterday in this House relative to a new restructured National Energy Board have been formally passed on to the federal government?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, they haven't but it would be my intention to discuss it with the members of the federal cabinet for their consideration.

MR. HENDERSON:

Supplemental, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister really suggest that they are going to be seriously entertained when he deals with this matter?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I am certainly pleased to answer that. I hope that we can be very persuasive in our presentation to the federal cabinet.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Was this proposition discussed at the Prairie Economic Council?

MR. LOUGHEED:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Air Ambulances

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. About a week ago I asked about the use of air ambulances for emergency highway accidents. Has the hon. minister had a chance to look into that as yet?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, after the hon. member's question I did apprehend that the reference to it had come from one of the municipalities. I believe, that the suggestion had been made publicly. If I am not mistaken I think the City of Calgary made some reference publicly to the feasibility of that idea. I have not had an opportunity to check the feasibility of it yet; I'll look into it again.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Bus Line Schedule

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Highways and Transport. Has Greyhound Bus Lines filed their new schedule, their spring schedule, with the Highway Traffic Board?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Greyhound Bus Line has filed their new schedule.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has this schedule been approved by the Highway Traffic Board?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the hon. Member for Lethbridge giving me advance warning of the questions and I have with me the application. The hon. member also wanted to know about the time limit.

Under the Public Service Vehicles Act, Article 241:

The holder of every public service vehicle certificate for the transportation of passengers shall file with the board a timetable showing the scheduled times of arrival and departure from all stopping places along the route. Such timetables shall only become operative on the approval of the board and after at least ten days notice has been given at all waiting rooms along the route. All alterations and changes of timetables must be submitted for approval before being put into force. A copy of such approved timetables shall be available for public inspection in each waiting room along the route.

I wish to table, Mr. Speaker, the timetable which was filed by Greyhound of Canada on March 29 with the Chairman of the Highway Traffic Board.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is there an increase in rates and fares anticipated in 1973?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure on that. I would be willing to check into it for you.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge East, followed by the hon. Member for Bow Valley.

Lethbridge University Theatre Project

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, mine is a follow-up to the Minister of Advanced Education. Have you approved funds for the construction of the Lethbridge University theatre complex as suggested by the Universities Commission?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I have now had the opportunity of reading the information from Lethbridge, and I have asked the officials of the Department of Advanced Education who will be assuming the responsibility for capital development once the bill dissolving the Commission is passed to review it and bring it forward to me for recommendation.

MR. ANDERSON:

Supplementary. Can this project be considered a minor capital cost project to meet the immediate needs of the university rather than a major, long-term capital cost project for the university?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, any project that involves the expenditure of about \$1.4 or \$1.5 million dollars is in my opinion, a major capital cost.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Fresh-Water Fish Marketing Corporation

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. The fishermen in northern Ontario have opted out of the Fresh-Water Fish Marketing Corporation. The question is: who has the authority for the fisherman for the Province of Alberta if they wanted to opt out of the

Fish Marketing Corporation? Would it be under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Lands and Forests?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that the hon. member's information is precisely correct and I would have to check on it with respect to the fishermen of northern Ontario.

There have, as I mentioned during the Lands and Forests estimates, been some problems with the Fresh-Water Fish Marketing Corporation and that this corporation was formed jointly by the four provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Ontario, only part of Ontario being covered, along with the federal government.

My deputy minister, as a matter of fact, attended a meeting just on Monday at the Fresh-Water Fish Marketing Corporation headquarters at Transcona, Manitoba on this matter and I have talked with him today on it. So far as I know the Province of Ontario has not, as of this time, opted out.

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I understand the fishermen are taking a vote now as to whether they are going to want to belong to the corporation or not. If they do vote to leave the corporation, would you favour getting them out of the corporation?

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly the hon. member could repeat his question after the result of the vote is known and then it would no longer be hypothetical.

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

Land-Use Forum

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. Could the Premier advise if any public hearings have been scheduled by the Land-Use Forum and if so, would it be possible to advise the location and dates for such hearings?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would think it would be well into the summer months before the Land-Use Forum has been established and whether or not the schedule would permit hearings prior to the fall would be doubtful. But certainly as soon as we have some more definitive information we will advise the hon. members.

MR. FRENCH:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Have the three members been appointed to the Alberta Land-Use Forum pursuant to the resolution which was passed three weeks ago today?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, no, and I doubt that they would be appointed until perhaps during the summer months. But if the hon. member has any suggestions of people who he thinks would be effective in terms of serving on the forum, we would welcome the suggestions.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Did they watch the program last night with the Minister of Agriculture from British Columbia? Will the Minister of Agriculture of Alberta be as adroit and as expert in answering these questions about land forum as the minister from British Columbia?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I haven't any doubt but I am also quite confident that the Minister of Agriculture in this province will not get himself into the box that the Minister of Agriculture in British Columbia is in.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. Will he give consideration to the appointment of at least one active, practising farmer on that commission as such?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Yes, certainly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Guaranteed Annual Income

MR. NOTLEY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Has your government given any consideration to conducting a guaranteed annual income experiment similar to the one announced on Friday last in Manitoba where the federal government picks up 75 per cent of the cost and the provincial government 25 per cent?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is no intention at the present time to embark on a pilot project or experiment in regard to guaranteed annual income. My view is that that's premature. We are just in the process of preparing for -- and when I say "we", I mean all of the governments of the ten provinces and the federal government -- a major meeting later this month in Ottawa. At that time, no doubt things like this will come up. But to embark upon it prior to that meeting doesn't seem to me to be very timely.

I do note that the Manitoba proposal would be timely in the view of the two governments involved, so I am not criticizing what they have done. But for our purposes it would seem to me that we should proceed with the meeting first.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the government monitoring or has it monitored the four guaranteed annual income pilot projects in the United States to consider the advantages or disadvantages of these schemes?

MR. CRAWFORD:

As far as I am aware, Mr. Speaker, the department monitors all such programs -- just going beyond guaranteed annual income for the moment -- of anything of significance in Canada. Whether all programs of significance in the United States would be followed up in the same way I very much doubt.

It's possible one or more of the programs, to which the hon. member refers, would have been monitored and I will check into that. I don't know offhand.

MR. NOTLEY:

A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the government considered the advantages of the guaranteed annual income concept in terms of actually encouraging the work ethic by subsidizing the working poor?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think the way of encouraging the work ethic, if it's going to be tied to a guaranteed income, has got to be based on a new concept that would introduce some additional controls over the life of the recipient that don't exist at the present time.

It seems to me that one would almost have to have an ingredient of a work commitment involved if the income were going to be guaranteed. I'm speaking very generally in a reflective way on the overall philosophy now and not stating the policy of the government which will be stated in due course on this subject. But it seems to me that when you go into guaranteed annual income you are, in effect, making the government the ultimate employer of that person and you would

thereby have a right or an obligation, or both, to direct his energies in a way that you won't have if the assistance is based solely on need.

I find the subject an engaging and interesting one and --

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. minister able to conclude shortly?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my ability to conclude I could demonstrate by stopping at once! But I did have one more point, which I suggest is extremely relevant to the question and the answer in its brief form up to this point. It's simply this: in most of Canada, if not all of Canada, there is in fact an income guaranteed to a certain class of people and that is people who are 65 years of age and over. I don't need to go through the figures and the way this was arrived at by the universal plan and then the guaranteed income supplement along with it.

The policy I am stating now -- and that will conclude my point, Mr. Speaker -- is simply this: I would be very, very hesitant and would hope that all governments would be very, very cautious in branching into the area of guarantees of income beyond that special group of 65 and over.

MR. NOTLEY:

The last supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In light of the decision of British Columbia to raise the old age pension supplement up to a figure of \$200 per month are you considering at this stage any move on the part of the Alberta government to increase the supplement to give old age pensioners a minimum of \$200 per month?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, what we have done is -- in Alberta the question of the new adjustments that were made, based on what is at the present time a solely federal program, are placed in issue here on the basis of whether or not the full benefit of the federal additional payment should be passed on to those who are on social assistance. We have decided, and it's been announced in the House before, that our policy is that the full amount of the benefits conferred by the federal government will be passed on to Alberta residents and that no adjustment will take place.

Now as far as extending it beyond the area of guarantee, which is basically the figure of \$170 at the present time for an individual, I think if a comparison of programs across the country were done it would appear that with the coverage under Medicare and Blue Cross, with the provisions in regard to property tax and the relief of payment of that by senior citizens and that sort of thing, it would be most likely that the Alberta program is already the best in the country --

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. minister prepared to conclude with admirable brevity? We have just had a mini-debate on guaranteed incomes.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I promise not to go on into my old age.

[Laughter]

The only other comment I had was to say again that the major meeting of governments that will be held later this month in Ottawa is, in my view, the place to begin to make known the proposals of the various provinces and to share them, and for everyone who attends that meeting to gain the maximum benefit from a discussion in that atmosphere.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

PORC

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question today to the hon. the Premier. Do you plan to grant an audience, as requested by the Edmonton consumer action group called PORC, Protest Outrageous Rising Costs, to receive their submission regarding rising cost of food in this province?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I hope we never get into the position where the Premier of the province grants audiences.

[Interjections]

As far as I am concerned, we would be very happy to meet with them. As far as the Minister of Consumer Affairs is concerned, I am sure this is a specific item that he is prepared to listen to, and I will be, too. We'll welcome them.

MR. HO LEM:

My supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Can the House expect an announcement this session regarding any specific action this government will take to deal with the alarming increase in the food cost to the consumer, which is creating --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The question is complete.

MR. DOWLING:

Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all I should also like to say that we will welcome the group that is obtaining signatures on its petition regarding the high cost of food products.

With regard to specific measures on food products I can't honestly say at this time that we will be in a position to introduce any legislative measures. However there are other pieces of consumer legislation or rather, regulation at which we are looking very carefully, and which are items of considerable consequence to a major number of consumers in Alberta. We may be in a position to introduce them before the session is over.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Minister, specifically what legislation are you looking at that is presently on the books to be used?

MR. DOWLING:

We are looking specifically at the sale of motor vehicles and the construction industry.

MR. CLARK:

What does that have to do with food prices?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

MR. DOWLING:

It has to do, Mr. Speaker, with consumers of Alberta.

MR. COOKSON:

Mr. Speaker, would the minister investigate the high cost of farm machinery while you are in the process of investigations?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, I am certain this is one of the things we will have under consideration in due course. Of course, one thing that all the hon. members

should appreciate is a major step forward in establishing a consumer affairs branch.

I would hope that in bringing matters of some consequence forward, as most members have been doing, that they bear in mind that we have had very little time to really get our teeth into the thing and we are doing the best we can. I expect by the fall that there will be legislation of some consequence to cover a major number of problems experienced by consumers today.

