

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, May 1, 1973

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you and to the hon. members of this Assembly some 120 Grade 9 students from the Stony Plain School. They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Neufeld, Mrs. Nicholson and Mr. Orieux, and by a number of parents, I believe.

I also had the pleasure this morning of meeting with about 25 Grade 10 students from Seba Beach High School, but unfortunately they could not stay to watch the proceedings.

I would ask this class to rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to file the response to Motion No. 233 in regard to food allowances for male and female adults as well as response to Question No. 155 in regard to the expenditures on hospital and related facilities in the province.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to file answers to two questions, Question No. 222 and No. 225.

MR. PEACOCK:

I should like to file answers to Sessional Paper No. 240.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Amendments to The Alberta Labour Act

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, the delegation that was out in front of the Assembly today was addressed by the Premier and the Minister of Labour. I believe the Premier said in general words that Bill No. 35, the new Labour Act, was a fair bill and he stood by it. The Minister of Labour indicated he was going to be introducing amendments for consideration by Executive Council. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the Premier could advise, in view of the apparent confusion within government ranks over the bill, whether it is their intention to proceed with it this session?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The question in that form is not in order. But if the hon. Premier wishes to deal with it since it has been put, it is fair that he should have the opportunity.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question, the position I take with regard to the principle of the bill we will be voting on on second reading (which we will be proceeding with hopefully in a matter of days in this session) is that it is in general a fair bill. As I said on the steps of the Legislature, it is a fair bill in terms of the Government of Alberta and a balance between management and labour. There are items in it that have been presented to us both by management and by labour on a specific basis which we are prepared to consider. When we reach the committee stage of the bill, it may be that the Minister of Labour will be proposing some amendments.

MR. HENDERSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Do I gather then the Premier still intends to proceed with third reading of the bill this session?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is yes.

MR. HENDERSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister could advise when he and his colleagues in the cabinet will be meeting with the delegation from the labour group?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, myself and the Minister of Labour have just concluded a meeting with representatives of the delegation which appeared here today. Perhaps the Minister of Labour might like to expand on some of the items that were discussed.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, there were two or three points of particular concern the delegation brought to our attention. One of them had to do with a clause that will give management an equal opportunity with labour to identify the trade jurisdiction with which they would wish to negotiate. This means that the employer as well as the employee association could apply to the Board of Industrial Relations to identify the work jurisdiction. The delegation felt that the management associations ought not to have the right to identify the employee group that would bargain. This was one major concern.

The second one, with which the members of the Legislature are familiar, had to do with universal picketing. They asked us to reconsider that particular item.

The third one had to do with a clause in Bill No. 35 that is referred to generally as the spin-off clause. They reaffirmed their view that that one clause should remain in the legislation. We weren't sure whether it would or it wouldn't.

There were those three and perhaps one more. But generally, the concern was that the legislation in general was too restrictive on labour. That was their main principle.

While I'm on my feet, I should like to make this point, that any contemplated amendments -- and there could well be many during clause by clause reading by the other side of the House -- any that I consider at the present time, including one or two that were on this list, will in no way change or abort the principles on which the bill is put together and which we will present for second reading very shortly.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to supplement the answer by the hon. Minister of Labour, although I am sure it will bring small comfort to the official opposition. We had a clarification from the delegation with regard to paragraph

two. It said in the submission that this bill continues Alberta's recent history of anti-labour legislation. To clarify their position, they made it quite clear they want to delete the word "recent".

[Laughter]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. We have three supplementaries waiting. The hon. Member for Drumheller, followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, and then the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View. Also, apparently, the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury. Possibly those four supplementaries might look after the topic for the time being. If there is time left over, we can come back to it.

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Are there any major changes in principle in the bill other than the ones you mentioned? If these are changes in principle, will the bill be discharged and brought back with the principle changed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Order, order.

MR. TAYLOR:

I'm asking a question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's first question was whether there are any major changes in principle in the amendments that are being contemplated. It's a doubtful matter whether it should be asked at this time before the amendments are introduced, because we are anticipating the matter. But if the hon. minister wishes to answer that part of the question briefly, perhaps that would be in order.

MR. TAYLOR:

On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, if there is a change in principle in the bill then we should certainly know before we have second reading of the bill. It's quite in order.

DR. HORNER:

On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member had been half awake, the minister has already said there will be no changes in principle.

MR. TAYLOR:

Well, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I'm half awake, but if the hon. Deputy Premier was awake at all he would realize that if there is a change in principles in the bill it should be discharged and brought back to the House in second reading, not in Committee of the Whole. Is the bill being discharged?

DR. HORNER:

No, he's already said so.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. Order, please. If the hon. minister wishes to deal with the matter of principle, although it is true that he has referred to it previously, perhaps he might wish to refer to it briefly again.

DR. HOHOL:

What I said, and I want to underscore what I said, was that any changes that may or may not be recommended by me in the clause by clause reading, following this noon hour's meeting with the Building Trades Council will not change any of the principles in Bill No. 35 as it is now written.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a supplementary question to the hon. minister and it is really to clarify the past question. By way of explanation, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. minister addressed the group this afternoon he suggested three or four major amendments.

My question to him is, will he, in his introductory remarks in discussing the principle in second reading, be able to give us the government's official position on these three or four major matters he dealt with when he spoke to the demonstrators?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. The hon. member is, in fact, asking the hon. minister to commence now his debate on the amendments. I must find the question to be out of order.

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

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is with regard to the hon. Premier's reference to the Social Credit legislation on labour. I would like the hon. Premier to indicate whether he is of the opinion that perhaps the Conservatives spearheaded labour reform in Canada?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. This is obviously a topic which will come up for debate when the bill comes up for debate in principle.

The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier and ask him if it is true he has asked the Minister of Advanced Education to do an independent appraisal of the Labour Act?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I certainly haven't. We don't operate on that basis within the Executive Council. We had a delegation from management, as we had delegations from labour, and various ministers regardless of their responsibilities will be considering it as members of the Executive Council. In due course we will have a final review as to whether or not any amendments might be made before clause by clause study.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Medicine Hat Tigers

MR. WYSE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation. Is the hon. minister aware that the Medicine Hat Tigers have captured the Western Canada Hockey League Championship and will represent the west in Memorial Cup playoffs in Montreal next week?

[Applause]

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. member has completed his announcement perhaps we can go to the next question.

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

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Or is it a supplementary announcement?

MR. WYSE:

Will the provincial government be sending congratulations to the Medicine Hat Tigers. Also is the minister aware that Dr. McCrimmon's son Jim is a member of that team?

MR. SCHMID:

Naturally, just to inform the hon. member, since Dr. McCrimmon's son was involved we already knew about it and a telegram has gone forward.

Rural Gas Policy

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities and it is with respect to the rural gas policy tabled yesterday. Will it be necessary to wait until after the legislation is passed this fall before applications may be made by gas co-operatives for government assistance?

MR. FARRAN:

No, Mr. Speaker, we will proceed immediately.

MR. FRENCH:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. With respect to recommendation No. 4 in the position paper, and this deals with the by-pass grants, will these be available to the gas co-operatives before the farmer joins? I am speaking of the by-pass grants. Will these be available to the farmers before they join the gas co-operatives?

MR. FARRAN:

No, Mr. Speaker, that would be impossible. The by-pass grants are designed to cover the people who don't join and there is no way that you can apportion them on the basis of consumer grants until you know how many consumers there are.

MR. FRENCH:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. With respect to the by-pass grants, will these apply to 85 per cent of the loan and also to the government grant? Would you clarify the situation?

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, the financing is as follows. The consumer himself must stand on his own feet for \$1,700 except that that \$1,700 can be covered by a loan from the Co-operative Activities Branch of the Department of Agriculture for 85 per cent of the portion of 1 per cent over prime over 15 years. The grants come into action above the \$1,700 level up to whatever the per capita cost of the system is to a limit of \$3,000.

MR. SORENSON:

Supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. My question is in regard to the subsidy that will be paid to propane users for tanks. Will the subsidy be paid to those who have propane at the present time?

MR. FARRAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would rather refer to that as a grant. It would be a grant of up to \$250 or 40 per cent of the cost of a tank for propane or fuel oil users outside the boundary of the \$3,000 viability contour beyond which it is probably uneconomical to supply natural gas. It would be provided to all those propane and fuel oil users, present and future, outside those boundaries.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, I just have one more supplementary question. Will the by-pass grant be made available to the co-operatives after the farmer joins, say a few years from now?

MR. FARRAN:

The grants will be made available as soon as the gas distributor has demonstrated that he has a viable system and is ready to proceed.

Rapeseed Processing Plant

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. By way of explanation, the hon. minister is aware of the growing controversy in the Peace River country over the location of the rapeseed crushing plant and that last night several hundred farmers walked out of a meeting sponsored by one of the principals. My question to the hon. minister, Mr. Speaker is, does he plan to visit the Peace River country in the next several days to see if some form of amicable arrangement can be made?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, it is a private company that has gone ahead with the proposal to organize a crushing plant in a particular area in the Peace River country. They did a feasibility study, as I understand it, and then selected their choice of location. I point out to my honourable friend and all members of the House that we expect a number of rapeseed crushing plants to be established in Alberta in the coming years, particularly if we can get some fairness in the transportation policies of this country. It may well be that additional plants will be built not only in the Peace River country but also in other areas of Alberta. For the government to take the position that they are going to interfere in relation to where private companies decide to build such plants, in my view, is wrong.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In view of the statement by Mr. Terry Nugent, one of the principals of the operation, that the government might not back the co-op if the proposal was moved to another site, my question to the hon. minister is, is the provincial backing contingent on the Sexsmith location?

DR. HORNER:

No. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the people in the High Prairie area have already formed a co-operative in relation to a rapeseed crushing plant in that area. The people in Alliance are in the process of forming a co-operative in that area and indeed I think the people in the Morinville area are also in the process of developing a co-operative in that area.

MR. NOTLEY:

A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. In view of the fact that 30 per cent of the project will be backed by the government in the form of guarantees to people in the co-op, can the minister advise the Assembly why the government didn't commission an independent feasibility study as to location?

DR. HORNER:

Very clearly, Mr. Speaker, I think I have answered that question. If the hon. member feels for a moment that the government should go around selecting sites for each individual processing plant in this process then I think he is totally wrong. We don't have a socialist state-controlled government in Alberta at the moment.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question. Subject to the concurrence by the principals would the government be prepared to table the feasibility study in the Legislature?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend had been up to his parliamentary duties he would note there have already been some feasibility studies tabled in regard to a rapeseed crushing plant in Alberta. I would be quite willing to get any available additional information for his perusal, because he obviously needs a great deal of education in this area.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker --

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member labelled his previous supplementary as the final one. Perhaps we could come back to this subject if there is time.

