

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Thursday Evening, March 21, 1974

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at 8:00 o'clock.]

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS  
(Second Reading)Bill No. 30 The Wildlife Amendment Act, 1974 (Cont.)

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, at the time of adjournment the Speaker was in the process of shooting down the Buck from Clover Bar. I would just like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I brought the little message that I wanted to bring to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, so we got that settled behind the scenes.

But the point I would like to make to the hon. members, Mr. Speaker, is that in the preservation of habitat and in the increasing of habitat, I would just like the hon. minister in his capacity as minister responsible for lands as well as forests to look at the possibility, in undeveloped areas that are going to be opened for farmland, that maybe X number of feet from the fence line could be saved and not brushed out.

That's about the only point I want to make at this time. The other matter we have settled outside the House.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, in making a few comments with respect to Bill No. 30, I would like to make very strong representation to the minister with respect to some of the upland game that used to exist in east-central Alberta. I am referring now to sharp-tailed grouse.

These last two or three years we have seen the sharp-tailed grouse almost disappear from our community. Very strong representations have been made to the department, to myself and to other individuals to see if it is possible to have a closed season until such time as these birds are back in sufficient number to warrant an open season on them.

I know the minister has had these representations. I don't know what the conditions will be this spring with the amount of snow we have had this last year, but I am convinced that the population certainly won't be very plentiful. I would certainly ask the minister through his department to consider very strongly the feasibility of either keeping the season open or closing the season.

It seems to me that this particular bird needs a certain amount of protection. I think we're well aware of the fact that in the wintertime the sharp-tailed grouse are up on trees and are pretty easy targets in the cold weather. They certainly need all the protection they can get.

Although we have had very strong representation with respect to the pheasant in our area, I think possibly we should also close the season on sharp-tailed grouse.

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, just a few comments I would like to make on Bill No. 30, The Wildlife Amendment Act, 1974, particularly as the minister raised some areas with regard to penalties and enforcement.

In our society nowadays, we so often look at the balance we are faced with in different studies, different expenditures, the environmental preservation. I only hope that somehow we could find a good balance of sufficient people to enforce some of the legislation we have, particularly the wildlife officers.

In my examination of some of the problems the staff of your department has, Mr. Minister, there seems to be just a lack of a number of dedicated people in this field, and possibly dedicated people to enforce the legislation that we bring about in this Legislature.

I know that it takes more than just academic training to become a good and an effective wildlife officer. It also takes a man who is interested in the field - man or woman - and a person who appreciates that there are two sides to it. There is the side that they have to enforce, with reason, to be able to police the wildlife areas against the unscrupulous hunters, and then the ones who need to hunt.

I have found that most of the staff of your department whom I have encountered and spoken with and associated with are dedicated people. Unless we are able to get more of these types of dedicated people in the field to enforce some of the legislation, wildlife is continually going to deplete in our society because, as man moves in, wildlife is depleted. Whether we are the supporters of the society for the preservation of the wolf or the little bear in Calgary or wherever it is, we still need some of these officers to protect them in their own habitat.

The only other area that I really find is of great interest to people whom I have met in both the urban and rural areas are the people who have accepted the - pardon the expression - the Buck for Wildlife, not meaning the hon. Member for Clover Bar. The Buck for Wildlife has a very positive approach, and I have found that the majority of the hunters, in general, have accepted this. Some of the hon. members in this Legislature have mentioned that possibly we shouldn't wait for all these bucks for wildlife to be raised. We should move in and start doing something with these dollars and wait for the bucks to come in. It has some merit because even if you get, say, \$250,000 a year out of the Buck for Wildlife fund - and I may be exaggerating the possibility of the fund - it isn't that much to spread across the province of Alberta.