Batten Royal Commission

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, last week the hon. minister indicated that he was going to meet with representatives of the retail trade to consider the recommendations of the Batten Royal Commission several years ago concerning excess space.

My question to you, Mr. Minister, is, will you have those meetings soon enough so that you can make a report on your discussions to the Legislature before the spring recess?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, that meeting was scheduled, as I indicated, either this week or the following week. Unfortunately the bulk of the manufacturing people were coming from eastern Canada. They were doing an across-the-country tour and meeting with people in every legislature in the country. And because they couldn't schedule their timing properly, they had to cancel the whole thing.

We expect they will make an additional attempt to meet with the various people responsible for consumer affairs in the next week or so and we will, of course, meet with them.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Bottle Drive

MR. SORENSON:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture and it arises from an inquiry from a young gentleman who is secretary of a 4-H Beef Club.

Is the government sponsoring groups or organizations that wish to have a bottle drive on rural roadsides?

DR. HORNER:

No, not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SORENSON:

A supplementary -- did I ask the Minister of Agriculture? I mean the Minister of the Environment.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the 4-H Club of Killam ought to be congratulated for contemplating such a worthwhile program.

I might suggest that two weeks ago as I travelled on a Sunday from Edmonton to Vegreville, a distance of some 52 miles, I encountered five different parties scouring the ditches for bottles and cans. Obviously such endeavours are paying propositions on the basis of the refunds now established, and I wish the 4-H Club of Killam every success.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister any idea or has he taken a survey to determine the amount of cans and bottles being bootlegged into Alberta from Saskatchewan, British Columbia or the Northwest Territories?

MR. YURKO:

We are keeping, Mr. Speaker, a monthly count on what is returned and I can release those figures if the hon. members wish.

MR. DRAIN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the hon. member realize he is destroying the artifacts of the future?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Disaster Relief Funding Formula

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Member of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Has the Alberta government accepted the federal government's new funding formula for disaster relief?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, the Alberta government has not yet accepted that. We are investigating the proposals that have been discussed in the House of Commons, but we're not prepared to accept it yet.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are you in agreement with the \$1 per head of population threshold formula for the first stage, and then the progressive stages through to where the federal government pays 90 per cent?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I think I just told the hon. gentleman that we are assessing the matter and when we have decided, we would either agree or request a change.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. When do you expect that you will have reached a decision on this?

MR. GETTY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, as soon as we are able to make a full assessment.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Travel Guide Place Names

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Consumer Affairs in his capacity and responsibility for tourism. In the 1973 guide by Travel Alberta, first, I would like to know if it is the policy of the government to publish the names of all the cities, towns and villages in it? And if not, what criteria are used to determine which ones will be published?

MR. DOWLING:

Well, Mr. Speaker, some of the motels and hotels throughout Alberta are not included because in some cases the standards of these motels are not considered adequate. However, we are not infallible in the Travel Alberta organization, and on request additional inspections will be made and the names of these organizations or motels will be included if they meet the standards of Travel Alberta.

MR. BENOIT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister would consider putting the historic towns of High River and Turner Valley in the next edition?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, they should apply to their zone. I just don't recall what zone number, it could be number one of the Tialta Organization and indicate that their town has been inadvertently left out by the Travel Industry Association of Alberta executive. And if they have some input into that zone executive, then I am sure their names and the facilities in High River will be included.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Senior Citizens' Lodges

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development and will require only a short answer. Mr. Minister, is it the intention of your department to raise the ceiling on the cost of room and board paid by senior citizens residing in Alberta senior citizens' lodges?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that is a question that requires some elaboration.

MR. SPEAKER:

In that event possibly the minister would like to make an announcement on Orders of the Day.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, if that is a ruling, I'll have to let Orders of the Day come and go without an announcement. I have no announcement to make. But I --

MR. SPEAKER:

The choice is the minister's as to whether he wishes to make an announcement on Orders of the Day. The hon. Member for MacLeod, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

AN HON. MEMBER:

A short one, wasn't it?

Civil Service Wage Negotiations

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Manpower and Labour. Has the agreement between the government and the civil service been signed yet?

DR. HOHOL:

No, it has not, Mr. Speaker. The Civil Service Association has given us notice that they would take approximately 10 to 14 days to study the memorandum of agreement which was signed by the negotiators. That time would be up sometime next week.

MR. BUCKWELL:

A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. As some of the civil servants already know what they are going to get, is it 15 per cent over two years?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I really couldn't comment on that. If they know, it's either by speculation or discussion with one of the members of the negotiation team. But this is unlikely. I doubt very much that anyone has that information.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, followed by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

Sale of AGT Assets

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities. When can we expect a release by him of the details of the sale of AGT assets to Edmonton Telephones?

MR. FARRAN:

As soon as the transaction is completed, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, could we have any idea when that transaction may be completed? It has been going on for a long time.

MR. FARRAN:

No, Mr. Speaker, for a proper evaluation we mustn't rush things. We are going to be fair.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, is the hon. minister suggesting that the assets of AGT are being evaluated after the sale?

MR. FARRAN:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. --

MR. LUDWIG:

Is the sale -- is it completed or is the sale still pending? Could you back out of the sale then?

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, Edmonton Telephones advanced \$10 million on account. The balance of the assets are being evaluated by an independent appraiser. And as soon as the price has been determined, I presume that the transaction will be complete.

However, either side has the opportunity, if they don't want to accept the figure placed by the appraiser, to back out.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Edmonton Crown Prosecutor's Office

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Attorney General and ask the Attorney General what's the reason for the significant difference in the rules of operation between the Crown prosecutor's office in Edmonton and the Crown prosecutor's office in Calgary concerning cases carried forward to higher courts?

MR. LEITCH:

Well that difference, Mr. Speaker, and the reason for it I think, must be answered by the former government. It's one that has existed for many years. Shortly after coming into office I reviewed the matter and decided it is a situation that shouldn't continue. And for some time now we have been holding

discussions with the law firm that's involved in carrying prosecutions forward in the superior courts in Edmonton. It is our intention to phase out that practice in the near future.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney General. What is the reason for the reported low morale in the Crown prosecutor's office here in Edmonton, leading to a lack of applications for replacement of prosecutors who have resigned?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is making an assumption which may or may not be debatable.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary then, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is there low morale in the Crown prosecutor's office in Edmonton? And secondly, what is the reason for a shortage of applications?

AN HON. MEMBER:

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not personally aware of any morale problems within the prosecutor's office in the City of Edmonton, although as I earlier indicated, because of the practice that has been prevalent for many years and which I think should be changed and which is going to be changed, there is I am sure, a feeling among people within that office that the opportunity for advancement is limited as compared to, say, the opportunity for advancement in similar work in the City of Calgary.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are you considering improving the Edmonton office facilities to avoid what has been termed a 'shoe box-like' environment, with one secretary to every eight prosecutors and no allocation of funds for prosecutors to upgrade themselves?

MR. LEITCH:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is making assumptions or stating assumptions with which I'm certainly not going to indicate any agreement. The matters he has mentioned are something I am perfectly happy to look into and to consider. But certainly at this stage I am not aware of any information that would indicate those assumptions are correct.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it not a fact that presently there is only one secretary for every eight prosecutors? That's not an assumption. I want to know whether it is a fact or not?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I'm perfectly happy to make an inquiry and give the hon. gentleman that information.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Attorney General. What is the reason for freezing the level of Crown prosecutors in the Edmonton office to the Solicitor II category?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, that relates to the practice that has been, as I said, prevalent in Edmonton for many years, where the Crown prosecutors within the Edmonton office did not carry cases to the superior courts as they did in other jurisdictions. As I have said a number of times, I cannot understand why this practice was followed for so many years, and it's one that should be and is being changed.

MR. HO LEM:

One last supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Why are lawyers remunerated according to pay scales, when doctors in the Department of Health and Social Development are paid on the basis of merit and individual ability?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is now debating and possibly he could rephrase the question in a different way in case there is further time left in this question period.

The hon. Member for Drumheller, followed by the hon. Member for Little Bow.

Passenger Train Fares

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. Has the hon. minister been informed of an increase in passenger fares on the CPR between Edmonton and Calgary?

MR. PEACOCK:

No, I have not, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary. I wonder if the hon. minister could check and advise the House in regard to increase in passenger fares on railways throughout the province?

MR. SPEAKER:

It would seem apparent that such a thing as passenger fares would be a matter of public knowledge which could be ascertained by any private inquiry.

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

Cline River Project

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Lands and Forests. What is the present status of the Cline River project that is presently being looked at in your department?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, the Cline River project is a project that is contemplated for what you might call, if you like, the Nordegg Recreation Corridor. This has two things about it in terms of location. One is that it is on the east slopes of the Rockies, and secondly, it is in an area included within the Environmental Conservation Authority hearings. These five hearings, as were described in the Department of the Environment estimates earlier, will take place throughout Alberta, and the area for which this particular project is contemplated is included. I've spoken very recently to principals of the project.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary. Will the principals be receiving an approval soon to go ahead with construction? Is this what the minister has indicated?

DR. WARRACK:

Good heavens, no. They're going to the hearing and we've discussed the matter very thoroughly. They are putting the proposal before the hearing.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Municipal Assistance Grants

MR. WYSE:

I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. It may have been asked previously. Has the unconditional assistance grants formula, the working paper, been distributed to the local governments as yet?

MR. RUSSELL:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WYSE:

Supplementary question. Is the minister waiting until after the session to eliminate embarrassment?

[Mr. Wyse rose.]

MR. SPEAKER:

With the greatest respect the Chair would hope that the supplementary would be of a higher category than its predecessors.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question to the minister. Have you increased any of the amounts for the assistance grants to municipalities?

MR. RUSSELL:

One, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Hansard

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier, or whoever he might so designate. Earlier in this session each of the members, I believe, were left with four bound volumes of the 1972 Hansard and mine was left in my office in this building. On various pages throughout one of the copies the following words are stamped: "Strathcona Branch Library, 104 Street and 84 Avenue, Edmonton 63, Alberta."

My question is, is this hot or stolen material and what should I do with it?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I will refer that matter to the hon. Government House Leader.

MR. HYNDMAN:

I would be happy to refer that matter, Mr. Speaker, to His Honour, the Speaker. I would suggest that I doubt if the House would think there would be any nefarious activities involving the Strathcona Library and His Honour, the Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair will be glad to inquire as to whether any volumes from the said Strathcona Library have been surreptitiously removed.

[Laughter]

MR. RUSTE:

This will ease my conscience?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Senior Citizens' Lodge Deficits

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Is it the intention of your department, Mr. Minister, to pay the deficits incurred by some of the senior citizens' lodge foundations?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, at the present time, in a word, no.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Taber Park Processing Plant

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Can you advise the House, Mr. Minister, what is the present status of the North American integrated food processing proposition for Taber?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I have not had any report with regard to North American Integrated Pork Processors in recent days. My last information was that there had been an application made to DREE, and as far as I am aware no decision has been reached by the federal government in relation to that application and I haven't heard from the principals.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, for clarification. Has the minister received a request from the principals for an interest free loan from the Alberta government?