MR. NOTLEY:

Just for the sake of clarification, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister if he would be prepared to table the specific feasibility study undertaken by the principals of the Sexsmith rapeseed crushing plant?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, pretty obviously that feasibility study was made by the principals and paid for by them. It is a private business document. Again, we don't have a state government in this province, nor do I think we ever will have.

MR. HENDERSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Do I gather from the minister's answers that the government is not prepared to intercede or intervene in any private enterprise planning to build a rapeseed plant any place in the province? It's a completely open market?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, now the hon. leader of the Opposition has got into this little game that he likes to play in relation to politics and he's as ignorant of the facts as my friend from Spirit River --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. Deputy Premier is not obliged to answer the question but he may not take advantage of the occasion to start a debate.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, may I ask another supplementary question?

MR. SPEAKER:

Could this be the final supplementary on this topic?

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure I understood the hon. minister correctly and it's for clarification that I am asking my question. Did I understand him to say, Mr. Speaker, that the government is prepared to assist any rape plant or any group that are established to build a rape plant?

My second part of the question then would be, will the government not assume any responsibility whatsoever in checking whether or not there is an opportunity for the plant to be successful before providing funds?

DR. HORNER:

Of course, Mr. Speaker, we are going to check the viability, in our view, for each of these plants no matter where they are. In regard to several we have already given assistance in my hon. friend's constituency of Cypress -- he's not aware of that, but that's a fact.

The situation, Mr. Speaker, is that it is very clearly a responsibility of government to look at the viability of these plants in relation to the moneys that might be loaned or guaranteed by the government in that area.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Electronic Listening Devices

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Attorney General. Can the minister advise who gives approval to legally install electronic listening devices in Alberta?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any approvals which are given in respect to electronically installed listening devices. There are provisions in the Act governing Alberta Government Telephones and I refer my hon. friend to the provisions of the Act. My memory is that AGT can authorize and does authorize recording devices on telephone lines. Coupled with that is the requirement that there be a warning beep on the lines so anyone who is being recorded is aware of it. It is also my memory that there are similar rules governing the operation of the Edmonton telephone system under their regulations but again, Mr. Speaker, I would refer the hon. member to those rules to review them for himself.

Apart from those two areas, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of anyone having any authority to give any approval for the installation of electronic recording or listening devices.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister advise who may be granted permission to legally install electronic listening devices in Alberta?

MR. SPEAKER:

Unless this is a matter of ministerial discretion it has to be a matter of law which the member may not ask in a question period.

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

Effects of Royal Alex Nurses' Strike

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Health and Social Development. I would like to ask the minister who is supervising the evacuation of parents, or of patients -- sorry, of patients from the Royal Alex Hospital? I assume among the patients there are some parents!

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the logistics of any such emergency arrangements made are, of course, in the hands of the board.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Mr. Minister, what effect will the evacuation of patients from the Royal Alex Hospital have on the waiting list of other hospitals in the City of Edmonton?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think there is probably an arithmetical answer to that. The patient loads at other hospitals will increase and the waiting lists at other hospitals will increase.

MR. CLARK:

A second supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Mr. Minister, is it true that the Alberta Hospitals Commission is picking up the cost of the evacuation and moving of patients to designated hospitals in the city?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that specific item is not something that I have had drawn to my attention or given consideration to. The only observation I would make is that the hospitals in Edmonton, as elsewhere, are on a global budget system which is fully funded by the province. If there is some appropriate amount related to that in the hospitals' budgets that is among the items which are covered by the global budget.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Mr. Minister, then the Alberta Hospitals Commission has not agreed to pay the cost of the movement of patients from the Royal Alex to other hospitals in the City of Edmonton as a result of the strike?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I know that the chairman of the Hospital Services Commission has been keeping in very close touch with the situation in order that the commission will be as fully informed as possible on such items as the emergency arrangements which I say, again, I believe the board is handling with full competence. As to specific approvals, if there has been a communication from the commission to the hospitals saying that this particular item is one of those items that would be looked after, I am not aware of it. I will check it out.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Rural Roads

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Highways and Transport. With reference to his announcement last week of the program designed to assist rural towns and villages with the improvement of the internal roadways, my question is, when will the municipalities involved be notified of the details of this policy?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Almost immediately, Mr. Speaker. I think about half -- the letters to the urban towns -- in rural areas have been notified now. The rest of them will go out in the next day or so.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question to the minister. Did these start going out on April 11 as on your copy attached to the announcement?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, April 11 has gone by, quite considerably. As I pointed out to the hon. member I have prepared about half the letters which will be going out today. I expect the rest of the letters to go out in the next couple of days.

MR. RUSTE:

For clarification, Mr. Speaker. The letter that was attached to the announcement last Friday bore the date of April 11 and I was just wondering whether that was the time they started going out.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, it probably was prepared at that particular time. If it upsets the hon. member that it's going out now it's kind of too bad, but it's just as authentic going out under that date as it is today. I don't know what else I can add to that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, just in reply, and maybe it shouldn't be, but certainly --

MR. SPEAKER:

No, the hon. member is not entitled to a reply at this time.

The hon. Member for Hanna-Cyen with a supplementary.

[Mr. Henderson rose]

The hon. Member for Hanna-Cyen has been recognized for a supplementary.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the hon. minister. Will there be a ceiling on these grants to the municipalities?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the ceiling is governed by the population of each of the towns and villages throughout Alberta.

MR. HENDERSON:

A supplemental, Mr. Speaker. Since the minister has said that it is on a first come first served basis on the part of the municipalities, does he not think it is in order that all --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Such a question is obviously debate.

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

Continental Trucking

MR. BENOIT:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour and has to do with the question to which he alluded last April 18 on Continental Truckers in which he said that those who had been dismissed by the company did not receive severance pay.

Will the Board of Industrial Relations be giving consideration to this situation?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, we have spent a great deal of time attempting to do essentially the job of getting jobs for these people and getting them back into the work force, and we have been, in the majority of cases, successful.

I recall indicating to the House at that time, Mr. Speaker, that this company is a national company and its problems in that respect are with the federal government. We have attempted to do what we can with respect to the severance pay but this, as I say, is a federal matter and we can simply indicate our point of view and concern to the federal government, and we have done this.

MR. BENOIT:

A supplemental, Mr. Speaker. Do I understand the minister to say that they have no appeal to the Alberta Board of Industrial Relations in a situation like this, that they must appeal through some federal board for severance pay?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I can check the fine point of this. Certainly they can appeal to us to assist them but this matter would come under the federal labour laws or the federal labour code. But I will check to make sure the question is appropriately answered.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Rural Gas Policy (Cont.)

MR. BATIUK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities. In the rural gas policy position paper it states that the maximum any consumer will have to pay is \$1,700. Is it possible in the densely populated rural areas, if there are such areas, that they could qualify for less than \$1,700? Or is \$1,700 also the minimum?

MR. FARRAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the procedure for hamlets and villages in more densely populated areas is that they would normally tie on to a farmer-oriented distribution system at a lower cost. This would be at the option of the co-operative. The government's grants and financial assistance kick in at the \$1,700 per customer level.

MR. BATIUK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Since there are a number of rural members in this House, I was just wondering whether the minister could tell us whether we -- including myself -- would be able to participate in such a plan or would we have to resign our seats first?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is asking for legal advice which perhaps he should get from his solicitor -- unless he is asking concerning a possible change in legislation.

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

Crude Oil Price Increase

MR. PURDY:

A question to the Minister of Mines and Minerals or the Provincial Treasurer. What will the effect of the 25 cent per barrel increase on crude oil announced today by Imperial Oil have on the Alberta economy?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, we noted the price announcement of the increase in crude oil by Imperial Oil. Providing the other major companies involved follow the same increase, our department has estimated that the additional revenue to the province by way of royalty and taxes would be some \$22 million per year.

MR. PURDY:

A supplementary to the Minister of Mines and Minerals, Mr. Speaker. Because of the higher prices, will this give an added incentive for more oil companies to look for oil in the province?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, without hesitation that would be an added incentive.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question. Can the hon. minister advise whether his department has any projections as to the impact of this increase in the price of a barrel of crude oil on the retail pricing of gasoline in the province?

MR. HENDERSON:

One cent a gallon.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, there hasn't been an announcement at this stage which has come to my attention about the price of gasoline increasing. The department has looked at that figure and it could be that if there was a price increase, it would be in the area of one cent per gallon.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Amalgamation of Education Departments

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, the issue of the two departments of education has recently been raised outside the Legislature. Is the government giving consideration to amalgamating the two departments of education?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, we certainly aren't. In fact, we are delighted with the way it is working and so are the people of Alberta.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. Premier then. Would he advise whether remarks made in a southern city speculating on the possible amalgamation of the two departments were merely wishful thinking?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The question is the same question as was asked previously in a different form.

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

Rapeseed Processing Plant (Cont.)

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture and it is a followup from the question raised by the hon. Member for Cypress.

In view of your answer to the hon. Member for Cypress, Mr. Minister, in view of the substantial public guarantee, do you feel that a feasibility --

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please address his question in the third person.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, does the hon. minister feel that a feasibility study commissioned by the promoters of the project is sufficient?

DR. HOFNER:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question then. Can the hon. Minister of Agriculture advise whether it is the government's intention to undertake a special feasibility study to consider the most feasible location for a rapeseed crushing plant in the north?

DR. HORNER:

That has already been done, Mr. Speaker, and tabled in this House.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Sales Training Unlimited

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. Can the minister advise the results of his investigation of the firm offering guaranteed employment which was referred to his department several weeks ago?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can in part -- only I was a little alarmed at the delay in receiving a written answer. So we followed up with a phone call to the Sales Training Unlimited organization, determined some of the details of the course they were offering -- \$199 for a four-week course, eight lessons in total. But this doesn't answer, in fact, the question of the hon. member and I would prefer to wait until a written response is received from the organization before I respond in a more positive manner.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise as to whether the firm is still collecting \$199 payments from citizens in Calgary without proof of employment?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, over the telephone the organization in question claims to have guaranteed employment for anybody taking their course. We wanted this to be specifically spelled out in letter form. We have yet to receive the letter. I have no knowledge whether they have curtailed enrolment in their course at all. But I do know that the organization in question is quite concerned with the questions being asked. However, the moment we receive some further communication from the organization, I'll make a statement in the House if I don't receive another question.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Due to the time that is lapsing in waiting for a written reply is any personnel available to the minister's office to investigate on a first-hand basis the offices of the firm doing the advertising?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is contemplated. The moment we receive the reply from this organization, the investigation will be undertaken.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Alberta Housing Corporation

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, my question today is to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is it a requirement of the directors of Alberta Housing Corporation to disclose their property holdings before serving as directors of the corporation??