Other than that, the penalty is a concern to me. I have on several occasions sat in the magistrates court here in Edmonton to observe what some of the violations have been and how some of the penalties were handed out, and to what extent. You know, Mr. Speaker, it's difficult to accept a penalty of, say, even a \$100 fine and the loss of the licence for the rest of the year, when a hunter shoots a Holstein cow or an animal from somebody's farm. Really, in some of these cases my sympathy is with the magistrates who have to dole out these penalties to some of the irresponsible hunters we find in the field. All the education you want is not going to resolve it, because there is always going to be the man who is trigger-happy and he'll shoot the first thing that comes through the bush - it could even be a fellow hunter.

In summary, I only urge that in some way we could get more funds allocated for the preservation of our wildlife, and even in some way to provide more funds for the staff which may be helping out some of the unemployment - to provide the required staff which is so much needed in the field to preserve some of our legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HANSEN:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a couple of comments on Bill No. 30. In my area we haven't got any pheasant, but we used to have lots of sharp-tailed grouse and the ruffed grouse. But during last fall and up until now, with all the driving that I do, I haven't seen one in our area, and I think it's time for a serious look at preserving this species before they have gone out of business altogether.

As far as pheasant, I don't know too much about them, although we did get a little history on their sex life here in this debate, which I was quite interested in. But I would like to make one other suggestion to the minister while I'm on my feet and this is with [regard to] the big game.

We talked about muzzleloaders, the bow and arrow, high-powered rifles. But I think one of the wastes of game is during the early season, and I don't know how we can prevent it as long as we have this early season.

If you talk to the guides, or if you've hunted over the years - I have hunted for some 20 falls - I feel that the biggest loss of actual meat and game is due to the heavy foliage in the fall. Your wounded animal, whether you shoot it with a high-powered rifle or whether you shoot it with a muzzleloader that they were talking about here a while ago, can go 400 or 500 yards, and there's no way that you're going to find it if there are other tracks in the area.

Another thing, in the early season a lot of meat is shot and they can't get it out of the area fast enough to preserve it on account of the high temperatures and flies and everything else.

So these are just a couple of the things I'd like to bring to the minister's attention for him to consider.

Thank you.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, I have on numerous occasions brought to the attention of the Department of Lands and Forests, and to the minister in particular, the lack of game animals in my constituency. I believe that in about four instances I could possibly say why the decline of the moose, elk and deer is occurring in my area.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, we have to try to negotiate with the Native people of Alberta and of Canada, since we cannot by regulation or by legislation prohibit the hunting out of season. I would suggest to the minister that he try to negotiate with the Indian Association and the Metis Association of the province and come to some agreement on the indiscriminate slaughter of our big game that is sometimes occurring. I will quote an incident that I think the minister knows about - maybe the House does not.

This occurred about a month ago, just in the area between Rocky Mountain House and Drayton Valley. There were 14 moose shot, Mr. Speaker. Out of those 14 moose - and pictures were taken, the hides were left and some were taken a few days later - the young, the cow moose, the young moose that were to be born this spring numbered 11. So when you consider 14 moose had been shot and 11 had been taken out by the killing of the female species at that time, the moose population in that area was lessened by 25.

Now I did not know who the culprits were, Mr. Speaker, but I tried in vain on that occasion to find an enforcement officer. I phoned one afternoon and I finally ended up with the deputy minister of that department to try to get hold of an enforcement officer to investigate. The hon. member mentioned the lack of enforcements. It doesn't matter what laws we make in this legislature if we have no enforcement officer to enforce the laws.

I will draw attention to another item where the lack of enforcement officers pertaining to the hunting of big game animals by Natives is also concerned. You can, Mr. Speaker, if you find the right Native person in the fall - and the enforcement officers in that area know it - buy a moose or an elk for \$100.

Now we tried to decoy these Natives out to try to make a purchase, but they are even too smart for that. They can smell a white man and his tricks long before the white man ever even thinks of it.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if we are going to continue the slaughter of our big game animals - and this commences sometime early in September in my area - you can go out any day on Sunday, drive that area, and you can hear hunting as if it was the Vietnamese war or down on the Israeli front. Now surely we should be able to get sufficient men trained to try to protect our wildlife. I am sure the department could allocate some funds so that we can at least train some young people perhaps in a year or two to come out and try to protect the game we have still left.