DR. HORNER:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

"Buck A Cup" Buttons

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Premier. I wonder if he could advise if the colours he so proudly displays today are any indication of a return to more sensibly-coloured licence plates next year?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, that's a "Euck A Cup" program by the Restaurant Association for crippled children and I appreciate the opportunity to explain what the button is for.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

AGT Annual Report

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Telephones and since I regard the picture on the inside cover of the Annual Report of the AGT as one of great significance, I would ask him whether I could get a copy of it.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Drain brothers look like their father. If the hon. member is sure he is not referring to an annual report prior to 1971 and is referring to the current edition, I will certainly arrange for him to have a picture. I believe he is probably referring to the picture of the Drain Brothers cable-laying crew.

I would just like to supplement that answer, Mr. Speaker, by saying that Drain Brothers do excellent work and do a good job of shooting a line and cutting swathes.

[Laughter]

MR. LUDWIG:

I wonder if the line the Drain Brothers shoot is as good as the hon. minister shoots once in a while.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, before we go on to Orders of the Day, I rise in my place concerning a matter of privilege as it affects a member in this House.

I should first preface my remarks by saying the incident to which I refer, while it occurred some few days ago -- the actual seriousness of the particular occasion did not come to my attention and that, Sir, accounts for the somewhat delay which will become apparent on the matter which I raise.

Before returning to the specific item itself, I would refer you to the The Alberta Bill on Human Rights, Chapter 1 of the Statutes of 1972, wherein it states:

It is hereby recognized and declared that in Alberta there exist, without discrimination by reason of race, national origin, colour, religion or sex, the following human rights and fundamental freedoms, namely...

And it goes on to name them. The two I am concerned about are "(d) freedom of speech" and "(f) freedom of the press".

On March 21 in this Assembly, in response to a question by one of the members for Lethbridge to the Minister of Labour concerning the imposition of a news blackout on the strike negotiations at Lethbridge, the minister gave the following answer. He goes on:

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.

And then he goes on:

There is a news blackout which I personally directed the Board of Industrial Relations to impose on the parties to the dispute.

Mr. Speaker, as per Beauchesne which states that there must be a prima facie case of privilege, the necessity of laying it before the House I have done at this time since I have just had the information put together to deal with it.

And accordingly I move, seconded by my colleague, the Member for Drumheller that this Assembly demands the immediate resignation of the hon. Dr. A.E. Hohol from the Executive Council of the Government of Alberta.

[Interjections]

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I have never heard such a weak explanation of any point of privilege, ever, in this House.

I would like to point out very clearly that Beauchesne states that any privilege must be raised at the time. This entire matter is at least a week old. I appreciate the hon. leader is busy but so are all of us, and the question for him to now raise at this late date, to suggest that there is some question of privilege here, is frivolous in my view, Mr. Speaker, and the entire motion should be called out of order immediately.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Before we proceed with any further observations which are, of course, welcome from the members of the House on the alleged point of privilege, possibly the hon. Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition might specify which privilege of the House, or of the members, his point of privilege involves.

MR. HENDERSON:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I presume that the laws of this Legislative Assembly are subject to the laws of the Province of Alberta just as are the other citizens of the land. And it isn't a question of privilege relating to the procedure in the House; it is a matter of privilege relating to the conduct of a member of the House.

I think if one would examine the occasion of the McKay incident one would find that it is at least in keeping with that particular exercise, Mr. Speaker.

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Without wishing to give the impression that the point of privilege raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition has not been given sufficient consideration, I would have to say that in the first place the delay in bringing up the matter, which has been substantial, would be fatal of itself. But in addition to that, any wrong which a member of this House might feel that he has suffered or endured because of some alleged lack of observation of a statute of the province, where such a thing involves not only the members of this House, but also the public generally, cannot possibly be a foundation for the type of privilege which may be raised as a matter of privilege in this Assembly. Such a matter of privilege, I think it is clear from a super-abundance of parliamentary precedent, must relate to the privileges of the members as members of the House and not as members of the public, or the privileges of the House itself.

I must therefore conclude that there is not here a prima facie case of privilege, and there would not be one even if the matter had been raised within the prescribed time.

MR. TAYLOR:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, for the future benefit of the hon. members, would you give us the benefit of your thinking in regard to Section 104(3) now or at a later time where it indicates that a matter of privilege is a case that has arisen recently? 'Recently' may be a day or it may be a month and I think we need some interpretation in order to deal with this type of thing.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is another passage in Beauchesne, of which I am not able at present to give the number, which uses, if I'm not mistaken, the words "at the first opportunity." There is a precedent in Beauchesne, again I stand to be corrected as to the details, but the substance of it is that a matter of privilege which arose during the recess or vacation of the House and which was not raised on the first business day of the House was held to have been out of time.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS (Cont.)

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, may I have the leave of the House to introduce some guests in the Speaker's Gallery?

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. Deputy Speaker leave to revert to Introduction of Visitors?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, on your behalf I would like to take this opportunity to introduce three young citizens seated in your gallery. First, Miss Deb Cermak the grandniece of the former mayor of Chicago, His Worship Anton Cermak, and seated with her are Dennis Woloshyn and Diane Pelletier two members of the National Debating team. They are presently seated in the gallery and have been there for the last hour. Would they please stand and be recognized by the Assembly?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

QUESTIONS

228. Mr. Clark asked the government the following question:

(1) What is the number of new active treatment hospital beds provided by the province for each of the last ten years in

- (a) Edmonton,
- (b) Calgary,
- (c) other cities in Alberta, and
- (d) rural Alberta?

(2) What is the number of auxiliary hospital beds provided by the province for each of the last ten years in

- (a) Edmonton,
- (b) Calgary,
- (c) other cities in Alberta, and
- (d) rural Alberta?

MR. SPEAKER:

Does a member of the government wish to indicate any preference with respect to question 228?

MR. CRAWFORD:

It's agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER:

It's been agreed to by the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. I'm sorry I hadn't heard that previously.

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. Mr. Benoit proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Cooper:

Be it resolved that this Legislature requests the Department of Education in Alberta to adjust its curriculum so as to provide that equal time and energy be expended in presenting all aspects of controversial subjects presented to Alberta students.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to address myself to the motion before us I would first of all like to extend my gratitude to the broadminded government members who voted against the motion to adjourn the previous motion on Tuesday some time after 5:00 o'clock. It would certainly have cut off my arguments rather short if that had happened.

Secondly, I would like to draw to the attention of the members that maybe it wasn't as magnanimous as it could be because they had twice as long for that resolution as we will have for this one today. Nevertheless I appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw attention to the wording of the motion before us to begin with -- by way of introduction. It is a resolution that this Legislature request the Department of Education in Alberta to adjust its curriculum so as to provide that equal time and energy be expended in presenting all aspects of controversial subjects presented to Alberta students.

It could be argued that the word 'all' is too broad and I wouldn't argue with that point myself except to say that what is intended here in suggesting that 'all aspects of controversial subjects be presented' -- at least two or more -- so that those students who are receiving instruction would be aware of the fact there is more than one side or one facet to a subject.

Some may say that this now exists in the curriculum and this is where part of our problem may arise. It could very well be that the curriculum requires to a certain extent this type of exposure to every subject. But it would seem, in some areas at least, there is information lacking in text books or in the instructions to the teachers or somewhere in the curriculum so that very often and this may also depend on the nature and attitude of the teacher, only one side of a subject is given. Sometimes because of the controversy that would arise by presenting both sides there is a tendency to avoid the presentation of two sides of a subject.

So the resolution is asking that consideration be given to ascertain for certain that in the curriculum and in the instructions to the teachers, every opportunity possible be given to expose two or more sides to a controversial subject so that students will have the opportunity of getting a broader viewpoint.

Mr. Speaker, it may be that others will want to use other illustrations, but after I have introduced the idea so that we get the philosophy behind this resolution, I will use one classic example so that we will have an idea of what I am referring to. There are, no doubt, others which others will want to raise.

For some time now education has been at the crossroads and I think this is pretty well generally agreed by most people that we have gone along the way, not only in Alberta but everywhere in Canada, along a certain line. It is very well brought forth in Dr. Worth's report on A Choice Of Futures, the need for making some choices in the future. While these futures forecasts are difficult and probably not predictable, nevertheless the fact remains that something has to be done.

The question is now being raised as to what education really is, because in the last number of years we have been so bent on getting facts and figures across and trying to fill the students' minds with matters of science, mechanics and industry that we have, to a certain extent, lost sight of human beings and even of the world itself and the history which brought us so successfully to the point in history in which we now are.

If we ask ourselves the question, "What is education?" we are faced with the fact that it is an assimilation of facts and theories and viewpoints, it is the imparting of those facts and theories and viewpoints by teachers.

I suggest to the hon. members that it is necessary that not only shall the students be exposed to the data but they shall also be made much aware of the fact that they are responsible for making choices in the data presented to them. So they must arrive somewhere, in their educational system, at a set of values and perspectives of life itself.

I cannot think of it as being really true education unless it fits or equips the student to live in this world with his fellow man and not just with the industry and the machines we are faced with today.

Dr. Worth says we have "a choice of futures and a future of choices." I think the latter is just as important as the former. A choice of futures -- but in the future we will have to make choices. Not that we aren't making them now, but the problem, Mr. Speaker, very often is that the student is not adequately equipped to make the kinds of choices he has to make out of a great variety of choices he is facing in this modern age in which we live. He is not equipped to make these choices unless he has been faced with the alternatives there are to certain subjects which are taught -- certain facets of certain subjects which are taught -- so that he may be able to explore and be exposed to all that is available. There is no doubt about a choice now having to be made. That is the fact. We are at the crossroads and we have to make a choice with regard to some of these things.

Recently in the International Review, in "The Critical Path", which is the equivalent of the editorial, one Michael O. Alexander, among other things writes these words in "The Critical Path" entitled Investments in People.

Where once we looked to machines and technology to provide us with major increases in productivity, we now must focus our efforts on people. Not just because our human values and systems must catch up with the technological race, but because ... perceptions and attitudes to their work can have an enormous impact on the levels of productivity in modern business.

Once again, he says, "The post-industrial society is calling for a concern for people."

And this is what I mean when I say that we must be at the crossroads now because we are having to make a choice between whether we will continue on in this industrial-oriented society, or whether we are going to give more time and more consideration to people.

John B. Ludwig, in dealing with Dr. Worth's treatise on A Choice of Futures, has this to say:

The Report offers a choice between two kinds of society, a second phase industrial society and a person-centered society. It highly recommends the latter as the most beneficial to the people of Alberta.