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member referred to the situation in Lethbridge last night I undertook to check on that. I've been in a cabinet meeting all morning and haven't had time to do so, but I will get him the answer to that question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller, followed by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Non-Organized Labour Force

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Has the hon. minister the percentage of white collar workers and the labouring force in the province that are not organized?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I have not. I have the total percentage that is organized. If that information is possible, it would certainly be of use to the government and this department and we'd gladly share it with the House.

Discriminatory Employment Programs

While I'm on my feet I wonder if you'd permit me to answer a question which was asked some days ago. This had to do with the number of complaints -- approximately only -- received by the Human Rights Commission from women complaining of discrimination in employment.

The answer says this, that in 1972, 47 females registered complaints with the Human Rights Commission in the area of employment. The total employment complaints were 154. It's interesting to note, however, that 35 of these females alleged that grounds other than sex, for example, race, age and so on, were the cause of the employment difficulties.

The first supplementary question was, "Has the Commission acted on a suggestion by an Officer of the Commission that more effort should be made to encourage women to report unfair treatment in wages and job promotions?"

The answer: "What has probably been said at public meetings or in other conversations with Commission staff members is that an increase in complaints from females alleging discrimination on grounds of sex is anticipated once the provisions of The Individual's Rights Protection Act become more widely known."

The last supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, was: "Could the minister advise the House of the nature of the advertising campaign informing people of their rights under Alberta law to be carried out by the Commission on a Province-wide basis?"

The reply: "A major media campaign, principally employing newspaper and television advertising, to acquaint Albertans with their rights under The Individual's Rights Protection Act is in the process of preparation and should be launched [some time] in the near future." Thank you.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. In the reorganization of the Department of Manpower and Labour, is provision being made for personnel (who may be called upon by unorganized workers) to help them organize?

DR. HOHOL:

No, Mr. Speaker, that would not be our intention.

MR. WILSON:

Will the hon. minister advise why the government has terminated the services of more women employees than they have hired since September 30, 1971?

MR. SPEAKER:

This is scarcely a supplementary, and we're getting into such an area of statistics that we really should have these on the Order Paper. The question itself is perfectly in order as far as the question goes, but it's just that it is not the type of question that is intended for the question period, but is intended for the Order Paper.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Rural Street Improvement Grants

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Highways. The Minister of Highways, in a statement made on the Orders of the Day, indicated that grants made to towns and villages for street improvement programs were to be allocated on a first come first served basis. Will the minister be sending out announcements of details of the program to all the municipalities involved in the program simultaneously?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, the announcements to the towns and villages throughout the province are being done on as simultaneous a basis as the mails will allow it to be done.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Auto Repair Shops

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. Is the minister planning to introduce legislation which would require auto repair dealers to tell car owners if they plan to ship their car out for work elsewhere, such as a transmission shop?

MR. DOWLING:

Not at this time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might use what is left of the question period to answer questions that were asked yesterday and to which I indicated I would reply.

Methaqualone

The hon. Member for Highwood asked me a question some time ago about the drug Methaqualone and I invite him to conclude that the reason why I didn't recognize that as soon as he said it was because it is also known as Mequelone, Tualone, Quaalude and Mandrax in various forms.

Mr. Speaker, the drug described is basically known as a sedative hypnotic and is issued only by prescription under Schedule F of the legislation. The Alberta Pharmaceutical Association advises us that they did inform all registered pharmacists in the province two years ago as to the abuse potential of this drug. At that time the pharmacists were requested to inform the physician prescribing the drug of any possible overutilization of the drug by the patient. I understand it has a particularly unhappy effect if used in conjunction with alcohol.

Use of Marijuana

This brings me to the next answer, Mr. Speaker, to the question that the hon. Member for Drumheller had raised, an inquiry I had promised to make of the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission. This dealt with the inquiry with regard to the use of marijuana.

The commission at the present time is not planning any programs in regard to giving statistics on the extent of marijuana use in the province because of the difficulty of getting any statistic that would be reliable. An inquiry was made through the drug section of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police who were willing to express the opinion that the use of marijuana in Alberta has decreased while the use of hashish is increasing.

It is also their opinion, which they stress is an opinion only, that about 50 per cent of school children over 12 years have been exposed to marijuana but this does not necessarily mean that they have actually used it.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a brief announcement.

Yesterday marked the official signing of the collective agreement between the government and the Civil Service Association of Alberta. It is a matter of real satisfaction to the government that the process of collective bargaining was a major success.

The agreement which covers the period from January 1, 1973 to December 31, 1974 covers all but a small group of tradesmen who failed to ratify the section that relates to them. This dispute covers approximately 600 employees.

The remaining 16,000 employees will have the negotiated increases reflected in their salary cheques for May. The major fringe benefit changes will be effective from April 1, 1973.

The government appreciates the general good faith and willingness to share a point of view that characterized this year's negotiations. It augurs well for our future relationships.

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

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

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

One copy of the loan agreements or mortgage documents relating to each loan made during the period January 1, 1971, to September 10, 1971, under the Commercial Services Act for tourist development projects.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I move Motion for a Return 243 standing in my name on the Order Paper.

[The motion was carried.]

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to accept the Motion for a Return, No. 243, at this time. First I would take note that the hon. members opposite are asking to be told what was done when they were in power. I would say to you if they did not know then what they were doing, it is too late now for them to be asking.

Secondly, I would say Mr. Speaker, that we feel obliged to extend the same confidential treatment to those people who borrowed money from the government prior to the establishment of the AOC as we do for those people who have more recently borrowed from us. I might point out in this respect that legally speaking the loans on which the hon. member is now asking for information were transferred into the AOC and hence are now bound by the legislation and regulations pertaining to AOC.

However, Mr. Speaker, since this matter of disclosure was first raised, we on our side have been giving it serious consideration and do accept that the AOC has a responsibility to provide sufficient information to this House so that its performance may be measured. I expect I will have something further to say on this subject within the near future or possibly, at the latest, by the fall session.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. Leader of the Opposition close the debate?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to rehash the basic question of whether the information should be available or not. I think we have covered that rather thoroughly in the past. And I must say I am not particularly surprised at the attitude of the government refusing to make the information available.

I think so far as the other rather facetious remarks about the propriety of the opposition asking for information that related to the previous administration, I would point out to the members of this House we have of course, had countless returns in this House where we have asked for information relating to the previous administration. And not being omniscient as the minister who spoke to the motion seems to be, I make no pretence nor does any member on this side of the House make any pretence of knowing all things that were done by all departments of the previous government over the past 36 years, whether we start with the first year or the last year it was in office.

And so I can only conclude by saying, Mr. Minister, that we don't intend to pursue the matter further. There was nothing secret relating to the operations of the Commercial Service Corporation.

The new government has a difference of opinion on the matter but I do suggest that the remarks as to the propriety of the opposition asking for information relating to the operation of the previous government is utter nonsense and absolutely out of place so far as the responsibility of the minister is concerned. The motion however stands as being denied, as a matter of record before the House.

[The motion was defeated.]

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. Moved by Mr. Lee, seconded by Mr. Purdy.

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

[Adjourned debate: Mr. Drain]

MR. DRAIN:

I think probably, Mr. Speaker, that the thinking behind the fielding of this particular resolution was the amount of adverse public comment that resulted from the newspaper publicity regarding the clearing of the initial 15 miles of road that was to be upgraded in the Kananaskis. I think probably this has more of an aesthetic impact than a direct impact when all factors are weighed and taken into consideration.

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair.]

There is a minimum width of 75 feet required no matter how carefully or how closely you can put a road together. So having regard for several factors, one being visibility, curves for instance, backsloping which when you carry along a hillside requires a considerable length. It would appear to me that 35 feet or so on the 35 or 37.5 feet on each side of the right-of-way would not be accepted and therefore would be within reason.

There is an alternative method of building a road which does not require these particular dimensions so far as widths are concerned. That is what I would classify as the British Columbia style of building roads which simply means you fill as you go. This, of course, is necessary in building roads in British Columbia because of the occurrence of large amount of rock structures and so on. It is a very common practice and means that you, in effect, curtail the rest of your right of way by the factor of having no requirements for backsloping. In most cases this is done on what is usually a very straight stretch of road. However, the cost factor in building a road in this particular manner is on a ratio of probably about 3 or 4 to 1 and I would regard it as prohibitive.

The regrettable thing about this particular motion and the reason why I take objections to it are: design to prevent heavy industrial usage. This, Mr. Speaker, would prevent the present use of roads, such as is used at the north end of my constituency where coal is hauled and the living of 700 miners depends on moving this coal to market and it is presently moved down the Kananaskis highway.

This particular section of highway, of course, is maintained by the coal company as part of the deal they made with the Department of Highways. In addition, in the upgrading of this particular section of the road a considerable proportion, I think about 40 per cent, cost was picked up by the companies as part of their contribution toward this particular road.

Hence, Mr. Speaker, I regret I cannot accept the particular resolution as it and therefore I propose the following amendment, seconded by Mr. Benoit.

That the motion be amended by striking out all words after "50 miles per hour" and by adding "and further that the Kananaskis Highway be upgraded to ensure safe recreational access for Alberta citizens, with emphasis on upgrading in the Coleman area where heavy industrial use presently exists while at the same time minimizing adverse environmental impact on the valley."

It would be unrealistic, Mr. Speaker, to believe that in the case of industrial endeavour which does presently exist that another road should be built adjoining, or along side, the Kananaskis highway in order to accommodate what really would be incidental traffic.

I refer now to the development of oil and gas in that particular area. We all know that a rig requires 64 heavy truck loads -- that's a deep rig -- in order to bring in the materials, machinery and equipment which is necessary to drill a well. Therefore, this particular type of encroachment on the Kananaskis highway would be very minimum. It is already accepted that the development of oil and gas is a recognized fact. There is also lumbering which is done on an infrequent and incidental basis in that particular area. This particular motion is also designed to prevent heavy industrial usage being established, it would appear to be to be a direct prohibition of any particular development of this nature.

In moving the amendment, Mr. Speaker, I do so because of my knowledge of the danger and hazards which presently exist on the north section, north of Coleman, on the Kananaskis highway where there is heavy truck traffic and a dust problem that creates a genuine hazard. There is an ice problem as a result of the amount of traffic that is utilized, a crowding of vehicles which makes it very dangerous, indeed. There have been no major casualties thus far, but as certainly as the sun rises and sets it can be expected that this will occur. And as usage increases in this particular area it can be expected there will be more and more accidents which are now at a very high rate in relation to the amount of road that is presently used.