Mr. Speaker, it only seems reasonable that when we open the season in September, in the time of the rut, these animals are normally stupid. They will run to any noise there is in the bush. Consequently we wound animals, we lose them, and on two occasions - a year ago last summer we went out and we found five animals. You didn't have to drive too far off our forestry road to find where animals had been shot and were in the process of decay.

I can only suggest, Mr. Minister, Mr. Speaker also, that if we are going to try to preserve some of this game we will have to stop the slaughter of the female species of moose, elk and deer. If we don't, Mr. Speaker, we are going to regret it, because I think someday we may be on a select committee, on a draw. The people of Alberta will have to be on a draw basis in order to get a hunting licence to go out and take a game animal. Seriously, Mr. Speaker, I think I've seen that area where there were moose and elk in plenty. Today we have very few. I know that I have argued, Mr. Speaker, with the wildlife officers. They say that there are six per township. I think there are six per six townships. I know they have said at times that the aerial survey shows there are six to one township. Well, there may be, but I couldn't count them from the airplane.

Now I can only emphasize, Mr. Speaker, the change that must come about in the protection of our wildlife in this province. There are two things that must happen. One, we must shorten the season. We must stop shooting our female species, and we must put in more game officers to protect the laws that we enact in this legislature.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, just one or two remarks regarding the principle of Bill No. 30. The basic principle, of course, is the preservation of our wildlife in the province which is a very admirable thing for the minister to be doing. And I am sure, along with the rest of the Legislature, we wish him the best of success.

There is one point I would like to bring up, Mr. Speaker, that I feel the government could take a look at and probably do something about. It is that a lot of these people are running around in half-ton trucks with two or three rifles in a vehicle. I've had complaints that a number of these people, naturally not all of them, but a number of them are quite trigger-happy. And this is the problem in trying to preserve some of our species, because if you have a rifle all ready in your vehicle and you see something that you think would make a good trophy, or whatever else they decide they want to use it for, the temptation is there.

I am wondering if we could have an educational program to discourage people from doing this, to put their guns from their trucks and vehicles into the gun rack until the regular hunting season is on. Now there may be good reasons for some people, but I imagine that less than 10 per cent could justify why they need these rifles with them at all times, running all over our rural roads. If we took a look at that situation, I think that would be one principle which would help in the preservation of game. It would also be fair to the other hunters in Alberta who obey the law and do not hunt until the regular season, which has been authorized by your department, is carried on.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to congratulate the minister for stopping the issuing of wild horse hunting permits. I don't believe there has been a cause that I have mentioned in this legislature that has brought more public reaction and more correspondence than that particular thing. Over my 22 years in this Legislature I have taken up a lot of causes, and I say without hesitation, this particular cause created a great deal of public interest and is continuing to do so.

I wonder if the minister, while he is closing debate on this bill, would enlarge a little further on his plans as far as the wild horse population in Alberta is concerned, because I feel we could even go a step further. Rather than just stopping the permits, I think we have to give them a little added protection, because they are not only being bothered by the people who have actual permits, but also by people who do not have permits. I think we should strengthen the law in that respect. I do, Mr. Minister, congratulate you and your department for that forward step which thousands of Albertans are very much in favour of.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. minister close the debate?

DR. WARRACK:

Thank you Mr. Speaker.

The biggest problem I have, really, Mr. Speaker, is to confine myself timewise to the 19 - I just counted them - pages of notes that I have and, if I may with all due respect say, have mostly nothing to do with the bill. So I know that I am going to have to set some priorities timewise because I think probably most hon. members would prefer that I don't take up the entire 30 minutes, particularly noticing the unkind sensitivity we witnessed this afternoon. In that event I am going to have to leave out a number of people's remarks and set priorities with respect to those which are, in fact, connected with amendments contained in Bill No. 30.