That is, it recommends the person-centered society which is not the way that we have been going in the past. He continues:

It is not difficult to agree with the Commission's contention that educational institutions "can and must provide an environment wherein teachers and students are enabled to pursue activities in accordance with their emerging convictions"

And this, Mr. Speaker, is the crux of the whole situation as brought forth in this resolution, that unless they are aware of the fact that there are choices and unless they are presented with some of the choices that are available, and unless there is something built into their system of values that helps them to make choices, they are not going to be able to make the choices of the future which will be required of them in order that they may enjoy life to the full here in this life.

John Ludwig further states:

If a spirit of true democracy is to prevail Albertans should have a true choice of futures by being offered a future of real choices.

And he underscores the word, "real".

Parents who agree with the value system advanced by the Commission should have schools based on this philosophy. Parents who support a different philosophy or value system should have the option of operating schools according to their philosophy without financial or other penalties. Perhaps the School Council concept advanced by the Commission could be adopted to include this option.

Here, of course, Mr. Ludwig is making an argument in favour of more than one school system in order that parents may have a choice where their children will be trained, and children when they get older will have also a choice between which school system they may want to be trained in.

One further reference, Mr. Speaker, is by Roger Armbruster in the January, February, 1973 ATA Magazine, when he makes reference again to the Worth Commission Report in an article entitled Can Changing the System Change Man? He has this observation to make in his introduction and also my final conclusion.

My primary concern with the Worth Report has to do with the basic, underlying assumptions and principles upon which the report has been based. Too much attention has been placed upon various recommendations without enough attention given to the very premise upon which these recommendations are based.

He says the section dealing with the central question involved in a choice between our alternative futures states clearly the preferability of choosing a person-centred society over a second-phase industrial society.

But there is a vital point raised on page 24 which he goes on to point out and then comes to this conclusion: "Can altering this system give us the capacity to truly love our fellow men?" And probably there will be an argument here for not giving equal time to all subjects. But I suggest respectfully, Mr. Speaker, that I believe it is necessary in order to fulfil this quest. He quotes, "The system has not failed. Man has failed". This is a statement that was made by Max Wyman. He goes on to say, "Until a government commission on education comes to better grips with the reform of human nature in a less superficial way than to deal only with the reform of the system, I have little faith that the person-centred society will, indeed, be attained."

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, just as a byline here that in the same edition there is another article by Stephen Truck entitled Transcendental Meditation, which gives some ideas on oriental thought in regard to meditation and which is intended to fill the gap or the vacuum that is being created today in the school system. He suggests that a lot of the problems that arise might be solved by people practicing transcendental meditation.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I repeat that I believe we are indeed at the crossroads so far as education is concerned. And what we really need is to take a look at the curriculum to see whether we are presenting as much of both sides of the subject as we should.

May I read one brief paragraph pertaining to a speech made by the hon. Minister of Education recently. It says, "He predicted further a greater public interest in curriculum which will compel us to explain what curriculum is and what it is for." I really believe that if the Worth Commission report did nothing else, it did make a lot of people do some thinking and begin asking themselves some questions as to what the curriculum in our schools is all about and probably what education is all about.

In a country founded on and developed through spiritual principles, there should not only be something in the historical content of the curriculum to recall these facts, but the whole nature of the educational system and content of the curriculum should reflect them. And I believe it is necessary that we do look not only at the industrial aspect but at the human aspect, not only at the material aspect but also at the spiritual aspect.

Now we don't, in my humble opinion, Mr. Speaker, really need three school systems if our curriculum is broad enough to include all facts on controversial subjects. I appreciate that this is definitely open for question and for controversy. But I can't get out of my mind the words of a lady who, when discussing very recently the subject of Hutterians attending the public schools in our area, made the statement that she didn't blame Hutterians for keeping their children out of the public schools.

Now some people may consider this a very narrow viewpoint. But the lady had reference to a number of things when she made the statement. And I couldn't by any stretch of the imagination consider this particular lady a prude or a religious person. But she had reference to the many problems which exist in our public schools, one of which is the lack in some instances -- and I am not putting the blame on any particular aspect now -- of having all aspects of a subject exposed to the student so that he might have the benefit of all facets of education.

The Worth Commission made it easier, really, for people to question and even to challenge school curriculum when it doesn't appear to meet our requirements.

Mr. Speaker, I think that sometimes we have to put the onus right on the people at the local level, because there is no doubt in my mind that a great deal more could be done where the municipal government is concerned, whether it be the municipal government, the civic government, or whether it be school boards, or whether it be hospital boards if the local people would require of their locally elected representatives that they do the things which they have the right and the privilege to do, in the acts under which they operate. So one might say, well here is a situation where we should not be putting the blame on the curriculum, but we should be putting the blame at the local level.

Mr. Speaker, I think we need to check the curriculum more carefully, for I am pretty well convinced from the information I now have that there are some areas of our education where we have, if I may be pardoned for using the expression, a lopsided presentation of some of the viewpoints. I repeat that there is no choice of futures or choice of values where only one facet of a many-sided subject is presented.

I might take, for example, the tendency, whether it is in the curriculum or not, that exists in school when it comes, for instance, to matters of religion. I think most of the people in our country, from what they have received in school, could easily be left with the impression that there are two major religions in Canada -- the Catholics and the Protestants. They are not prepared to consider or think about any others.

When you consider how effective the Jews have been in the history of the world, when you consider how effective a number of the oriental religions are becoming in Canada where Catholicism and Protestantism have not fulfilled their responsibilities, or have not been successful in persuading people in the Christian way of thinking, then I think that those who are taking education in school should be made aware of the others. And I made reference only a moment ago to what appears in the Alberta Teachers' Magazine with regard to transcendental meditation.

When we look at the matter of politics, and I know most members will be interested in this, I think that even as recently as the last four or five years, when you talked about politics in the school, if you thought in terms of the United States you thought in terms of two parties, and when you thought in terms of Canada you thought very much in terms of two parties -- the two major parties, the Conservatives and the Liberals. This was the main emphasis. And then if you had an introduction to Union Nationale or NDP or Social Credit, or something by the way, that was a bonus, but it wasn't the main emphasis.

So I'm suggesting that equal time and energy should be given to every subject, or every facet of every subject, so that students would have an equal exposure to all facets of any subject.

I would like to suggest that in The Albertan recently there was an article which pointed out one of those areas in the school system that was being neglected in some facets of its presentation. The first two paragraphs of the article read like this, Mr. Speaker. At this time, before I read them, I want to suggest that this is where I want to introduce this example of the lopsided presentation of some subjects being dealt with in the schools.

Fossilized footprints in the Texas riverbed have led thousands of Albertans to ask education officials to include the biblical account of creation in school science classes. A movement protesting the teaching of evolution as fact rather than theory and demanding equal time for the creationist viewpoint has aroused so many Bible-belt parents that a test case before the Alberta Supreme Court is a possibility.

There are a number of other things in this article but I will not take the time to read it. There are other aspects of it that may be referred to by other speakers.

The one thing I want to do, Mr. Speaker, is to point out that this is what I might call a classic example, which I wish to dwell upon to illustrate the need for giving equal time and exposing all aspects of a subject.

In this particular instance these people are not asking for the creation viewpoint to be presented in the schools as something in the religious area. They are not asking for the religious aspects of it to be presented. They are simply asking that the scientific and biological aspect of it be presented in the schools along with the evolution theory.

They object to the evolutionary theory being presented as fact, and I thought in all of my relationships with education that the evolutionary viewpoint was being presented only as a theory in textbooks and that maybe the teachers were speaking of it as fact. But it would appear from reading some of the textbooks that these theories are being presented as facts, and if so, then certainly some other viewpoints should be presented so that the student will have the opportunity to make a choice between two or three or more viewpoints.

While the evolution and special creation viewpoints, or philosophies if you want to call them that, or theories depending on where you stand and which way you look at them, have considerable religious or spiritual connotation to many people, I want to emphasize again, Mr. Speaker, that in speaking of it in this particular instance I am not talking about it from the spiritual aspect or connotation. I wish to concern myself primarily, if not solely, with the scientific aspect of this particular subject so that we may get the picture of what we are asking for in the resolution when we ask that equal time and energy be given to exposing all facets of any particular subject to the students.

To begin with, there are many evolutionary viewpoints with regard to the theory of evolution and sometimes it is doubtful if a teacher would have time, or circumstances would permit, for all of them to be presented, or if the teacher would have the ability and the knowledge to present them all. But if the teacher is presenting one viewpoint, he or she should at least give the idea to the student that there are viewpoints other than the evolutionary theory so that the student may be able to apply himself, if he wishes, searching out what other viewpoints are and preparing himself to make a choice.

The whole matter should be dealt with in biology and science when treated in the curriculum and not in religion or sociology classes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to show to the legislators a new book, one of the most recent on biology. It is a book that was printed in 1972. It is a book prepared by 20 eminent scientists and biologists. It is a book that was designed on purpose to present the whole picture of biology, and in it are presented in detail two viewpoints of the origin of the universe -- one, the evolutionary viewpoint, and the other, the creationist viewpoint.

In this book you will find what I have been talking about in the last few minutes, is the fact that the evolutionary theories are presented in such a way as to give an understanding that there are a number of evolutionary theories and that their approaches. Or should I say, the arriving at these viewpoints comes from different angles and the various angles are presented. So that the student when he is studying it has an opportunity to see all aspects of the biology he is studying.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the introduction to Unit 9 which is entitled The Theories of Biological Change. I will only read a very short part. It says:

It is now known however that Darwin's theory is fraught with difficulties. In the introduction to a new edition of Darwin's book, Dr. W.R. Thompson,... former Director of the Commonwealth Institute of Biological Control, Ottawa, Canada, points out how far Darwin departed from scientific objectivity. Because of the significance of the Thompson critique, the following excerpts are quoted.

'When I was asked to write an introduction replacing the one prepared a quarter of a century ago by the distinguished Darwinian, Sir Arthur Keith, I felt extremely hesitant to accept the invitation... I am not satisfied that Darwin proved his point or that his influence in scientific and public thinking has been beneficial. If arguments fail to resist analysis, consent should be withheld and a wholesale conversion due to unsound argument must be regarded as deplorable... he fell back on speculative arguments. He merely showed, on the basis of certain facts and assumptions, how this might have happened, and as he had convinced himself he was able to convince others.

It sounded to me when I read that passage, Mr. Speaker, that he might have made a good politician.

But the facts and the interpretation on which Darwin relied have now ceased to convince. speculations, the limits of categories nature presented to us, is the inheritance of biology from The Origin Of Species. To establish the continuity required by theory, historical arguments are invoked, even though historical evidence is lacking. Thus are engendered those fragile towers of hypotheses, based [upon] hypotheses where fact and fiction intermingle in an inextricable confusion.

This critique illustrates the need for investigating an alternative. Both points of view are presented in this unit.