Therefore, if it is to be accepted and presumably it has been accepted that this coal haulage is legitimate, that there is a vested interest on the part of the coal companies in their involvement in this particular area by the money they have invested, by the maintenance they do and therefore that this is accepted as part of an industry, it would then appear reasonable to me to suggest, as I do in the amendment, that priority should be given to improve this particular section of the highway where the greatest risk occurs, where the greatest hazard is and where we can anticipate that non-improvement would result in certain statistics which would be very unfavourable.

If this did not, in fact, exist as such, Mr. Speaker, the realization must be given consideration that the impact on tourists after travelling through 14 miles of dust following a coal truck is more than most of them can stomach. They do not leave Alberta and spread the word across the United States, or wherever they come from, of the beauties of the Kananaskis. They talk about the dust and the danger of travelling on a road that is used without having the proper design basis to handle the traffic it is forced to carry.

So with these few thoughts, Mr. Speaker, and in realization that oil and gas development are a fact of life in the Kananaskis, that lumbering is something which is carried on, that coal haulage does occur, that there could conceivably be other types of mineral development, that the public usage of this particular area is going to increase because of the enlarged amount of recreation time available, because of improvements on the road itself will create the traffic, and because it is the limiting factor of less and less open areas and the more awareness and desire of the public to appreciate the great

outdoors and to see nature as it is, I urge, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. members the necessity of a good road in the Kananaskis area.

I think that if care and consideration is given to my amendment it will be accepted by the hon. members. Thank you.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member, on a question or a point of order, would explain to the House whether there may be a word left out in his amendment, because while the original motion refers to "a maximum speed of 50 miles per hour be established," the amendment apparently has left out the "be established" words and therefore while 50 miles an hour is referred to, nothing is done with it, whether it is established or eliminated. Is it possible that a word has been left out of your amendment?

MR. DRAIN:

Hon. member, my thinking was that 50 miles per hour should be a maximum and if the intent of that amendment is written in that manner that would be the meaning I would be prepared to expound.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, isn't this really a contrary motion? If it relates to the 50 miles per hour speed which the motion wants to preserve and the prevention of heavy industrial usage -- the amendment seems to want to encourage heavy industrial usage. Surely on a point of order this is just a direct contrary motion. Why don't the members just vote against the main motion?

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, the amendment retains the 50 miles per hour. If, as the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs mentioned, you want to put in the words "be established", I don't imagine anyone would have any objection to that and it makes it read that much better.

The other point is that already on the Kananaskis Highway there is an area where there is industrial traffic. It is there now and the amendment is only recognizing what is there now, not encouraging it elsewhere but recognizing where it is now. Consequently I would suggest that it is a proper amendment.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I accept that. If the motion could be read again then maybe we would understand it. If it can be put in its final version -- could the hon. member please read it to the House again?

MR. DRAIN:

I would be delighted hon. member, but the page has purloined all of them. If he would kindly bring one back I would be delighted.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

If the hon. member will agree, I will read the amendment. The amendment to Motion No. 1 moved by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, seconded by the hon. Member for Highwood -- that the motion be amended by striking out all the words after "50 miles per hour and inserting:

and further that the Kananaskis Highway be upgraded to assure safe recreational access for Alberta citizens with emphasis on upgrading in the Coleman area where heavy industrial use presently exists, while at the same time minimizing adverse environmental impact on the valley.

[Mr. Farran and Mr. Benoit rose simultaneously.]

MR. FARRAN:

Does the seconder want to go first?

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, if I may.

I think I would like to say a few more words about this Kananaskis road and particularly on the amendment, Mr. Speaker, even though I have spoken fairly extensively on this subject on previous occasions. I think probably that before I speak directly to the subject matter of the amendment I might comment on one or two statements which have been made.

When the mover of the motion in the first instance made reference to the Kananaskis road, the hon. Member for Camrose stated that he thought the road was the dirtiest, roughest, dustiest -- the worst in Canada. With all due respect to the hon. Member for Camrose, I would like to suggest that he hasn't travelled very far, even in the Province of Alberta, or he wouldn't have said that about the Kananaskis road.

The Kananaskis road, it is true, in dry weather and under good conditions is rather dusty. But I have travelled the Kananaskis road on a large number of occasions and very seldom, if ever, have I found it in rough condition for any extent along the route. If one wants to go as far north as Hinton and come down that portion of the road, then that is a horse of a different colour, Mr. Speaker. But as far as the portion between Seebe and Coleman is concerned, it is a fairly good stretch of road and very well kept, I must say, considering the length of the road and the number of people who travel on it.

Mention was made of a large number of attractive areas along the road which would attract tourists. One of the things not mentioned, and which is very well known in our area, is the legend of the Lost Lemon Mine. If tourists were informed about the Lost Lemon Mine, it might be attractive to them. They might spend more time on the road and might someday find enough to pay for their trip. I say 'might' because it is true that it has been searched for a long period of time and supposedly, no one except those who died ever found anything. They did not tell us the story of where they found it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Did they find peace?

MR. BENOIT:

The hon. member says, "Did they find peace?" Really, this is why most people go on the Kananaskis road, to look for peace.

Something else I noted in one of the comments made is that you have access to the Kananaskis road through Nanton via the Chain Lakes. I suggest to anyone who wants to take a shorter route to Nanton that you can go through Williams Coulee. It's quite a bit shorter to get to the Kananaskis then going by way of Chain Lakes. Nevertheless the scenery is nice on the Chain Lakes road too. I think that they don't need too many more visitors in the Chain Lakes area than they are getting now. The Chain Lakes area is crowded every weekend with city dwellers coming particularly from the beautiful city of Calgary. However with the new parks being established there now, I suppose that will cut down some of the traffic to Chain Lakes.

Mr. Speaker, I'm primarily concerned when we talk about the Kananaskis road and particularly in conjunction with the proposed amendment, that we give the amendment serious consideration. In the Kananaskis road we have a road being used now for the hauling of natural resources and for a certain number of industrial purposes. Let us keep in mind that main purpose of the Kananaskis road. In the first instance it was built by the forestry department for the purpose of protection against fire hazards or destroying the fire hazards so far as the forest area is concerned. It has been upgraded and utilized by so many people, even though it is still used at the risk of the people who travel on it, and this is made plain as you enter onto it. Nevertheless the fact remains that people forget that aspect of it and they travel on it as if it were a regular tourist road.

I'm not averse in any way, shape or form, Mr. Speaker, to the upgrading of the Kananaskis road. If I understood the Minister of Highways properly, it was intended to make a large increase on the upgrading of the first portion from Seebe for 12 miles and then that there would be a moratorium on the upgrading of the remainder, and if it were upgraded it would be to a lower standard than -- the minister shakes his head. I wanted to say that the first portion of the road from Seebe, the portion that is being upgraded now was probably the poorest portion.

But anything that would increase the speed in excess of 50 miles per hour, or would utilize more territory than is necessary for the existence of the present road would not be totally acceptable because this is truly a haven for

tourists who want to see our mountain country in its natural state. There is no road in Alberta that takes us through more beautiful parts of the Rocky Mountains than that portion from Seebe to Coleman. Many people who have travelled from Calgary to Jasper via Banff have said how beautiful the scenery was. But once they had travelled on the road from Seebe to Coleman they said that there was nothing in the Banff-Jasper area, Lake Louise, or the Icefields area that could compare with that portion between Seebe and Coleman. I firmly believe what they say, having traversed both areas myself many times. I feel very keenly that the Kananaskis road is one of the most beautiful spots not only in Alberta, but in all of the world.

Those who travel at high speeds on hard-surfaced roads through this area are sure to miss some of the beauty spots. No one should be going through an area of this nature who doesn't really want to take the time to give it a thorough going-over. It is not intended as a short cut. Hopefully it never will be. There is another road that travels approximately 25 miles east of that, now commonly known in our area as the Happy Valley road. It now has a highway number but people are not aware of it. It goes from Longview to Lundbreck and that is the road that could take the traffic off the main No. 2 highway. But the Kananaskis road, I believe, should always be preserved strictly as a tourist road, which supplies not only the scenery, but even now many facilities for the comfort of those who are travelling there, and want to stay overnight.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse the proposed amendment to the resolution. I suggest that the highway should definitely stay -- well, that is in the resolution -- at 50 miles per hour, but that it should be upgraded to assure safe recreational access for Alberta citizens. In upgrading, I want to draw the attention of the Speaker and the House to a statement that was made by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek when this motion was debated previously in this House. He pointed out that the climatic changes and the conditions at those high altitudes provide rain, snow, ice, heat, drought -- all in the same day probably, especially if you travel the length of the road. In the highest portion of the road snow never disappears. In the middle of summer you can step off the road and jump into a snowbank. If the day is warm enough, you can have a snowball fight, and if it isn't, why, the snow is still powder.

Under those conditions, I firmly believe that some kind of dustproof gravel road would be much safer than a hard-surfaced road. For many times in the year, between the rain and ice the hard-surfaced road would be bound to be dangerous. The ditches are deep and in some places you travel along the mountainsides. It would be very dangerous, require a great deal of railing protection and even then wouldn't be safe.

So, Mr. Speaker, in seconding the amendment to the motion, I want to say that I agree with it so far as the upgrading of the road is concerned, except that I do not agree that it should be a hard-surfaced road, but a dustproof road. I don't think it should be widened any more than necessary for safety's sake. It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that it ought not to be straightened out and a lot more of the territory there that can be used should be utilized for natural habitat and so on. It is enough that it should be upgraded to safety measures and they can continue to use the road that currently exists travelling at safe speeds, 30 and 40 miles an hour if necessary, and not necessarily the full limit of 50 miles per hour the resolution calls for.

Finally, with regard to the matter of the heavy industrial equipment and the area where this equipment is already being used, Mr. Speaker, I think that probably not only in this area but in some other areas, where it is necessary that access roads come on to the Kananaskis road that the Kananaskis road should be prepared accordingly. A great deal of the viability of the area and even some of the attraction to the tourists depends on the natural resources being developed in the area of the Kananaskis road. Much heavy equipment with regard to oil drilling and this type of thing is being used in that area, and if the road is not built to stand up to that type of equipment it will break down and become rough.