I think I will work backwards, since the weakest presentation to us was made first. I wanted to just comment, only very briefly, on the remarks of the hon. Member for Calgary Millican. While I certainly accept his kind comments, I do want to make sure that two things are clear. The first of these is, in contrast to what was said we are not talking about preservation of wildlife but conservation of wildlife. On some appropriate occasion I would be happy to deliver the whole message on that, but there is a very, very consequential difference in concept. Secondly, with respect to the question of wildlife, and with respect to the subject that occasionally comes up relative to wild horses, it is just fair to recognize that these untamed horses are not wildlife.

With respect to the question of firearms in vehicles and so on, this was the spirit of the resolution sponsored by the hon. Member for Drayton Valley last year, and a very useful debate took place, I think. But if the hon. member will recall there was a very telling counter-argument to the position he takes with respect to firearms in these vehicles. That is in the farm areas, dealing with the predator problems, and please know that that is a serious problem for agricultural producers in the province. They need to

be able to act very, very quickly in order to deal with these predator problems. Also, one of the worst firearm dangers is when a person has to load a gun in a big rush - that's when you tend to shoot yourself. So you're better off if you've got the thing ready to swing into action to deal with the predator problem that you have.

MR. DIXON:

So you agree with me then?

DR. WARRACK:

Either I'm not explaining very well or he isn't listening very well, because I'm disagreeing with the hon. member.

I think, relative to some of the game considerations which were important parts of the resolution brought forward by the Member for Drayton Valley last year, it is important that we recognize some of the points that are made and that we'll probably need at another time, since I don't think it's directly related to the bill, to debate some of these matters.

But there are just two things I did want to respond with. One is, not to over-emphasize hunting beyond its importance to wildlife populations. The conventional wisdom I know, because I hear it all the time, is that hunting is the whole problem. If we had no hunting at all there would be almost no difference in many of the wildlife populations that we have. It may not be music to many people's ears, but it is a fact. So habitat is the key - particularly with respect to the critical times, over winter normally - to wildlife species, and also at the reproductive point in their life cycle. Above all, it's a habitat question with respect to the game populations that can be sustained.

With the exception of the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, everyone seemed to feel we were almost out of game. On the other hand, it's difficult to visualize how you could have a major slaughter of game if there wasn't a relatively abundant number of game to be slaughtered. I will be just as clear as I can in pointing out that the culprits, in terms of the slaughter mentioned, have not been resolved and I'm not prepared to give the slightest indication that it's necessarily Native people who are responsible.

I think the suggestions made by the hon. Member for Bonnyville were very appropriate and along the lines of those of the Member for Drayton Valley. I wanted to take the opportunity to thank the Member for Edmonton Beverly because he has acted, along with two or three other members, as an informal sounding board. This has, from time to time, been a group of people with whom I could discuss some of the problems, particularly in the wildlife enforcement area. I have found this to be very helpful as we've strove towards what has just got to be the primary objective in any kind of enforcement, including wildlife enforcement, and that is the objective of maximizing voluntary citizen compliance. The balanced approach that is necessary and the presence of wildlife officers that is necessary are a part of this, but only a part. It has to be, above all, a voluntary compliance that we seek and that we maximize that voluntary compliance with the staff that we have. I think we have so far - and I've got great hopes for the future - been dealt with rather well in the wildlife enforcement direction in the budget, and I look forward to being able to do an even better job of supplying the wildlife enforcement needs that we clearly have before us.

I might mention also, with respect to the imposition of these penalties, that members have - as I'm sure the hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly referred to - taken note of the change in penalties that is involved in this amendment to The Wildlife Act, relative to both some increase in penalty in a certain area and some discretionary power on the part of the judge, in that the discretion leaves flexible the opportunity to impose equal and fair penalties on a case-by-case comparison.

The hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen again mentioned the upland game problem, sharp-tailed grouse and so forth. I guess I would say this, that in terms of the upland game problem the difficulty of closing it for one species is, in addition to the fact that it may make absolutely no difference at all in the population as I have described earlier, that it piles all of that hunting pressure on the other species and can create, by region and by species, an 'unlivable' amount of hunter-landowner conflict. Then you get a kind of domino effect that leads you towards the direction of having no hunting available for anyone. That really is a serious problem, certainly with respect to the suggestions of game closures. It is difficult, Mr. Speaker, to separate which ones of those are based on purely the concern for the population of the species involved as compared with, in some sense, a second reason or dodge if you like, of trying to keep hunters off the land.

Again, particularly in the instance of sharp-tailed grouse, the key problem is related to habitat, particularly to the mating or reproductive part of the sharp-tailed grouse's habitat life cycle and specifically to the fact that more and more the dancing grounds that are necessary before they will mate and reproduce are starting to be farmed and many of them have disappeared. So regardless of the other habitat that you have, without that

crucial, critical part of it that is part of the mating behaviour, they won't reproduce. That's a habitat problem. I guess it is something like streaking by college students. The sharp-tailed grouse feel they need a little of that in their lives to make them do the other things in life.

[Laughter]

I probably shouldn't have said plural there. I'd have reached everybody.

Actual',, the hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly stole the one humorous thing I did think of. I was going to say that I was delighted that the Member for Clover Bar was here and made it very clear that that Buck is for wildlife. I understood after talking to him Wednesday afternoon that he was going to be home with his doe.

[Laughter]

Seriously, there is something about Thursday nights that does this to a person.

[Laughter]

Really, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member did make a very good point relative to the question of disappearing habitat on roadsides, especially as it pertains to upland game and especially pheasant in southern Alberta. A number of members did mention that and it is an important point because the fact is that some of the area that's being farmed is where they used to live and now can't. So it does make a substantial increment of difference.

Aside from the humorous comments by the Member for Drumheller, with whom I don't dare enter into debate in case I mispronounce a word or two and get into a lot of trouble, I think I'll just talk about the female-male population ratio and be no more descriptive than that because, as I reread Hansard, I couldn't help but laugh quite a bit. In any case, the reason I make this point, and it's a complimentary one as far as I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, is that the Member for Drumheller did make an extremely important point relative to the whole question of female hunting of anything including the ...

[Laughter]

I seem to have a certain amount of empathy for that - but I really am trying to be serious. The member was being serious and the point he makes is serious. I just don't know how to make it without seeming not to be serious. But the point is, first, if you have too many females relative to the male population it has a 'destabilizing' effect on the population of that species of wildlife. So there you forgo something.

Secondly, there is a certain hunting opportunity that is foregone by not hunting when it can in fact improve the population, let alone worsen it. Okay?

In a statement, what the hon. Member for Drumheller said - I tried to reconstruct and admit to total failure - is that it is possible that female hunting can improve the population situation for a wildlife species. Right?

[Laughter]

There are two of us who are managing to keep from laughing on this.

But that really is an extremely important point and it pertains not just to pheasant, which I think the hon. member was referring to, but also pertains to all kinds of wildlife species.

[Laughter]

Mr. Speaker, I don't know why everyone's laughing so hard. Every kind of wildlife I know has both kinds of sexes.

With respect to the comments by the Member for Taber-Warner, it is my understanding - and he might nod or otherwise on this - it is my understanding that the snow cover in far southern Alberta has been less than average this year. So that being the case, it gives us a real important distinction with respect to upland game between real southern Alberta as compared with southern Alberta. I used to think Edmonton was a long way north. But there is a difference between southern Alberta, say south of about the Picture Butte line, if I understand it, where the snowfall has actually been much less than usual, and therefore much better for wildlife habitat in wintering the pheasant over, as compared with the more northerly areas, particularly from Olds north, where the situation has just been really serious with respect to snow cover and the problems that gives pheasant.

I'll not comment further on that, Mr. Speaker, because I think that's of limited relevance to the bill, except for the habitat considerations in Bill No. 30, and I will

have an opportunity to speak more on that matter on one of the resolutions on the Order Paper.