You would be interested to know also, Mr. Speaker, that this book is now being used in a number of the schools, some of them in the Province of Alberta. And this is what I suggest when I say, Mr. Speaker, there is a necessity for people at the local level exercising the freedom that is theirs in these respects. But for the sake of the students where teachers, or school boards, or parents are not willing to exercise that freedom, I think that in all fairness to these children, all aspects or a number of aspects of controversial subjects should be presented and they should be required in the curriculum so that the student will have the privilege of making the choice.

In this same chapter to which I was making reference, Mr. Speaker, there are headings such as this: "The early opinions on evolution were divided." He gives Lamarck's theory as well as Darwin's theory. And then he shows some of

the failures of the Darwinian theory and the lack of the fossil evidence to support evolution and some methods of fossil dating which are inconclusive and some alternate interpretations of fossil records.

And so I would like to draw the attention of the members to one or two articles in a publication entitled Acts & Facts by the Institute of Creation and Research in which it is pointed out that in California this controversy has been raging now for some time and it has been before the courts of California.

I believe we could give it due consideration in Canada, particularly in Alberta before it comes to the place where it has to go to the courts because I think we could benefit from the help that we get from other jurisdictions. Surely we want to be fair and present all facets if possible.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to make reference to the latest edition, of the Geophysical Science publication published by Resources Canada in which is an article entitled How The Fourth Dimension Unlocks the Earth's Resources. In this they point out the changing dating procedure that scientists are using and the fact that the fossil dating is not that accurate, and the fact that a number of other more recent dating processes including Carbon 14 are anything but accurate.

I would like to cite one or two instances. It begins by saying:

Alvin Toffler's "Future Shock" has surely underscored the need to make current decisions or courses of action conform to expectation about the future in a rapidly changing post-industrial society.

There again is that reference to a post or industrial second-phase industrial society.

The future [he warns] must become a more viable tool in our arsenal, if indeed, we are to adapt quickly enough to changing circumstances. And he labels the inability to do so as Future Shock.

That we are all familiar with, Mr. Speaker.

Now he points out that besides height, width and depth there is a fourth dimension, time, and he suggests that this time dimension will unlock the earth's resources. And we are looking at all the resources that are in the earth.

Now he goes on to say, the most common identification of time is by means of index fossils. And then he points out something of the Carbon 14 method and says this:

Finally, absolute measurement of time by Carbon 14 methods on plant fragments and shells can be used to measure the rate of geological processes that affect man's environment.

However, he points out that it is limited. "The earth is very old," he says, "Four and a half billion years or more according to recent estimates."

Then he says:

The vast span of time called geological time by [some] earth scientists and believed by some to reach back to the birth of the Solar System itself is difficult, if not impossible to comprehend in the familiar time units of months, and years or even centuries.

Then he goes on to point out there is a study being made now and it's a study of amino acids in fossils giving researchers a new clock with which to measure geological time. He has this to say:

The standard method for determining the age of fossils is a so called Carbon 14 clock -- [But] the Carbon clock has a practical upper limit of about 50,000 years.

On the one hand limit he says, "The upper limit of the Carbon clock is 50,000 years", on the other hand, he points out, "the world be four or five billion years old."

So how will we determine this? He says the

Trouble is the alternative clocks are usually accurate only with objects at least a million years old. That leaves many pages of the past still

partially closed to scientists, some of the most critical years in man's own evolution.

Then he has this to say:

The new method, [that is the amino acid method] would be restricted because of the effects of temperature, however, since a 1-degree temperature change could produce an error of ± 25 percent in dating calculations.

I stopped to think of this for a minute, Mr. Speaker, and I came to this conclusion. Suppose we said that the world was estimated to be 200 million years old according to the amino method. If it were one degree out it could be 150 million years old or it could be 250 million years old. But if it were four degrees out it could be 800 million years old or it might only be 4,000 years old.

So no matter what method of time has been used, it simply points out there is no way of knowing for certain, with all the scientific discoveries we have had up to this point, how old the earth really is. Therefore, one argument is as good as another in determining how old the earth is up to this point. They may all be wrong, Mr. Speaker, but they surely can't all be right. One final paragraph:

The development of theory to explain the sequence of events through this fourth dimension of geological time has caught the imagination of the earth sciences and produces such concepts as continental drift which have transformed the way Man sees his world.

So probably a lot hangs on those two words "theory" and "imagination". If this is so, and I have reason to believe it is, Mr. Speaker, then I think in all fairness to the students in our schools that in this area, as in many other areas where there is a controversy or where there is a doubt, it is only fair that the curriculum the government is responsible for should clearly outline as much as is possible, how the student may be exposed to all facets of any subject so that he may have the opportunity to make a choice of his own. I would hope that that type of determination in the curriculum would be -- I believe it is now -- accompanied by a system of values and perspectives which, if presented, prepares the student to make the choices which he would have to make.

One other aspect is rather interesting, Mr. Speaker, if I can find the information which I want here. It will be interesting to note that the other night the hon. Minister of Public Works made an observation that scientists are now producing oil out of animal manure. They are producing it very quickly, and that is what I want to come to.

The hon. minister at the time he raised the question said he didn't know which would produce the most oil -- cow manure or bull manure -- and it was interesting to note in a publication by the Department of Agriculture that was put in the news March 26, 1973, that some studies here have proven that the value of cow manure on an acre of land is \$2.32 but steer manure is valued at \$2.98. So I guess that would answer the minister's question. The bull manure is more valuable than the cow manure. Now that is scientific, Mr. Speaker, according to the studies that have been made -- the research that has been made here in Alberta.

I raise this question because in another edition of Acts & Facts it points out that petroleum is made in minutes and coal is made in hours. It says

Theories concerning the formation of coal based on the assumptions of uniformitarian geologists generally postulate that coal was formed from trees and other vegetables ...

and so on. All members know. I need not read it in detail.

... through millions of years they resulted in coal deposits found today, it is said. This in situ theory, or autochthonous theory as it is called, is preferred by most evolutionary geologists.

And he goes on to say a little further, they have made some discoveries with regard to this that indicate that you can form coal very quickly and form oil very quickly.

And talking about oil, he says,

In the second method the manure was heated at 380 degrees C. at 2,000 to 5,000 p.s.i. for 20 minutes in the presence of carbon monoxide and

steam. The product was a heavy oil of excellent heating quality. The yield was about three barrels of oil per ton of manure.

Now other members have been made aware of this -- and I'll not take the time of the House to point out how they produced the coal in a similar fashion in a matter of hours.

All of this, I say, Mr. Speaker, to the Legislature to point out that there is another viewpoint of the origin of the universe other than the evolutionary viewpoint. And the scientists of the world, the very eminent scientists of the world, have found abundant evidence of this fact. And if, indeed, there is more than one viewpoint regarding the origin of the universe, be it theory or viewpoint of philosophy or fact, we owe it to our young people in the schools of Alberta to present them with all facets of controversial subjects so that they may know that there is a choice to be made and the decision will be theirs rather than ours.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest, that there are possibly many controversial subjects which are being treated unintentionally in a lopsided fashion, through ignorance or fear or bias or lack of curriculum guidance and information. And this resolution is calling upon the Legislature through the Department of Education to strive to ensure that the curriculum and the textbooks and required reading and teacher instruction and guidance provide equal time and energy to be expended in presenting all aspects of controversial subjects in the Alberta classrooms.

As important as this illustration I have used is, it is only one example of what I would hope would be many that we might be able to find in which there are a number of facets to a controversial subject.

Don't lose sight, hon. members, of the philosophy of the resolution seeking equal time and energy being given to all controversial subjects by thinking only of the illustration to which I have drawn your attention. I have only drawn that illustration to your attention in order that we might understand that there is a need for investigation in this area.

I'm sure that every member of the Legislative Assembly on both sides of the House represents in his constituency people of both viewpoints which I have pointed out in this illustration. I'm sure they all realize that it is the freedom and the right of every student to know two or more sides of every controversial subject in life.

Students should know that there are choices, and they should know how to make those choices in every facet of their living. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COOPER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, it's indeed a pleasure -- a dual pleasure I should say -- for me to second the motion by the hon. Member for Highwood. His motion covers possibilities which deeply concern me. Secondly, he has covered the subject matter so thoroughly that little needs to be said by the seconder and I would congratulate him upon a really excellent presentation.

The hon. mover, Mr. Speaker, stressed the principle involved, namely that equal time and energy should be expended in presenting all aspects of controversial subjects to Alberta students.

My remarks in support, Mr. Speaker, will be on one phase only which arises frequently and is now a matter of concern with many Alberta people. I allude, of course, to the creationist versus evolutionist theories, or views of the creation of human life.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that parents in the Peace River area have recently protested to the Department of Education, stating that respective theories of creation and evolution as related to the origin of man are not being given equal exposure in Alberta schools. These parents want evolution taught as theory and not as fact, with a parallel use of text and reference books giving equal space to the creation theory.

Debating the merits of science versus religion is something. It is something, Mr. Speaker, which could be carried out in the context of the school. I would point out further that at the present time this opportunity is denied to students through exclusion of the creation theory in textbooks which present only the scientific viewpoint.

There is a desire for equal time and the wish that science teachers present evolution and creation as equally plausible explanations of how man came to be. On this matter, Mr. Speaker, persons of my way of thinking are proving very broadminded indeed. There is no desire to engender a head-on confrontation between science and religion. We want to recognize a coexistence of religious thought and philosophy and the evolutionist approach. But I do not think for one moment, Mr. Speaker, that the Darwinian theory should appear in full context with little mention of the biblical story of creation. Whatever the merits of the particular beliefs of the creationists, their concern is to safeguard the religious heritage of their children. And I believe this is legitimate.

In the interest of fairness, Mr. Speaker, I hope that all members will support this resolution.

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak this afternoon to this resolution I would like first of all to comment on the very careful thought that obviously went into the remarks made by both the mover and the seconder of the resolution. They were, of course, speaking to a resolution which deserves the careful consideration of all the members of the Legislature.

I have tried to give it that kind of consideration myself, Mr. Speaker, and I don't know whether or not I have succeeded. But I have some comments to make respecting it.

I think that as it is worded there are two practical problems. The first is that equal time and energy will not in my view result in an accurate or a sympathetic presentation of alternative perspectives that are available to controversial issues. Equal time and energy by themselves are not sufficient.

The second is that controversial issues are particularly susceptible to local influence, to the characteristics of the local community. And these are kinds of issues which particularly should be handled by the local community, in this case by the local school board and the staff there.

In my view, and I think it would be a view shared by most hon. members, the educational process has a major, extremely important responsibility to expose the students of our province to as many as possible of the features that express the pluralism, the variety of life.

There are obviously two reasons why the educational process has this responsibility. The first is that pluralism, variety, is a fact of life and young people as they enter increasingly into the life of society, as they become adults, have to learn to live with pluralism. We don't have an homogeneous society, we don't have homogeneous individuals or personalities, and we have to be able to live with variety when we come out of our school system.