Mr. Speaker, may I leave it with this. So far as I am concerned, in seconding the amendment to the motion, I favour the amendment, the low speed, the upgrading of the road, taking into consideration the needs for the industrial development in those areas where the road goes through such developments. Thank you.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, my only hope is that this road is designed and constructed with consideration for the safety of the people who drive upon it getting a

useful return on the investment, both by the amount of public use by Albertans and from tourist dollars used to attract from the point of view of getting a useful return on the investment, both by the amount of public use by Albertans and from tourist's dollars through its use to attract tourists. But it doesn't spoil the beautiful Kananaskis valley or any of the other areas through which it goes, as far north eventually as Nordegg. It makes access possible to the eastern Rockies in summer and in winter. I have some misgivings about the insertion in the amendment of upgrading for heavy industrial use in the Coleman area, even if that use does presently exist. I would be against anything which encourages a growth of heavy industrial use.

That doesn't mean to say that I am not wholly in accord with the rest of the motion that the amenders have left; that there should be a maximum limit of 50 miles an hour, but that the road be designed to the present high standards contemplated by the Minister of Highways.

The emotional, environmental fanatics who have opposed any upgrading of this road in a sensible way really do more damage to the environment and do more harm than anything contemplated by the hon. Minister of Highways. I believe this criticism has been misplaced and ill-informed.

What are the main considerations for this road? First of all, I think one should recognize in all honesty it was a far-sighted move by the former government to open up this forestry road at all, the road that runs north from Coleman, through this beautiful area of the eastern Rockies, making accessible to Albertans and visitors to Alberta all the beautiful scenery of this valley. But the road, as it was built, could only have been the first step because it is an extremely dangerous road in winter. I have one young fellow who lives in my riding who now has only one arm, because the vehicle in which he was riding overturned on this particular road.

I was one of the early enthusiasts for the Snow Ridge ski resort. Fortunately, I didn't invest any money in it, but I was an enthusiast from the point of view of liking to ski there. The snow conditions are quite good, even though the tows and the chair may have been placed at slightly the wrong angle. They could easily be adjusted. An enormous amount of money was invested in this ski resort by self-starting Alberta entrepreneurs who were the type who have really built this province.

Mr. Bullock of Okanagan Helicopters suffered a lot of financial pain from the failure of this particular enterprise, but we must recognize that it's people like him who have been prepared to gamble that built this province. Snow Ridge failed because the skiers every weekend could see the cars that had skidded off the road into the ditch. That 40 miles south from Fort Chiniquay was just too dangerous for people to take weekend after weekend. The cars in the ditch turned out to be a deterrent for the ski resort and it had to close down because of financial pressures. Even when it was offered at a reasonable fire sale price by the Industrial Development Bank, which had recently foreclosed on it, there were no takers. This great fortress of a building sits there in this beautiful valley in splendid isolation gradually deteriorating -- cracks appearing in the concrete, the windows broken and so on.

A road would have made all the difference, a decent road which would have allowed skiers and others, summer visitors as well, to drive safely into this beautiful area.

If the road is built to the substandard recommendations of the environmental fanatics there will be more cars in the ditch. Tourists are recognized as notorious rubbernecks. They like to stop and look at the beautiful scenery, and why shouldn't they? But every time they stop on a substandard road without any shoulders this is a danger to the people who come behind them.

The substandard road winds so much that many of the curves are blind. It is crazy to think that in 1973 anybody would recommend to engineers that such a road should be perpetuated. It was a pioneer road in the beginning and I give the former government full credit for building it, but the time has come now to upgrade it to modern standards.

If the objectives of the government to promote and encourage the tourist industry in Alberta toward providing more jobs for Albertans are achieved, we can expect there will be many trailers and camper trucks moving along a tourist road such as this. Without a proper width and without proper shoulders the road will be hazardous from this point of view too.

Just within the last two weeks I was present as part of my duties with the government at a conference with members of the Canadian Youth Hostel Association. These young men are the real outdoor types for whom I have profound admiration. They're not the problem youth; they're the ones who hike, cycle, camp in the wilderness and love the outdoors. In particular they stressed that from their point of view they want this Kananaskis road built to sensible standards because they want to use the shoulders for cycling. We must recognize that in the last three years, since the introduction of reasonably priced ten speed bikes, there has been a huge increase in the popularity of cycling.

Going back again to the use of this road in the winter, if the snow can't be removed and put on to adequate shoulders it will remain dangerous however good the surface or the base. You must have reasonable shoulders to accumulate the snow shovelled off by the plows. If you don't, then of course the big chunks of snow and ice cause more damage to the environment than is caused by a proper shoulder, properly landscaped.

The next point about a substandard road is that -- I think I have mentioned this -- there would be too many sharp curves which would be extremely dangerous under ice conditions in winter. You must have shoulders, you must have a proper curve and you must have adequate drainage and runoff. There is nothing obnoxious or harmful to the eyes of lovers of beauty about a properly built road that has well-landscaped shoulders.

The road running from Eisenhower Junction down to Radium must have been an extremely difficult road to build, but it was built to reasonably high standards. I certainly agree with the low speed limit, but that has nothing to do with the standards of construction of the road.

The benefits of tourism to the province have been stressed many times in this House in the last 18 months. We all recognize that however hard we try there are difficulties to be overcome in obtaining secondary industry for a landlocked province such as Alberta. But the tourist dollar is comparatively easy to obtain. All it requires is a little promotion and encouragement, and facilities to give access to our beautiful Rocky Mountains. The tourist dollar is clean and it comes in with minimum outlay, minimum cost, by the person who is seeking it. It provides employment and it doesn't really harm the resource it exploits, namely the resource of scenery.

Also, it is only fair that all Albertans should be given access to the beautiful province in which they live. Many of them, perhaps because of lack of road facilities when they get into the eastern slopes of the Rockies, have only read about or seen pictures of the beautiful outdoors which is theirs to enjoy, the beautiful and blessed land in which they live. If the roads go in there then it gives access to take-off points from which they can walk, fish, even stand and stare so long as the road is wide enough to allow them to draw their vehicles off the highway.

As the hon. Member for Highwood says, there are all sorts of beautiful spots along that forestry road. The Chain Lakes of which he is properly proud coming from Nanton, the Highwood River, the Upper Reaches, Picklejar Creek, Savannah Creek, all that Grande Coulee valley north of Cochrane, right up to the Clearwater river, right down to the Livingstone Range. It is probably the most beautiful area we have in a beautiful province.

So I conclude by saying that I support the main motion. I have some doubts about the amendment although I realize that if there is some industrial use providing employment in the Coleman area it must continue, but I don't like the wording because it seems to me to tend to encourage a proliferation of that use.

I conclude by saying this, that after the speech by the hon. Member for Highwood, I have really obtained a little bit of knowledge. I didn't realize that the Lost Lemon Mine was named after him.

MR. BENOIT:

It was named before me.

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, speaking to both the motion and the amendment to the motion, I noticed by reading back on --

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I believe that only the mover and the seconder of an amendment can speak to both, but an average member cannot speak to anything but the amendment. He has to restrict his remarks to the amendment only.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The point is well raised and I am sure the hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona intends to speak to the amendment.

MR. KOZIAK:

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that that would then afford me an opportunity to speak again on the main motion once we have voted on the amendment. I would like to thank the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View for bringing that particular rule to my attention as it doubles my ability to speak on the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Mr. Speaker, we always want to give ability an opportunity. Would the hon. member go ahead?

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, in looking back at Hansard for Tuesday, March 6, 1973, the occasion on which the original motion was first moved, I noticed that the mover of the motion, Mr. Lee, who is not with us this afternoon, challenged me to speak in regard to this matter. The challenge arises from a trip which I took on this particular Kananaskis road last summer. I think perhaps I should take up the challenge and impart some of my impressions of my little trip through the Kananaskis road on August 19, 1972. I remember that date well and as I proceed with my contribution to the debate the reason for that will seem clear.

This was the last few days of a holiday which I was spending with my family, Mr. Speaker. We had purchased a trailer that summer and felt that this would give us an ideal opportunity to see more of the Alberta that is talked about so often in this Legislature Building. We had spent some time in Waterton on the last leg of our journey and I had suggested to my wife that we take the tour through the Kananaskis road back to Calgary and then up to Edmonton, rather than the normal well-developed highways that were available for the tourists. She viewed this with a little bit of alarm but finally agreed.

We reached Coleman and I recall filling up the gas tank at a service station, I believe it was an Esso station, but right next to the service station was a little store which served ice cream and that was probably the first mistake on my trip. They sold the largest ice cream cones for ten cents I had ever seen. I, having purchased one, found out that each of my five children also wished such an ice cream cone.

We commenced our trip from Coleman along a fairly dusty road, each savouring, as I say, one of the largest ice cream cones I have seen for ten cents. About three or four miles along our trip we found that none of us could complete our cones and that was the first unscheduled stop along the Kananaskis corridor road.

From then on, Mr. Speaker, things slowly progressed in the wrong direction. We came upon -- I don't know whether it was a lumber truck or a coal truck or what it was because we couldn't see it. It was ahead of us somewhere. It raised a cloud of dust. We followed it for about 30 or 40 miles and never really did get a good glimpse of it. We knew it was there because it created this great big storm of dust but we couldn't do anything about it.

We stopped approximately half way. I believe there is a little service station and a store half way between Coleman and Seebe where I picked up a large box of aspirin. By this time with five screaming children and a wife who wasn't extremely happy I needed the aspirin quite badly.

That part of the road was extremely well preserved, the first half I might say, from the south going north. It was from that stop going north that I really ran into some bad road, Mr. Speaker. At one point the brakes on the trailer were torn out by rocks on the road. I recall having to almost bring my vehicle, automobile and trailer, to a complete stop to avoid certain potholes in the road. I imagine the scenery was beautiful and on occasions it was. But the dust prevented my enjoyment of it.

Five and a half hours after our trip commenced we reached Highway No. 1 and said our prayers. As I say, we immediately stopped on occasion when the road permitted it and my wife decided to enter the trailer for some reason or other. I recall this, as I say, being August 19 because that was our eleventh wedding anniversary.

When she opened the door to the trailer I thought that was going to be our last wedding anniversary.

It was completely covered with dust, Mr. Speaker. The can of hot chocolate had been opened and it was no longer brown, it was grey -- everything completely covered with dust. It took about six hours that evening to clean up before we could go to bed. So I remember that trip through the Kananaskis, Mr. Speaker.

As a result I must say that I congratulate both the mover and the seconder for bringing forth a motion which would see this road paved. I must also agree to a certain extent with the amendment that has been raised which supports the upgrading of the Kananaskis road, so as to avoid for future couples who will be taking the same route the same matrimonial difficulties in which I found myself.