I was going to respond with respect to comments by the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake, but I see he is not here. I was kind of disappointed that even though he commended this particular bill with some congratulation, at the same time he said that he didn't visualize he would ever agree with me again, and I want to know why not. Because if there is something serious, put it on the Order Paper as a resolution and take me on.

The Member for Pincher Creek Crowsnest, as always, Mr. Speaker, made a valuable contribution with respect to game habitat and I noticed that he indicated he has never seen the wildlife population in his area higher in his lifetime. That's a view shared by many close observers of the wildlife scene.

He made a number of suggestions regarding some of the problems that he saw and also made some suggestions with respect to whether or not, in terms of the upland bird problems, habitat should be the only approach or whether or not it was fruitful to pursue a hatchery approach as well. And I think his view contrasted with others on that point. His remarks for all hon. members are certainly worth reading in Hansard.

I want to, at the urging of the Member for Wainwright, pick up the point that was a point of confusion relative to remarks made by the Member for Calgary Foothills. That had to do with this question of road allowances - road allowances in the sense of their coverage within what I had described as the firearms protection package.

The proposed amendment deals with the use of a firearm on or along developed road allowances in counties and municipalities, and that's all. It does not deal with any other road allowance question including the ones referred to by, I think, both the hon. Member for Calgary Foothills and the Member for Calgary Mountain View, with respect to the kinds of road allowances that are really a part of the undeveloped area and it's extremely difficult to tell just where the road allowance is. I want to make it clear we are only talking about developed road allowances in this act, also only talking about them in counties and municipalities, and that, in fact, the other road allowance issue, if you like, is not one that's part of the responsibility of the Department of Lands and Forests.

The remaining outstanding question, I believe, was brought up with respect to the comments of the Member for Wainwright, which had to do with the question of local autonomy. This was a question I had given a good deal of thought to, and it's the reason why we have had extensive discussions with the people of the Rural and Municipal Districts and Counties Association on this question, recognizing, as they do, that they are in a situation where they have by-laws and that it is extremely difficult for them to: (a) advise the public adequately of the by-laws so that the public might voluntarily comply; (b) have the staff that it would take to enforce the by-laws that are unclear to the public; and (c) recognize the chaos that sets in when it's different from municipality to municipality, and therefore simply unfair to the members of the general public. As a consequence of this, we do have a resolution from that association asking that the province consider legislation which would apply a uniform situation across municipalities and counties. I think, really, that we have been able to work that out in an appropriate way and that was well discussed.

The Member for Macleod - I have now discovered the point I had missed, and I want to again assure the member it was not in any way my intention to embarrass him at all. I simply had missed that point and now I've gone back and checked. The point I had missed had to do with the danger of predators, the red fox predator danger that he had pointed out to us. I know there is a fairly, perhaps more than fairly, substantial amount of predation by foxes on pheasant and other upland game going on in that area. This is part of the overall cycle, and more than likely it can be offset rather well with improvements with respect to the habitat for the upland bird game. As a matter of fact, as I believe I did mention in my opening remarks, we are working in the general Lethbridge region with some habitat development for pheasant on road allowances of which we have been able to obtain the use for fish and wildlife habitat purposes. I'm hoping in the near future to be able to take a look at some of this Buck for Wildlife work that we are doing to improve this.

I would like, in response to the comments of the Member for Camrose, to first of all give very considerable recognition and debt of myself, and perhaps other members as well, to some of the considerations and problems he put forward during the course of discussing his private bill last year, and to assure him that those discussions and the points he made are ones that were given considerable attention as we worked towards a system on occupied lands and undeveloped road allowances to protect people in the settlement areas, which was much of the objective of the bill the hon. Member for Camrose had introduced. I wanted to recognize his contribution in that regard.