Not only is pluralism a fact, and therefore necessary of acceptance as such, but in my view it is a desirable thing. Pluralism, to the extent that it exists in society is the proof of the freedom of that society. It is the proof of the freedom that is available to individuals within society.

Obviously, some of the features that express pluralism in a society are going to be controversial. And it is these to which the resolution addresses itself. Four of them come to my mind, and I'm sure that all hon. members can think of additions to the list. One of them has been dealt with at some length by both the mover and the seconder of the resolution. That is the question of 'creation versus evolution'. But there are others, including 'family life education', 'sex stereotyping', and 'Canadian content'. Perhaps we could even expand the last one, that is 'Canadian content', to 'ethnic content'.

Now one point I would like to make to all of the hon. members is that the question of controversy cuts both ways. We have had expressed in the Legislature this afternoon the view that creation should be brought into the school system, should be expressed as one aspect of a controversial issue. But it is, of course, true, that on the other hand there would be many citizens of this province who would like to see some aspect of a controversial issue excluded from the school system -- 'family life education', or 'the merits of free enterprise versus Communism' would of course be two good examples.

In a consideration of the teaching of controversial issues in the school system, we would do well to remember that what we have to say about those things which we would like to see taught, we must also consider with respect to those things which we personally may not want to see taught.

In dealing with controversial issues, there are three criteria that, I think, have to be met in every circumstance. The first is that differing positions should be stated comprehensively and they should be stated sympathetically, using both resource people and resource materials.

A complication which arises is that sometimes the different perspectives on a single controversial subject cross disciplinary lines and I think that the question of 'evolution versus creation' is an excellent example of this. It may well be that they are both different perspectives of a single subject, but part of their 'differentness' is that they are not of the same discipline. There is by no stretch of the imagination, deductive, scientific reasoning as part of the story of creation as it is found in the Bible. It is, in my personal view, a valid alternative to be considered. It is not something which, in my view, would be part and parcel of science as it is taught using the foundations or the principles of deductive reasoning.

A second criterion that I think has to be met in addition to this comprehensiveness and sympathy is an extension of the question of sympathy that students should not be ridiculed for choosing one side or another of a controversial issue. This is extremely important in any aspect of the educational process.

The third which is important, is that I think consideration of controversial issues should be appropriate to the maturity of the students with whom you are dealing, and it should respect the feelings of the local community.

I think it is obvious that what is a controversial issue in Edmonton, in a large metropolitan centre is not necessarily going to be controversial in a small community, perhaps in another part of the province or in another province altogether. And vice versa, what is controversial in a small, perhaps very religious, community will not be found to be controversial in the Edmonton public or separate school system.

Now the necessity of meeting these three criteria brings me back to my initial criticisms. I think it is insufficient and it is probably self-defeating to base the treatment of controversial issues simply on the expenditure of equal time and energy, because the phrase "equal time and energy" neglects completely the absolutely essential role that sympathetic treatment plays. The expenditure by a teacher of equal time and energy on the creation story does not in any way guarantee an equally sympathetic treatment, and whether or not it is sympathetic is crucial to whether or not it is receiving the treatment it deserves in the consideration of the issue.

The second thing that I think is a weakness is that it is impossible for the provincial Department of Education to create or to impose the conditions of the study of controversial issues. They may set guidelines, they may point out danger areas to the local school boards, they may urge a variety of expression, but in questions of creation versus evolution, or in the way in which Family Life Education may be taught in Edmonton or in High River, I think it is impossible for the homogeneity of the curricula standards of the Department of Education to treat the variety which is absolutely essential to the proper consideration of these controversial issues we are dealing with this afternoon.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I would like to, before adjourning debate, move an amendment to the resolution which is as follows: to delete all of the words after the phrase "in Alberta to" and to replace them with the following: "develop a model policy for use by local school boards with respect to the presentation of controversial subjects." My seconder is Mr. Koziak and I have copies for yourself, the mover of the resolution and the independent members.

Because my time is up, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to speak briefly to the amendment, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

[The motion was carried.]

PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT ORDERS
(Second Reading)

Bill No. 203 - An Act to amend The Clean Air Act

MR. YURKC:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to be able to rise today and participate in the debate on Bills 203 and 204. The remarks that I am going

to make in regard to Bill 203 are certainly applicable to both Bills 203 and 204.

I would like to say to begin with, Mr. Speaker, that those who are responsible for bringing before the House both of these bills ought to be congratulated for a number of reasons: for their concern and their interest in this field and for, in fact, expending the effort to draft the bills, the two bills, that we have before us.

Now I don't want to be too magnanimous and offer this type of congratulation and credit to the member who has in fact brought the bills before the House, because I happen to know that he doesn't really deserve credit for structuring, putting together and bringing, in a real fashion, before this House these two bills.

MR. CLARK:

Why didn't you bring it in?

MR. YURKO:

The STOP organization, in fact, has been responsible for initiating the action and drafting to a large degree these bills, and through the member seated opposite they were brought before the House.

I would like to say initially that I, personally, and the government are in agreement with the principles embodied in these two bills and in fact, the intent of the two bills.

However, I would like to go on and talk about a number of matters and why the two bills in their present form would experience some difficulty in being incorporated into The Clean Air Act and The Clean Water Act.

However, first of all I would like to say that the STOP organization, which is one of several organizations to have interested themselves in pollution matters in a major way, has in fact been responsible for a considerable amount of good work. And their interest in a number of areas in terms of controlling pollution and in terms of bringing an awareness to the public in this area is certainly to be commended. However I do want to suggest that it isn't the only group that we have in Alberta; there is a large number of groups and the list is growing. I commend all of them for their interest and their endeavour in this field, most or much of which is done without any form of compensation.

There is, of course, an awareness in regard to pollution matters that is spreading and intensifying quite readily these days. And it is only natural, for pollution awareness and bringing pollution under control is nothing more than applying the good rules of housekeeping we learned in our homes, applying these rules to our yards, the communities, the cities, our towns, our country-side, our province, our nation and the world in total. For if we can live under good rules and good housekeeping standards in our homes then surely we can live the same way in the total society.

The STOP organization wrote to me some time ago and asked me in fact if there were any kind of legislation of this type. I answered in 1972 and I think, for the record, I would like to indicate what I said at that time. I said:

Thank you for your letter of August 24, 1972.

Firstly and most obviously the anonymity of an employee can be safeguarded if the employee phones in a complaint anonymously. My department will investigate complaints of this nature.

The Clean Water Act and The Clean Air Act presently offer no protection of this type to the employee -- that is the type proposed is Bill No. 203 and 204.

The Human Rights Protection Act, Section 6(1) offers very limited protection and the section I quoted was as follows:

No employer shall [(a)] refuse to employ or refuse to continue to employ any person ... because of race, religious beliefs, colour, sex, marital status, age, ancestry, or place of origin.

So we have to stretch that section a bit to see how it applies in this particular case.

Also Section 84, 1(c) part 3 of The Labour Act offers some small measure of protection. And it says the following:

Anyone who by intimidation, by threat of loss of (position or) employment or by causing an actual loss of employment or by any other threat seeks to compel any person [(c)] to refrain [(iii)] from giving evidence at any inquiry...is guilty of an offence....

Subsection 10 of Section 84 of The Labour Act provides for restitution to the employee by the employer in cases of intimidation.

Now, I want to indicate to the House that generally there are two reasons for bringing in legislation. The first reason is where it is envisioned that there is an anticipated need for something and the second is, where there is an actual need to protect somebody or something and cases have been demonstrated where somebody has in fact suffered grievously because of lack of protective legislation.

In scouring the departments in regard to which of these two categories this type of legislation would fall, I have had to conclude that this type of legislation would overwhelmingly reside in the category called "anticipated need" because of the development of the society in a certain way. We have not been able to find in our records any instance where anybody has been threatened or has, in fact, suffered in any way because of the lack of this type of legislation.

However, I want to suggest that doesn't mean to say it hasn't, in fact, happened. The only thing I am saying is that to our knowledge there has been no case brought to our attention where somebody has been harmed because of the fact that he offered information or, for that matter, testified in regard to pollution by the company he worked for.

In discussing this with some of my counterparts in the other provinces, it was also established that basically this was the type of legislation that fell into the category of anticipated need in the future as against actual need at this particular time.

However, as I have indicated, because of changing attitudes in this field this anticipated need might be upon us much faster than we think. I also suggest that even in the other provinces, with whose counterparts I discussed this matter, they certainly are not aware of the information in this field and, in fact, there may have been cases where people have suffered grievous harm because of this type of principle.

So I would just like to reiterate that we can acquire information anonymously and act upon it so that anybody working for any plant can phone us at any time -- we now have an emergency number -- and give us information, and this information is acted upon.

The second area which I wish to discuss briefly is the drafting of the legislation as brought before the House, not because I wish to depreciate those who worked on drafting this legislation because I know a lot of hard work and time has gone into it, but nevertheless there are a number of flaws and I will simply touch on just a few of them.

In relation to the legislation there is a penalty clause in The Clean Air Act and The Clean Water Act in regard to supplying false information and pretty stiff penalties with respect to the supplying of this information. And there is some conflict in regard to that section and Section 11.3.

I would also like to suggest that Section (4) is perhaps a little before our time where, in fact, we require that a person prove his innocence, otherwise he is guilty. Nevertheless I want to suggest that this principle is being used at this very time in the United States and, in fact, is being used by the Government of Alberta.

But where it is being used it is being used in pre-approval. For example, when the Energy Board gave Calgary Power permission to expand one of their major power plants on Lake Wabamun, it had included in its approval the fact that the company had to prove beyond a shadow of doubt that, in fact, the thermal pollution it was creating was not injurious to fish and the lake itself.

So the burden of proof in that case had been put upon the company and it had to prove to the public that, in fact, it would not endanger the life in the lake and deteriorate the lake very substantially from the standpoint of use by the citizens around the lake.

So that was one example where we had required a type of proof before the fact. But to my knowledge, I have at present no understanding of where this principle is applied to an offence committed after an approval of a project and, in fact, the project is built and is given a licence to operate. So I do believe that 11.3(4) is perhaps premature. time.

I would also like to say that there is perhaps a shortcoming of the principle itself in that there are other acts where this principle may initially be incorporated and is needed to a larger degree than The Clean Water Act and The Clean Air Act. So that if the principle is embodied in legislation, it would have to be embodied in legislation in addition to these two Acts, some of them being, of course, The Litter Act, The Water Resources Act, the contemplated Land Surface Conservation and Reclamation Act, or in The Reclamation Act effective now, and particularly so in the area of occupational health and safety and to some degree in the area of the workmen's compensation legislation.

So there is room for expanding this principle and trying to make it -- if it is adopted by the government -- universal across more of our legislation than just the area of The Clean Water Act and The Clean Air Act.