The hon. Member for Highwood suggested that this wasn't the worst road in Alberta or the worst road in Canada. Perhaps on occasion it isn't, but on the occasion on which I travelled through it, it was. I have travelled on the Hansen Lake road through Saskatchewan up to Flin Flon which was sometimes called the road to resources -- 240 miles of gravel -- and that was a dream in comparison to this road. The road over by Spirit River, again that's a dream in comparison to this Kananaskis corridor road.

I think we have to look at these roads and analyse the costs of poor roads. We know that the volume of usage on this Kananaskis corridor is increasing steadily. If we take that into account and weigh it against the fact that the road is definitely a poor road, we can see the results. There will be motor vehicle accidents, on which subject the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill has already elaborated. That is going to result in property damage, injuries to occupants of the motor vehicles, and in all likelihood, the death of some of the occupants.

Consider, Mr. Speaker, what would happen if, as a result of a motor vehicle collision on this Kananaskis corridor road, a \$100,000 claim was successfully brought in the courts. A \$100,000 claim is not an unusual claim and a \$100,000 judgment is not an unusual judgment any longer in the courts of the Province of Alberta. That means that if \$100,000 were paid, 2,000 insurance policy holders would have to contribute \$50 each toward that one claim. That goes a long way toward increasing insurance premiums on motor vehicle accident contracts.

Now the monetary aspect, of course, is insignificant when you compare it to the loss of life. Mr. Speaker, we have examples of roads in this province which have been referred to as "death roads". I recall Highway No. 2 between Edmonton and Nisku as having had that particular nomenclature until such time as it was properly upgraded and designed to proper, safe specifications.

Sections of the road travelling west from Edmonton to Edson and from Edson to Jasper are now being referred to as "death road". We all experienced the loss of a good friend on that particular road.

There are some, Mr. Speaker, who suggest that we don't even pave the road, let alone upgrade it. I think, in considering those objections and in considering that particular point of view, we have to look at the Province of Alberta as a whole.

We have, in the province, 255,285 square miles. Of that, over 10 per cent has now been dedicated to federal parks, taken out of normal usage with the particular designations and with the particular restrictions as to use provided for in federal legislation. Thirty five per cent of the province, approximately, is in the hands of private individuals and is used primarily for agricultural purposes. The remaining 55 per cent is in the hands of the Crown in the right of the Province of Alberta. Included in this 55 per cent are minor amounts of grazing leases, but to all intents and purposes almost all the Crown lands owned by the Province of Alberta are, in fact, wilderness areas. Some of them have already been designated as such under the wilderness areas Acts, such as The Siffleur Wilderness area, the Whitegoat Wilderness area, and the Ghost River Wilderness area. So we have a situation where, I would say, at least 125,000 square miles of this province are in that particular category.

The Kananaskis corridor represents approximately 2,500 square miles. The road that would be going through this would be an insignificant portion of that

2,500 square miles. When we consider the effect of a small road running through the corridor of the Kananaskis and compare that with the lake, I believe it is Williston Lake, that has been built behind the Bennett Dam in British Columbia, a lake which now I understand covers more than 1,600 square miles, the comparison is basically non-existent. In the one case a lake completely takes out of use the particular corridor that backs up behind the Bennett Dam. In this case we have a small road and an insignificant portion of the whole valley being provided so that the people of Alberta and visitors to the Province of Alberta can better enjoy that valley and corridor.

I think that we must consider our particular position and determine whether nature is something that man must enjoy or something man must revere and adore like a god.

Comments which have been brought to my attention by Michael Collins in an article to The Journal and I would like to quote from one paragraph:

Extreme notions of nature's functions stem, I think, from a misunderstanding. Some like to believe the hinterland has a role and a value in itself, apart from mankind. This is scarcely so. Nature, surely, is not to be worshipped; rather, it exists to serve humanity. Without people to use and enjoy it, the great outdoors might just as well fold up and steal away.

A mountain in the Rockies, what's the aesthetic point to it unless access allows the hardy to test their courage on its slopes with ski and toboggan? The most noble landscape counts only when people can get close enough to gape at it. For it cannot admire itself? Neither can gophers.

Now I'm convinced that a road of proper specifications throughout the Kananaskis corridor is necessary for its proper enjoyment. The question that must be considered is whether or not the 50 miles per hour used in the motion and the amendment to the motion will satisfy that requirement.

My understanding of a road built to 50 miles per hour specifications is that the road contains two travelling lanes, but no provisions for parking lanes, no second lane on hills and does not contain the same gentleness in curves as does a road built to a higher speed specification. Now this is extremely important in an area such as the Kananaskis corridor.

Being designated a recreational area you can expect first, as the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill has dealt with adequately in his remarks in this debate, tourists who are going to be stopping and gazing. They are going to be seeing animals; they are going to be seeing scenery that at a particular moment impresses them; they'll want to stop and take a look at it. If no provision is made for them to park their vehicle safely, then a real hazard is created, not only for vehicles following, but for oncoming vehicles.

Considering also this being designated a recreational area, people will probably be travelling in the area with trailers, campers and what have you. This will mean vehicles that normally travel at a somewhat slower rate of speed than a vehicle not pulling a heavier load or carrying some heavier object. Again when we face steep hills these vehicles will usually impede traffic unless provision is made for such vehicles to pull over and travel along at a slower rate of speed permitting vehicles travelling at a faster rate of speed to overtake them.

What happens when the tourist or the traveller suffers the misfortune of a flat tire, engine trouble or some other motor mishap? Where is he to effect repairs? Where is he to leave his car while he perhaps goes for a new tire, some part or some gasoline? Unless a parking lane is provided, again a great danger is created for all those who follow and also for the oncoming traffic.

So, Mr. Speaker, not only is a road necessary in this area, but a road built to proper specifications is necessary. It should be one that is not going to cost more to maintain because it was built to proper specifications and one that will not create great human and financial costs as a result of dangers inherent in a road which was built to specifications below those required for the area.

I don't quarrel at all with maintaining a maximum speed of 50 miles per hour. That is perfectly satisfactory to me, Mr. Speaker. But a speed limit of 50 miles per hour on a road built to proper specifications is a different matter from a road which is built to 50 miles per hour maximum specifications. A great deal of difference lies between those two types of roads.

My brief, Mr. Speaker, is for a road with a 50 miles per hour speed limitation, a legal speed limitation, but a road which does not create dangers by reason of having been improperly designed in the first place to lower specifications than would be required.

If we consider this matter in its proper context, Mr. Speaker, we must say that the lives of men are more important than nature itself. Because if our society is moving in the direction where we are going to bow down, adore, venerate and worship nature to the point where nature becomes more important than lives, to the point where we are prepared to build something substandard which we know will result in the loss of life strictly in order to venerate, honour and adore nature, then our society is moving in the wrong direction.

Mr. Speaker, my brief and my contribution to the amendment on this debate is that man is much more important than nature. The two can live in harmony, but man is still the important being on this planet. When we consider the construction of this road, the most important consideration we can possibly take into account is the safety of man when using that road.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the amendment I must state that as I listen to the hon. members speak I am certainly aware that they do make contradictions, perhaps unknowingly, in their statements.

First of all, they are all in favour of putting a good, wide, paved road through. But they also say that they would like to leave that country intact. We are looking at about 1,500,000 acres or more of fairly nice country, not really used too much by man, although there are roads, trails and perhaps even some industries that most people are not aware of. But when you look at opening up the area by way of a paved road, you are inviting intensive public use of that area. I am saying that is something disastrous, but is that what we are advocating? Is that what we understand will happen to that part of the province when you get that road through?

People are always looking for places to go, places away from intensive public use, places where they can perhaps have a little bit of this province all to themselves, at least for part of the day. That's why they hike, that's why they go on horseback rides, that's why they buy four-wheel drives or trail bikes -- to get away from everybody into wilderness country, explore it and enjoy its beauty.

But once you open up the area by paved road, then the circumstances change. Instead of hundreds you have thousands. You invite people to go there. I doubt whether anybody here really knows what the end will be with this kind of development. When you open up 50, 80 or 90 miles of paved road into a beautiful part of the country where there are three major lakes and numerous streams, tremendous trails, several mountain lakes, then you are really inviting the people to come and use that country.

But there are areas like that in Alberta now that are very intensively used. You are looking at the three national parks which perhaps represent more park area per Albertan than any other province may have for its whole population. And so we are wondering whether we need to open up what is relatively virgin territory to intensive public use.

The hon. member who just spoke mentioned that cars will need to be repaired. That's true. They will need to be serviced. You need service stations. When people go there in large numbers they will want to buy food and so you will start with perhaps some drive-in type of establishments, but eventually when people go there for weekends or for a week's holiday they will want to stop in a motel.

This is just the beginning of the development of this area. Eventually it will become commercialized, not because of industries such as mining or logging, but it will become commercialized in the manner of Banff or Jasper or Waterton Lakes, because you will have all this population, all this tourist attraction, and they will require services. Naturally, in a free enterprise economy these things will be provided. So the development is, as far as one can predict, that we will have a wide open kind of country with tourist facilities intensively used by the public.

The Minister of Highways is smiling now but the Minister of Consumer Affairs has indicated that already there have been proposals made for developing tourist facilities in this area. I'm not saying that this is all that bad. But why don't we face the fact that we are opening up this country and once we have

done that, once we have built the road or the highway, the whole thing is irrevocable. You cannot reverse what you have done, unless you then state that you can only travel by permit and only for one or two nights of camping.

But I foresee that we are going to have campgrounds, camping facilities, motels, hotels, eventually drinking establishments, perhaps boat servicing facilities, service stations and that will be the end of the Kananaskis valley as you now know it. So we have to take a stand as to whether we favour this or whether we don't.

Now I know that road wasn't very good. I've travelled it on numerous occasions, and sometimes it is impossible when you get a flash storm or you get a snowstorm early or late in the spring, so that road will never really be a cheap road to operate. If you open it up to winter traffic you will have a tremendous maintenance expense in keeping it open.

The amusing part about this development -- and it should be to the present Minister of Highways -- is that I recall a picture of him and the hon. Premier in one of the papers looking at a very thin road. It looked like a quarry road on one of the hills in the Kananaskis area and there was just a little strip of road you could see near the horizon. They were pointing to it and the impression was created that this country was being desecrated by the 'then' government. It's an interesting thing to recall.

The hon. minister says right, but now that he is really going to shove it through he is going to knife this area with a major highway with many side roads, with many opportunities for development, commercial developments.

But this is different because this is now the 'now' government doing it and I submit that the minister, notwithstanding that I did get the impression on several occasions that his vision is rather limited so far as judgment is concerned, really hasn't a clue as to what is the ultimate end of this area once you put a road through, a major road. I'm not talking about a road that some people will take, but once you invite the public into major intensive use of this area, then the country will never be the same. It will then be intensively used. It will be crowded. It will be sought after, not only by Albertans but by tourists and that is the future of this area if you build this road.