He, too, mentioned the need for some type of cooperative system, as did the Member for Sedgwick-Coronation, with respect to a farmer-sportsman relationship perhaps in providing space, some habitat, for wildlife development. It's certainly a good idea and we have

been giving some attention and work to it as a part of what we are working on under the Buck for Wildlife program, but it's one of those things that's making only so much progress in a given period of time and we'd all certainly want to make more.

The Member for Camrose also mentioned the point of paid hunting and I did want to make sure everyone recognized that there are instances where this occurs right now, particularly with respect to pheasant hunting. It's certainly possible there could be far more of it than there is now, but I did want to point out there could be more. With regard to the Texas experience that was mentioned, there are two sides to it. I have now heard both sides and the system they have there is far from perfect.

I thought the Member for Stettler made an extremely good and relevant point with respect to how the Buck for Wildlife habitat funds should be used relative to fisheries ponds. If I understand the point correctly - and I hope I do because we had discussed it before and I have discussed it with the wildlife division - the point is that the Buck for Wildlife habitat funds should be used in natural waterways and watercourses rather than in artificial fishponds. I certainly think that's a very good point.

I do note that the Member for Stettler supported the idea of a put-and-take or hatchery approach as at least part of the approach to sustain wildlife populations for upland bird game. I also appreciate his support with respect to the firearms protection package that is proposed in Bill No. 30.

I have mentioned a number of the points effectively covered by the Member for Calgary Foothills, including the one clarification that was outstanding. Certainly I have benefited, and expect to continue to benefit, from the views and the very considerable knowledge that the Member for Calgary Foothills has put together and put forward with respect to upland game, particularly pheasant. I have asked for his help on a number of occasions and am trying out some of the ideas he has had and look forward to doing that further.

I think an important point that was also made was the point of recognizing - I'm not sure whether anyone else actually recognized this point - the point of recognizing the importance of tourism to Alberta and to southern Alberta with respect to upland game. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this particular point was very well pointed out to me and the others who were in my group during the southern Alberta cabinet tour last September in Claresholm by the Claresholm Chamber of Commerce.

The idea, I believe, came first among the speakers on The Wildlife Act amendments from the Member for Calgary Foothills with respect to the use of area farmers, who might be prepared to cooperate as a part of the wildlife habitat effort, and also to urge very strongly, as he quite properly did, both additional hunter training effort - we have made some steps in that direction which I probably should not take the time to outline at this point - and to make the point very strongly for the earliest possible work relative to date and size of the pheasant hatchery at Brooks.

I did want to relate the one point, though, back to the suggestion of the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation with respect to giving out certificates to farmers for allowing the use of their land for wildlife habitat purposes. I just wanted to point out there is some disadvantage to advertising where this is done, because when you do that you immediately attract a lot of people there and you can create a landowner conflict you can't live with. You can also create a situation where you've got an enforcement nightmare to try to keep people off the area that the person who's cooperating as a farmer in the wildlife habitat program really means to hold off from hunting. So there are some possibilities there for some real difficulty.

The one point I very much wanted to refer to, and recognize as a point made by the Member for Highwood, was on the matter of search warrants. I know the instance the hon. member is referring to because we had a case from his area that was a difficult situation. We are removing that section entirely, as the member noted. The reason is that through the years, as I understand the history of that particular section, they were never really able to devise the wording of the section to handle the cases they face both fairly and precisely. The final judgment is that we would be better off to use the same provisions as are used under the Attorney General's provisions. I believe it's the convictions - help, what is it? - The Criminal Investigations Act under which the warrants apply. We think we are going to be able to avoid some of the problems that I know the hon. member is thinking of by going in that direction.

I just can't resist one brief comment further on, relative to the comments of the Member for Sedgewick-Coronation. I also at the same time thank him for the picture he gave me the first year we were in the House and the - I'll be careful again - the iron goose he gave me last year. It was made by a welder in his area and it's something I really prize. But if I heard the member right, he said there is no problem with coyotes. There sure is a problem with coyotes and some of our fellows would be happy to show you around rural Alberta. There is a problem with coyotes.