Again, without trying to nit-pick, I was at a loss to figure out what board was being referred to in the Act, 11.4(2) where it stated that:

No information or material furnished to or received by a field officer under this Act, and no report of a field officer shall be disclosed except to the Board or as authorized by the Board, and no member of the Board and no field officer is a [competent or] compellable witness in proceedings before a court, or other tribunal respecting any such information, material or report.

The only reference, of course, in our Act to a board is to the Provincial Board of Health, but it is an oblique reference. It is really reference to the Provincial Board of Health regulations rather than the board itself directly. So there would have to be some redefinition of terms and re-examination in terms of how the board fits into the incorporation of this Act.

The other area I would like to cover very briefly is the manner of the possible enforcement of this type of a provision. There is no enforcement procedure in The Clean Air Act or The Clean Water Act that may, in fact, involve arbitration because matters that are pinpointed in 11.3 are in most instances not necessarily matters of fact but matters of opinion, and an opinion between an employee and the company as to whether or not an employee was threatened, whether or not an employee was, in fact, discriminated against. We just simply don't have the type of organization required to adjudicate these types of questions under The Clean Air Act and The Clean Water Act.

Any consideration that we would be giving, and I'll talk later about the consideration that we have, in fact, given to incorporate these principles, would have to be in such a way that the principle would have to be embodied into an act in a universal way, possibly, and also in such an act that there was a body that could, in fact, adjudicate matters of opinion. To a large degree we relate to matters of fact and matters of technical fact in The Clean Air Act and The Clean Water Act.

We, of course, studied this matter and recognize that first of all, every citizen must be able to champion the public good in this regard and must be free or have the ability without incrimination of any kind to offer information in this vital area of pollution control and environmental management, particularly when it's easily identified that it is in the public good, and the public good to some degree completely overshadows the private good. Then he should be able to do this without fear of punishment or undue harassment.

And as a result we did study and have examined the possible incorporation of this type of universal coverage or feature in an act where, in fact, the mechanism exists to adjudicate these kind of cases.

And, of course, I'm sure everybody recognizes that I'm talking about The Labour Act. The hon. minister and I have had some discussion and we have also had some discussion with members of his department, and tentatively we had thought that perhaps we might incorporate after Section 22.1 [of The Labour Act] a section somewhat like this:

No employer or any other person shall discharge or threaten to discharge, restrict the employment or threaten to restrict the employment of, or in any manner discriminate against any person because that person or other person has:

- (a) filed a complaint, or
- (b) a person has testified or is about to testify or believes that such a person may so testify, or
- (c) a person questions, requests or demands anything, or
- (d) a person has made or is about to make any statement or disclosure as may be required of him

under the provisions of, or at any enquiry, or in proceedings under The Clean Air Act or The Clean Water Acts or other acts involving pollution control.

We also then discussed the manner in which the matter could be dealt with and we felt that we could possibly identify this after Section 148 and permit the Board of Industrial Relations to adjudicate such cases and we had thought of the following addendum in that regard.

(4) The provisions of subsection (3) shall apply to an employer or employers' organization and any person acting on behalf of an employer or employers' organization where a person or employee

- (a) has testified or participated or may testify or otherwise participate, or
- (b) has made or is about to make a disclosure, or
- (c) has made an application or filed a complaint

under the provisions of, or at any enquiry or in proceedings under The Clean Air Act or The Clean Water Act or any pollution control Acts.

And one area, of course, of considerable importance is The Environment Conservation Authority itself.

Now even though we had examined in some degree the possibility of incorporating these types of amendments in The Labour Act, we were of course confronted again with the question of whether this type of legislation anticipated a need or whether, in fact, there was now an actual need. And I recognized and received copies of the various letters of endorsement, that the STOP organization had received from a number of organizations. But in reading most of those letters I had wondered how deeply each of the organizations and individuals had, in fact, delved into this realization of anticipated need as against actual need at this time.

And in thinking about The Labour Act itself and in discussing it with some knowledgeable labour people, it seemed on the surface that in fact this could be incorporated without difficulty, that in fact there could be overtones where the normal process of labour negotiations between labour and management could be jeopardized and jeopardized in a serious way where a hang-up could be based on something in this regard and might delay the agreement on a much more vital matter.

Now I am not saying that this would happen. What I am suggesting is that we felt it was necessary to get the viewpoint of both labour and management in a very meaningful and direct way if, in fact, we consider further the inclusion of these types of clauses in The Labour Act, in which Act we are convinced this type of provision must be incorporated. So that if we continue to be convinced of the soundness of the principle -- and I don't deny the soundness of the principle and, in fact, the intent -- we will dialogue with the labour organizations, management and such additional environmentalist groups that wish to approach us in this regard to determine whether the time for incorporation of this type of principle is now or at some later date.

I feel certain that the anticipated need will eventually revert to an actual need. But I don't know if that's going to revert this summer, next year and when, in fact, it would be timely for the government to introduce this type of legislation.

So I might say, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, the government does not disagree with the principles and the intent of Bills 203 and 204. However, the government recognizes that the embodiment of such a principle in law and the implications of that law are vital and important matters and must be done with the greatest degree of care and with the greatest amount of discussion.

We, in the environmental department, favour and recognize the need for public hearings in a major way, stimulating the greatest possible amount of dialogue on principles of importance.

This is a principle of importance and we would feel that it is a principle which requires considerable discussion to determine if there were ramifications that we can't envision at this time, and to determine where and what piece of legislation this type of principle would most adequately fit. And if it is The Labour Act, would it jeopardize the normal labour and management relations that have been established, generated, refined and moulded over countless years and decades? And these are questions that, even if they are not answered, we must put to the various parties involved in this question.

It is anticipated that we will be doing some of this, this summer and perhaps if we receive substantial endorsement of incorporating the principle in The Labour Act, then perhaps we may give serious consideration to introducing the principle in the fall. However, at this time I can't really say, except to say again as I began with, that the principle is sound and the intent is good. The fact of incorporation of the principle and the intent in law may be somewhat premature at this time, because it is based on anticipated need rather than actual need.

Nevertheless, the government recognizes the import of the principle and is willing to take it under very careful scrutiny and advisement during the course of the summer with the possibility of incorporation of the principle perhaps in The Labour Act during the fall session of this sitting. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TRYNCHY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there a seconder for the hon. member's motion to adjourn the debate?

MR. APPLEBY:

I will.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 204 -- An Act to amend The Clean Water Act

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, again, I just want to indicate to the House that the remarks I made on Bill No. 203 apply totally and fully, and perhaps somewhat inadequately -- though I would hope the members would consider that my remarks were adequate to the situation -- to Bill No. 204. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TRYNCHY:

I beg leave to adjourn debate. Before I do, I might point out that I am working on some information --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. A motion to adjourn the debate is not debatable. Is there a seconder for the motion?

MR. APPLEBY:

I will.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 205 -- An Act to Protect Private Land from Trespass

MR. STROMBERG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since Bill No. 205 was introduced for second reading, a considerable amount of water has run under Bill No. 205. We have received information and letters, both pro and con, with regard to the bill. I would like, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, just to review some of the comments I made approximately three weeks ago in relation to this bill.

I described what I thought were the concerns facing rural people in Alberta today -- the concern of loss of livestock, the problem with regard to professional poachers, the use of high-powered rifles in fairly high density populated areas in Alberta and with the present Act, in regard to using bodily force to remove someone from your land. I also mentioned the problems in relation to 'No Trespassing' signs, the lack of adequate law enforcement, and the problems in relation to making a citizen's arrest. Of course, I summed it up by saying that I believed it is the right of a farmer or a rancher to know who is on his land, and the right to refuse entry.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to dwell on what I think might be some recommendations in regard to trespassing in Alberta. I think the Department of Lands and Forests should give consideration on opening day -- especially of deer hunting season -- to diversify it as much as possible. I'll use, for example, something that has worked reasonably well -- has been very successful, I should say -- in southern Alberta in the antelope season. This would be a draw.

Now a draw is going to have its drawbacks too, in that there is a lot of book-work with it. When there is a draw made, one-third get to hunt this weekend; the following weekend, the next two-thirds and the third weekend, of course, the rest. I think this would spread it out considerably and take off some of the pressure. As I described last week, on opening day of deer season south-west of Calgary it resembled a little bit of the German invasion of Poland.

Mr. Speaker, I have a recommendation in my bill that the holder of leased land in Alberta be given the same privilege as the holder of private land. After all, this man in buying a ranch has usually had to pay a fairly high price for the opportunity to own that lease -- in some instances, \$30 an acre. He's had to pay municipal taxes on it. He's had to fence it and he's had to pay rent for it.

Another recommendation this Assembly might consider is the land-use policy. Leased land could be included in this. He has had to pay taxes, municipal taxes on it. He has had to fence it and he has had to pay rent for it.

Another recommendation that this Assembly might consider is the land-use policy -- and lease land could be included in this, Mr. Speaker -- and of course that trespassing signs or hunting signs no longer be required and that some form of identification on the back of the hunter be mandatory.

I have made a recommendation in the bill that loss of hunting privileges -- Mr. Speaker, of course the biggest thing that I believe in Bill No. 205 will be that permission must be obtained in writing before entering on private land.

I would like to just read a portion of the by-law passed by the County of Parkland. It reads as follows:

Whereas council may under Section 105 of The Municipal Government Act, Chapter 246 of the Revised Statutes of Alberta 1970 and agreements thereto make provisions for the regulation of any matter or thing for the protection of life or property under Section 152 (d) of the said Act. Council may pass laws prohibiting the discharge of guns or other firearms in any part or parts of that county.

The part I find very interesting in this by-law -- and I understand the County of Strathcona has the same -- is item no. 1. In this by-law the words "occupied land" mean lands held under a certificate of title or agreement of sale or under a homestead lease, homestead sale, miscellaneous lease or cultivated lease issued under The Public Lands Act, 1970, Chapter 297. There they have included their Crown leases in that area.

Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments in regard to the different sections of Bill No. 205 and of course Clause 2 is rather a general statement of the purpose of the Act. Clause 3 puts the onus for permission on the person seeking privileges of using that land. This stand is backed by the Western Stock Growers, by Unifarm and NFU. Clause 4 in the bill covers trespassing by any persons by any means. Clause 5 provides for loss of privileges in addition to a fine. This, I believe, would be more of a deterrent than the matter of fines.

Clauses 7 and 8 are intended to provide that the person who apprehends a trespasser give sufficient evidence by noting hunting licence number, vehicle number et cetera. Clause 10 of the bill suggests that agreements for privileges on land belonging to others should be increased.