I am still not saying this is all wrong except that we mustn't talk on both sides of the fence as it were. We must decide whether we want to preserve this country for as long as we can, in its present state or whether we want to open it to the public, make it wide open, build roads, build side roads, build commercial establishments, hotels et cetera, and eventually we will not have this country, this 1,500,000 acres, as beautiful and perhaps as untouched as it is today.

People who want to go into the wilderness can still go. They can ride, they can cycle in, they can use tote goats, trail bikes, jeeps, automobiles, but walking is still a good way to get off the main road, the dusty road as it is now, and see the beauty of this country. All you have to do is cross one hill. You get on top of the hill and you can see the whole valley.

But now this is going to become a highway with lots of automobiles and the problems that automobiles bring, and so I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that the minister is thinking only about the road as a nice road through the country. That is only the beginning. That is the least of the problems. It's what happens after that that is concerns a lot of people, a lot of outdoors people, and I do not believe that just because a person should take up the cause of maintaining wilderness areas in as natural a state as possible that they are either emotional or environmental fanatics. Because you have to become concerned and take a stand on these matters either for or against.

So one can hardly say that because a man or a person is concerned about the wilderness, about preserving the environment he is thereby a fanatic, particularly because he may be a little more adamant and persistent in defending or advocating what he believes.

Now I agree that road was not a good road. It was a dusty road when the weather was dry but that could be remedied without having to put a major road through. You can always use some chemicals or you can oil the road. I also favour that this road be graded and maintained more and some of the potholes filled up with gravel or whatever can best be used to fill these holes, and then you would have perhaps safer use of the highway.

But when we talk about safety of the highways, it is not unknown for the better highways to have fatal accidents on them. With proper patrol and proper

maintenance, built to high standards and specifications, it still requires care in keeping with the circumstances under which you are driving. I believe the accident rate and the fatality rate on the Kananaskis road from Fort Chiniki to past the Kananaskis lakes and towards Coleman is very low.

So we have to take a stand on this matter, whether we support the opening up of this country. My position is that I do not believe we should accelerate this development even though there is considerable use of the territory by people at the present time. We should not create a wide-open Kananaskis, knife through with a good highway, trucks, trailers and the pollution that is attendant upon intensive use by the public.

It would be different if they argued in this House that we are in desperate need of some park facilities, some tourist facilities. Maybe we could always use more. Maybe we should provide more accommodation in the areas we have that are wide-open now. Perhaps it would not have hurt even the national parks as much with providing more tourist accommodation as it will to get into this area. Before you know it you will not be able to come to a lake and rest awhile as a hiker because it is crowded out with motorboats, with exhaust smell, with people crowding the lake, littering the area, or in fact, camping all over the place.

So we have a choice to make. I believe that most hon. members who spoke have not really visualized the Kananaskis valley as a completely wide-open developed tourist area. It is pretty hard to envisage that area as being such when you look at it now, when you know what it is like, and those members who spoke know it.

I have had the opportunity of travelling in the area on a tote goat; I have flown over the area on several occasions, I have hiked in there; I have used a jeep in that area to get off the main roads, and have hiked into some of the more remote lakes. I have ridden in parts of the Kananaskis area on horseback while hunting and have a fairly good knowledge of what the potential is for that country so far as its being a beautiful attraction for people throughout the province.

But that could not last if you open the country to thousands of people. You will have the same crowded facilities. You would want to get away from it the same way you do now when you get to Banff, when you get to Waterton Lakes, when you get to Jasper Park. When you get to the developed part of those parks you really don't want to stay too long. You want to get away, get on to some place else that is not crowded with people.

So I have no hesitation, Mr. Speaker, in stating that I support the views expressed by the hon. Member for Highwood when he stated we can better maintain this road. We can oil it or use some other chemical to keep the dust down, that is not as great an expense, and keep Kananaskis relatively free from intensive development.

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Those are my few remarks, Mr. Speaker. I am actually surprised that so little concern is expressed in this House about the risk of commercial development of this area in the sense that I spoke of, that is, accommodation development. That would require a lot of space, it would require more of the territory being used up, being converted into commercial territory instead of being wide-open wilderness area. I believe that we will do harm to this country. It is my opinion that as far as the southern part of the province is concerned the minister's judgment to proceed with the road has been made in spite of talk from the government that it will be holding hearings and that the use of the valley will be discussed through hearings which are still to be conducted. He has already started and there is no stopping him notwithstanding that I don't believe he knows what the ultimate development in this area will be. As I have stated, you cannot forecast the pressures that will be brought to bear upon this area once the road is made.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am on record as opposing any excessive upgrading to the extent of wide pavement of highway. We could upgrade that area without turning it into a commercial area.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this debate, I am kind of amused by some of the remarks that have been made by the last speaker. Knowing of his knowledge of the area and the amount of time that he spent in it, some of the remarks that he has made are certainly incredible.

Mr. Speaker, my first occasion into the Kananaskis valley --

MR. LUDWIG:

Point of order.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker --

MR. LUDWIG:

Point of order. In view of the fact that the hon. Minister has stated that some of the remarks that I made were incredible, would he be kind enough to at least to pick out one or two of the remarks that I made which weren't credible.

MR. SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order and the hon. minister is entitled to comment using that word. He is not in any way unparliamentary.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View holds his fire and remains in his seat he will find out that some of the remarks he has made are actually incredible. They are.

Quite often, Mr. Speaker, he doesn't remain in any one spot long enough to actually gain the knowledge that would give him some constructive ability to put forth the types of argument that would be credible in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed. Agreed.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, the first occasion I entered the Kananaskis Valley was on a day in the fall when I was a young boy on a saddle horse with a pack train. It was following a very high wind and we spent most of the day cutting a route into the Kananaskis lakes through the fallen trees which were blown down by the wind. Naturally that day, Mr. Speaker, it never occurred to me that probably we would be pioneering someday, putting a road in there that would facilitate the use of vehicles or even bring any debate at all in regard to the development of that area.

This was, at that time, between the area of 1932 and 1934. I had to be a bit reminiscent about the stories which the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest told about the fishing in that area. He told quite a fish story that day. Unless you had experienced it in those days, entering the Kananaskis valley and fishing in the Kananaskis River at that time you would believe there could be a lot of truth to his stories of fishing in the Kananaskis valley. You know, Mr. Speaker, the fishing was nearly so good that it was dangerous to bait your hook beside the river because of the consequences of a big fish jumping out and taking you in.

In the short time since then there have been quite a few industries established in the area. One is the hydro development which was developed shortly after that time in the area. It certainly has provided a lot of comfort and convenience to the people of the area including the city of Calgary and all the surrounding towns. I don't think anybody would want to roll back the span of time and prevent that facility and the conveniences it has supplied to the people and the industries and the jobs it has created. Mankind has used his ability and knowledge from time to time to harness some of the natural things that are about him and use them in a constructive way. I suppose this is one of the industries which grew up in that area.

Since that time and following on there was a cabin development. Of course, Mr. Speaker, this was before the present government and perhaps the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View might have some recollection of that when there were in the neighbourhood of 80 cabins developed around Kananaskis Lake. There was also a ski facility put in there and this too provided access and comfort to the people -- and not so much comfort to those who had shares in the facility. They have had considerable financial difficulty in providing access into the area because the area generally has very deep snow.

Also in the area, and I recall this either in 1967 or 1968 three oil leases were negotiated. To my knowledge these leases probably still exist. There was a good deal of seismograph work done in the area. In fact, as I recall, from the day of signing those agreements they could be in force for as long as 16 years, Mr. Speaker, until the companies drop the lease or stop improving up on them. They could be in force for a considerable length of time. I believe, Mr. Speaker, they could be in force for as long as 16 years from the date of their enforcement.

We talk about this kind of development, and the particular line that the now Premier and I were looking at was another one of the permits that were allowed to be negotiated at that time for a mica deposit in the area. With a very small damage clause, the company was allowed to explore and put in a very high mark of damage on a particular mountain. It will take years for that mountain to recover. There were no clauses that made the company go back and do as much as cut the trees bulldozed to the side into small bits so they would return quickly to the soil in nature's way.

However, this all happened during an era when the government, like the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, maybe didn't know too much about the area or the value of the area to the people generally. That, Mr. Speaker, is getting back to some of the incredible things the hon. member has stated and his meagre knowledge of the area.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, there are many little side valleys in the Kananaskis valley. It isn't just one valley. It is a valley of several valleys. Certainly, it could not all be examined on just one drive through it as it is now. The original road put through was really designed to look after the needs of the forestry people, and it still is a forestry road as well, Mr. Speaker. It was done to service and look after the needs of the forest reserves, in the case of a fire as the modernized way of getting equipment to the scene quickly. Being in a high lightning area, there are innumerable fires created from time to time. At that date the road was put there to get the equipment into the area of a fire in a mobile way.

Now, at one time in the forestry service it was entirely serviced by horses and pack trains. But as time went on -- I am not sure now whether there are very many horses in the employ of the forest service at all, maybe not even as many as one. Certainly they use other methods and have developed their forestry trails in such a way that they can probably service the area with fewer men and a greater concentration of patrols than what it used to be. This undoubtedly was found to be efficient and effective in protecting the forests of the eastern slopes. We have also taken a step even further in the application of helicopters, lookouts and a greater concentration now of helicopters and water bombers in order to curtail the fire hazards that are presented from time to time along all of the eastern slopes.

Road 940, as it is designated, is the Forestry Trunk Road and it goes from Grande Prairie down to the southern border of the province. It is a scenic road. As I said, it was first developed to be a forestry road. But it was soon sought out by anybody who had a spare moment of time in which he could afford to enter the area and enjoy it because of its beauty, because of its scenic attraction and good fishing. Consequently although still a forestry road, it is used extensively not only by people from Alberta, but all over North America. As a matter of fact, on some weekends in the past, the Kananaskis Forestry Station has had counts of up to 3,000 cars. That is pretty heavy traffic.

Anybody who knows anything about the effect of cars travelling over a road, particularly a gravel road of this magnitude, will know that the light particles are soon swished away from the road in the cloud of dust and leave only the heavier articles which turn out to be boulders. The more the swishing the bigger the boulders. Finally you end up with a road that some of the hon. members have talked about as being very rough.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this dust doesn't only create a hazard to the people who are travelling and using that particular road, it also creates a problem for the ecologist as well. It is a well known fact that studies done in California in regard to dust pollution show in areas where the dust happened to drift it did affect the growth of plants along the roadsides. It also discourages the use of the fodder by the animals that inhabit the area. It certainly does until such time as the rains or the snows wash that material from the grasses and from the trees in which they eat.

That is only one of the problems that exist in the Kananaskis. When we made the decision to build a road in the area we made very extensive research into the ecology because we knew that it was a beautiful area. We wanted to

develop it in such a way that would enhance the beauty of the area and protect what was left of it. From the day I entered that area in 1932 to this present day there was a lot happening. There wasn't really very much protection for what was there. Sometimes you have to take major surgery in order to protect what is left. It might be said this is really what has happened in this case.

First of all there are a lot of people already in the area; that is factual. There is industry in the area; that is factual. And there is a growing number of people who want to enter the area and why shouldn't they? Alberta and the areas of Alberta are for Albertans. Certainly when we take the Lake Minnewanka area for instance. It's a beautiful area and I don't think there are very many members in this House who haven't gone up and enjoyed that area and the beauties it provides. It isn't everybody who is capable of putting a pack on their back and hiking a great distance anywhere to view these. There are people who are crippled, people who are old and decrepit, who are not able to put a pack on their backs and wander and enjoy some of the beauties of the area that the Kananaskis can afford.

I agree wholeheartedly with the hon. members when they say that the Kananaskis Valley area is probably one of the most beautiful in Alberta. Certainly, when the highway is developed through that area we will be able to enhance that beauty by doing away with the dust clouds so tourists and people who go there can enjoy it. Also, there will not be the hazard of driving through the dust and people will be able to see where they are going. We have designed a road in such a way as to do away with sharp curves and at the same time capture the beauty of the area. The limiting of the speed limit to 50 miles an hour certainly gives everybody a chance to slow down enough to see the area. We have designed it in such a way that it will have a wide roadbed with shoulders, and people who are bicycling can bicycle in safety on the shoulders and enjoy the area.

I think it is unique, Mr. Speaker, that such a design was taken into consideration. The uses we are looking at are in the future. On a day in 1932 when I was in that area it didn't seem that a bicycle or even a tote goat would have been of much use at that time or any time in the future. But because of this facility, on that particular day my brother and myself were probably the only ones in that area. Certainly the building of the trunk road and the development of the highway now will provide many people of all abilities and from all walks of life with the opportunity to move into that area and enjoy the facilities and the beauty that is there.

Hopefully, with the dust subsiding many of the animals, such as we see in other parts of Alberta, will return to be viewed along the roadside. We have designed the road in such a way that the slopes are very gradual. We will be able to establish grass and habitat on those roads. We are collecting very forward information in regard to developing and putting a habitat on the sides of those roads to prevent erosion and provide good sod and seedbed that will prevent washouts from that area, because it is a deep snow area as well, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I notice now that the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View is taking off again --

MR. LUDWIG:

Can you really blame me?

MR. COPITHORNE:

-- instead of staying around and finding out some of the facts. He would prefer to travel with little knowledge. I am being kind, hon. gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, I might also point out that this is a very deep snow area. In most winters the snow is four feet or more in depth. Consequently, there is a lot of maintenance on it.

This is one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why we have to be careful what type of slopes we put into the road. Also the location of the road is important, because there are some snow slide areas which could become very hazardous, not only to the motorists, but also to the general public and the maintenance of those particular roads.

You see, Mr. Speaker, in an area where there is a lot of snow, a lot of moisture, particularly in the winter months -- and you know, Mr. Speaker, winter sports have become very popular in the last few years -- perhaps up until the very recent few years winter sports could have gone for a dime a dozen.

Recently it has been found that there is a lot of recreation and enjoyment in winter sports such as skiing, snowmobiling, cross-country snowshoeing, cross-country skiing, just having barbecues and picnics in the winter time -- a lot of people enjoy this. This was something that wasn't very high on a recreation basis as few as even five years ago. That's how fast we're moving.

It would be folly to start putting a facility in that area which would be obsolete before you finished it with the knowledge that we have of the requirements of people today. It would be an absolute waste of money.

Certainly, in maintaining a road it is very difficult when the road is of gravel, because when you are cleaning the snow off it with the same persistence you would have in a deep snow area such as the Kananaskis, you would be scraping off the fine gravel if there were any left from the summer erosion. And with the narrow base that the old road had -- 18 to 22 feet -- it left very little area for the snow to be piled.

Consequently, with the wider base -- and if the hon. members care to go down through the Kananaskis valley on the first part now being constructed they will find that the right-of-way of 150 feet up to 200 feet -- it depends on where it is at -- that the road is just nicely fitting into it with the gradual slopes that are provided and with the cuts that are being performed in the area of the road hanging on the side of certain hills. Because if you have those cuts and slopes too steep, you are not able, Mr. Speaker, to establish a fauna on the slopes that will hold the mud and the materials from sliding. You will have them so steep that no fauna and shrubs will grow on them. Consequently you have to have them on as gradual a slope as possible.

The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, as I recall, talked in his speech about the short time in which the trees would be starting to grow back onto that right-of-way. Certainly that's an area where Lodgepole pine are found very profusely and almost immediately after any disturbance of the soil in an area where they are native they come back very quickly. I would be very surprised if I returned to that area in 20 years time if there were not a lot of Lodgepole pine growing on the slopes and on the area now being cleared, and has been cleared, for the road right-of-way. This is a natural phenomena that happens and luckily so, because it would be terrible if some of the damage done by man was irreplacable and irreparable forever.

But with careful engineering some of these things we worry about in the initial stages are healed in a little time. Certainly with the advice and with the ability of our knowledgeable ecologists today, the time should even be made shorter because we can use the knowledge of the best kind of plants to establish in the area. With the use of fertilizers we can bring those plants on with an ever greater increasing rate of growth. And I think that when the road is complete we will learn a lot of things about the development of roads in sensitive areas for which people have fondness. We will learn a great deal about how to prepare and develop that road to the highest of standards and yet to the greatest enjoyment of all of the people.

One of the things the hon. members might like to know is that we carried out an archaeology study in this area before we proceeded with the building of the road. One of the reasons for this was because of its proximity to a natural path through the mountains which the Indians have used for many centuries. It is probably high time we were taking a look at some of the natural phenomena that have existed over the years, and of our heritage, and of the culture those people may have left in certain areas.

We carried on our study in that area and I might say, Mr. Speaker, that it is probably the first time anywhere in Canada or North America that such a study has been carried out prior to the development of a facility such as the Kananaskis Highway.

So we have taken some very great steps. There is a tremendous amount of data to start with on the ecology of the area because of the federal government experimental station in that area. Certainly the Eastern Slopes have gathered a lot of information over the years which has been compiled. And we studied some of that. We have used the knowledge of the people at the University of Calgary and we have made some adjustments that would avoid what they felt at that time would be a folly if their advice were not taken seriously. We have done those things and certainly, I think, all people in the province have profited from cooperation with that group.

You are not always able to undertake to the fullest degree some of the recommendations made because you have sometimes to choose between, you might say apples and oranges, which you would sooner have. When you are constructing a

facility which will be used as much as the Kananaskis Highway, you sometimes have to choose between safety and lower standards of construction. Maybe you have to choose between safety, such as in a snowslide area. One of the choices we made was to the highway a little closer -- actually into part of the riverbed of the Kananaskis -- in order to move it out of a perennial snowslide area. This was done to provide a facility that would be safe for the people travelling in the winter time.

I think these things, Mr. Speaker, are of importance and it takes a good deal of understanding, not only from the people who object but those who are trying to do a constructive and good job.

We have taken and tried to have a good understanding of what we are trying to accomplish in the area. We have performed the development of the slopes in such a way that the deep snow in the winter time when it is swathed from the road will not be a problem of any great magnitude when it is put on the sides of the road. And again, this is in the development not only of reasonable maintenance costs, because, Mr. Speaker, when you talk about maintenance costs of such a highway in a deep snow area, this was one of the things that foundered the snow ridge operation probably more than any other single cost of that operation because of the low standard of the road and of the weather conditions that prevail in that area.

I presume that in the future the area will continue to be a deep snow area and although this year it wasn't a deep snow area it was one of the years when you have a phenomenon that we all enjoy. Even here in Edmonton it wasn't a deep snow year nor was it a cold year and the winter was not particularly objectionable. It was a rather pleasant winter and I think many people enjoyed it.

But this isn't always the case. And on those high ridges in the mountains that people enjoy when they go out to ski, when they go out to toboggan or cross-country ski or snowshoe, all of these things have to be taken into consideration. Quite often because of the chinook developments that are in that area, the weather is very mild in those hills even though the snow is deep and makes it an excellent recreational area.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize again that because the road is being built to fairly modern standards, with gradual slopes to look after the run-off in the area, it will only be a 50 mile an hour highway. It will be speed limited to 50 miles an hour in order for the people to enjoy the ecology around them, to enjoy the mountains, the scenery that is going to be available to them.

Those who feel a little more vigorous than car drivers, those who want to bicycle or hike, will have a place to hike. It is a very popular sport today to use one's body in such a way as to get the full enjoyment and feeling of the area. Certainly they won't have to be ducking from rocks or worrying about somebody not seeing them through a cloud of dust when their safety would be in jeopardy.

I think these points are very important. Certainly with the cooperation that we are getting now from the environmentalists, and with the knowledge of the people in the Department of Highways, the Department of Lands and Forests, the Department of Tourism, and with the cooperation that we have from the Department of the Environment, with all these being taken into consideration no road in Canada has ever been built that has had so much input from so many departments of the government. This is probably one of the very first anywhere in the country. Certainly when we have finished building this road I am sure it will be a credit that all people in Alberta will endorse.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment that was made today deals primarily with the portion of the south end of the Kananaskis Highway, the end down by Coleman. Now the part that we are constructing at the present time is at the north end, just south of the TransCanada Highway, a distance of 28 to some odd 30 miles. It is a very minimal area of construction compared to the overall length of highway when you consider its possibility of going from Grande Prairie to Cardston. It's hard for myself or for any hon. member to [envisage] what the needs of the road might be in 10 years.

It might be we won't need the standard of road we have today because we will maybe be travelling on a hydroplane or some other contraption we have not thought of. Now we are living in an age of invention that is hard to foresee all the modes of transportation which might come about, particularly with our concerns of pollution. Being by nature an inventive group of people we will undoubtedly be making some great strides in this area.

So I would like to gather further information before I finish the debate in regard to the hon. member's amendment, with regard to the southern part of the highway. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. minister adjourn debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move we call it 5:30 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree that we now call it 5:30 o'clock.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]