Clause 12 on my bill limits sale of access land to provide unoccupied land but provides reference to occupied lands. This paves the way for landowners to devise agreements and/or permission for access to land for prices and conditions under their control.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that that part of the bill leaves the door wide open for farmers or ranchers who are willing to go into the business of supplying habitat for good game management. I would like to use, for example, what has taken place in an area west of Vulcan at Carmangay. The local Fish and Game Association and their farmer members left one swathe-width of wheat standing in their fields in a protected area, and according to that Fish and Game Association in three years time their pheasant population had increased to the extent that they now claim it is equal to Brooks in hunting.

Now Clause 12, and I mention leaving the door open for this type of thing, if a farmer is willing to invest \$100 in habitat, maybe we should be looking down the road to where he would be allowed then to charge for hunting.

Mr. Speaker, if this bill should fail it would still provide an excellent opportunity to discuss many of the following issues: ownership rights, positive approaches as opposed to legislation, agreements, permission, sale of access, profit potential for off-season, use of farm land, family farm development, vacation farming, dude ranching, game preserves and game farming.

And four, Mr. Speaker, I believe that land use demands, in regard to hunting, recreation vehicles and hiking.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. W.S. Patterson, who is now the acting head of the Resources Economic Branch, conducted a survey of several counties to the east and to the south of Edmonton, Counties No. 9, 22, 29, and 30, and parts of Counties No. 20, 21, 25, and 27. Now approximately 11,000 farmers were contacted with a questionnaire. The questionnaire had listed on it present land use, population trends of varied wildlife species, trends in hunting activity, landowner opinion in regard to hunting activity, specific problems encountered by farmers in that area and trends in posting land.

Mr. Speaker, some very interesting answers came back. There was a total of 1,096 questionnaires mailed out. A response of 780 came back and the part that I had marked in the questionnaire was the type of hunting taking place out there. The farmers were asked, "Do you believe that deer, water fowl or upland game is increasing or decreasing?" And on deer, 61 per cent said that they were on the increase, 4 per cent on the decrease and, of course, 27 per cent expressed no opinion because they thought they were still stable. On water fowl, 42 per cent for an increase, for a decrease 21 per cent and 37 thought it was about the same. Upland birds showed about the same percentages.

I would like to point out that the next part of this questionnaire was farmer-hunter relationships. Thirty-five per cent of the land owners stated their opposition to sports hunting of wildlife, while 42 per cent approved of the sport. Sixteen per cent of those farmers posted their land, 55 per cent of the land owners granted permission to hunters asking to hunt deer on their land, while 64 and 83 per cent granted access to upland bird and duck hunters respectively.

Some more statistics, Mr. Speaker -- the major reasons given for opposition to hunting. Now, 30 per cent of the hunters wanted to keep the wildlife, 16 per cent of the farmers said it was a danger to their livestock, 15 per cent said hunters were a nuisance and 13 per cent quoted damage to property as a reason. Only 4 per cent said hunters don't ask permission, 4 per cent said hunting was a danger to human life. Others reasons were about 18 per cent.

Now, the next group of figures here concerns the type of damage reported by the 780 farmers. Thirty-four per cent listed crop damage. Seventeen per cent listed fences cut or damaged, 13 per cent gates left open. Now this is quite a problem, with cattle in on a field and gates left open onto highways and onto roads. 11 per cent put down 'buildings or machinery damaged', while 11 per cent had livestock killed or injured, 4 per cent 'garbage left around' -- I like that word 'garbage' I wish they had used beer bottles -- 3 per cent 'open pits left', and 7 per cent for 'general nuisance'.

It goes on to state the farmers who sustained losses were asked to place a value on the damages experienced. For the sample of 187 instances shown in this table a total of \$15,400 in damage was estimated, approximately \$82 per instance.

I have one more bit of statistics here for the year 1950 -- this is in regard to land posting in the study area. In 1950 there was 2,100 acres that were posted or a percentage of .7 of the farmers; 1966 there were 34,000 acres posted or 11 per cent of the farmers. I'll go up to 1971 when there were 92,000 acres posted or 30 per cent of the farmers were posting their land. If you continue these figures on at the rate they are increasing now, by the year 2010 we will have 75 per cent of the land in Alberta posted.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude by reading one letter. I received several letters, as I mentioned earlier, pro and con. This letter is from the Stettler area and it reads as follows:

We heard over the Radio, that your bill 205 was meeting opposition from Fish and Game.

No wonder they have walked over farmers and ranchers for a long time.

We had a good cow shot [dead] last fall and canvas stolen off a grain truck parked in the field 300 yds from [our home]; truck was full of Elite seed which got partly spoiled by moisture getting in. They wrapped a deer in the canvas.

They drove over [our] summer fallow that was to be seeded to registered seed with dirty cars and pickups, which gave us several days hand picking wild oats cut of [the] crops where none had been before.

They leave [us] live shells on swathes for the combines to pick up. Also many gates are left open.

Rustling especially [of] calves could be very bad this fall due to [the] price of meat. They are very easily loaded in [a] pickup or [a] car trunk.

We have had losses not accounted for, last fall. This land was posted, but the penalty is so light that they don't care, and if you are busy in the fall you cannot keep track of who [is] in shooting.

We could go on for hours, but these are just a few of the facts To help you in your fight for the same rights that other people have. They don't let rural people trample all over their lawns and yards.

Yours truly,

Herbert Hayes, Arthur Hayes
Bosk Hill Ranch.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table this letter and this document. I think that letter, Mr. Speaker, typifies the feeling today in rural Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drayton Valley.

MR. ZANDER:

No, Mr. Speaker, the secndr, first.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Whitecourt, followed by the hon. Member for Highwood.

MR. TRYNCHY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to second this bill before us. I might say that the hon. Member for Camrose has made quite a lengthy speech on it. As a matter of fact he used up more than his time and just about all of mine. But in the brief time I have I want to say to the members why I believe this is a good bill.

In this country we take a lot for granted. We seem to think that when we go out with our machines we can cross land without asking. I know I have done this myself in the past and I am sure most of us have. I know in the last few years when going skidooring, I have taken some time and phoned the people where land I was going to travel over and got their permission because I thought this was right. But so many people don't do this. Possibly this is why we have to have a bill such as this.

I would like to relate some of the things which have happened in the farm areas and some that have happened in my own constituency.

Last fall I drove down the road one way, and coming back about ten minutes later there was a cow shot about 20 feet from the fence. I notified the farmer that his cow was shot. The farmer was busy and, when he came back next morning, the forequarters were gone. Somebody had shot the animal, taken the forequarters and left the rest there in the field. These are some of the things which have happened. I don't know whether this is trespassing or not, but certainly it is a step in that direction.

Sometimes I have had complaints from farmers. They have gone out to their combines and found the battery had been shot with a shotgun -- blown to pieces. Slow moving signs on a cultivator in a field have been used for target practice. We have had tires on machinery shot at. We have had the machine itself shot at.

These are the things that have been going on. I am speaking now of trespassing on private and deeded lands.

I have also had complaints about hunters who come in without permission and dig pits, and in their anxiety to pack up their ducks and geese, or what have you, they leave the pits open. I have had one occasion where a farmer had run his combine over and over the pit and broken the axle and the wheel off the combine.

I have a case where a number of trespassers have gone onto vacant farms. They have torn off picket fences around some vacant buildings. They have burned haystacks, and they have made fires in vacant buildings right on the floor. I have seen where granaries have been burned on account of this.

This last winter I had a complaint from one of my constituents who doesn't live on the farm but runs a small farm and keeps a number of bees. He had stacked all his beehives up against a shed and left them for the winter. In the course of the winter he came back to visit his farm. The gate was open. There were skidoo tracks all over the farm. He went to check his beehives, and half of them were burned for firewood because it is pretty easy to start a beehive with a lot of wax in it. The rest were run over and crushed by the snowmobiles.

Now this is the type of thing we can't condone. And this is why I feel we must have some protection for the man who owns property.

I have also seen this happen on golf courses where young shrubs have been planted and the snowmobilers have run over them, broken them off and smashed the small shrubs to the ground.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is one thing I would like to point out and that is in The Alberta Bill of Rights, and it says under 1(a):

the right of the individual to liberty, security of the person and enjoyment of property, and the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law.

I think that really fits in when somebody trespasses on your property without your permission.

I can't go quite so far as the hon. Member for Camrose did on our grazing leases, because the grazing lease is held from spring to fall and in the winter time it is vacant and it is used by a number of people, in my area, for hunting. I have done this myself. So long as you use the gate and don't cut the wire, I see nothing wrong with this. I would hate to see a hunter using an area where there are thousands of acres in his hunting process, be picked up and prosecuted under this act. I really think we should have a good look at that and that is about the only point I do not fully agree on. Other than that it is a good bill.

I spoke at an NFU meeting yesterday and I got full approval from the meeting on this bill. This is something they have asked for for a long time and so has Unifarm.

In my area the Unifarm and the Edson Fish and Game got together. They had a committee of eight members, four from each side, and I would like to read for the record the recommendations that the Fish and Game and the farmers in that area made.

Due to tensions developing between farmers and hunters as a result of irresponsible acts by some individuals in our society, our organizations

have joined together to try and clarify and resolve the problems facing both sides.

The heritage of our hunting rights is being endangered by certain irresponsible persons in our society. The following recommendations have been drawn up by this joint committee formed by Unifarm and the Fish and Game members.

(1) Hunters convicted of willful trespassing should face a suspension of their hunting privileges for two years.

(2) Permission of entry to private land for hunting purposes should be on a written form supplied by the Department of Fish and Wildlife and issued with the hunting licences.

(3) All persons convicted of willful trespassing should receive a minimum fine of \$100.

(4) Restitution for all acts of willful damage and vandalism should be made to the landowner by the person or persons committing or convicted of such crimes.

(5) An unsatisfied judgment fund should be set up using a portion of the fines levied under recommendation 3 to cover acts of vandalism or damage caused by unknown persons or persons not having sufficient assets to cover such costs.

(6) Hunting season should be opened on approximately October 15 or November 1 in settled areas to allow farmers to get their harvesting done, thus enabling them to allow more hunting privileges on their land.

The committee felt that there are numerous rewards to be gained by extensive public relations and educational programs which should be carried out cooperatively by all concerned organizations.

Mr. Speaker, these are recommendations by Fish and Game and the farmers. It doesn't correspond or coincide with the one we got from the Alberta Fish and Game, but in my area I believe this is a must and I think the farmer and the Fish and Game have to work together to get these policies where they can be beneficial to all hunters.

I want to make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that not every sportsman or every hunter is destructive. But there are always one or two and they are the ones who spoil it for the ones who don't do the things we are talking about in this Act.

I would say we should look at all possibilities for and against this bill, and then, and only then, should we come up with policies that are good for all sportsmen and all Albertans. Thank you.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. Member for Highwood adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[A noticeable pause ensued.]

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the clock appear to the House to have reached 5:30?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

April 5, 1973

ALBERTA HANSARD

36-1757

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 5:29 o'clock.]