-----

Lastly, with respect to the comments by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View. Throughout the hazy delivery there were some things that certainly one could agree with. He came very close to actually making a point once, regarding muzzleloaders, but his weak argument was effectively demolished by his colleagues from Sedgewick-Coronation and Pincher Creek-Crowsnest. And, by the way, the contention that muzzleloaders are all single-barrelled is, of course, wrong. A friend of mine has a double-barrelled one.

But above all, I did want to express my appreciation for the highly complimentary remarks the member made about the initiatives of the Department of Lands and Forests, its leadership, and the government in the area of resource management within the responsibility of the Department of Lands and Forests. I am certainly grateful for the glowing candour with which he extended those compliments, Mr. Speaker, and express my appreciation for those complimentary remarks. I find them very encouraging indeed.

MR. LUDWIG:

You can forget about the bears.

DR. WARRACK:

I kept expecting something to happen as I was acknowledging the beautiful graces of the member, Mr. Speaker, and it almost didn't.

With these comments, by way of reaction on the amendments that are contained in Bill No. 30, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move second reading, reading in principle, of Bill No. 30, The Wildlife Amendment Act, 1974.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit a question?

MR. SPEAKER:

I think it would have to be with leave of the House, since the minister's time has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could enlarge on the observation that improving ...

[Interjections]

... Maybe I could ask the question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister enlarge on the observation that improving the habitat would improve the population of upland game, especially in an area where sharp-tailed grouse are almost extinct?

DR. WARRACK:

Well actually, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to be facetious, but if they have nowhere to live, then they're extinct. It is really a question of what habitat there is for them to live in, particularly at the critical time of the life cycle, including the reproductive time of the life cycle, the dancing grounds and so forth that are absolutely critical in the behaviour of the sharp-tailed grouse. Those dimensions of the habitat simply have to be present as a place for the sharp-tailed grouse, or they are not there. Really, wildlife are very much like people inasmuch as they need clean water, clean air, shelter and food in order to survive in a healthy way. That's really what habitat is.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 30 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 33 The Provincial Parks Act, 1974

DR. WARRACK:

Thank you Mr. Speaker.

I wish to move second reading of Bill No. 33, The Provincial Parks Act, 1974.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to very briefly retrace the roots of this act. In looking at the parks policy situation, and with that the parks legislation of the province early during the time of my responsibility, I think it would be fair to say the judgment was

that there was not an adequate specification of provincial parks policy in the province. But in fairness, I would hasten to also add that the interest in parks has increased very dramatically in recent years. So over recent years it has become far more important to have a detailed parks policy than would have ever been the case not too many years ago.

In the course of this assessment, Mr. Speaker, first of all noting that there was a need for a specification of just what provincial parks policy would be, and also noticing that as with any major act that has any length to its life there are revisions that become necessary for clarification purposes and to meet changes that come about in one way and another, when we addressed the question of a plan for provincial parks regarding policy and legislation, the sequence of events went like this. We felt that it was essential to specify a provincial parks policy in as detailed a way as we could, and that legislation should reflect that policy and have that policy built into the legislation. So with the need for specifying a fully new and fresh approach to provincial parks policy, plus the fact that a number of clarification and administrative amendments would be needed in any case to the old parks Act, putting the two together it was our judgment that it was sensible to proceed and do both things at once in an act that would follow up from the parks position paper as we specified it in this House in May of 1973.

Then it boils down to the choice of very substantial revisions of the old parks Act or - and this turned out to be the alternative chosen - to proceed with a full rewrite to a completely new provincial parks act. That's the direction in which we went and Bill No. 33 is that new provincial parks act.

That's a brief outline of the sequence of events that led up to today, Mr. Speaker, with having Bill No. 33, The Provincial Parks Act, 1974, before us. First of all, the matter of parks policy assessment; and secondly, the specification of that policy about ten months ago in the House and an opportunity for public comment during the intervening period of time while the new legislation that we bring before the members at this time was written.

I would like, in this instance of provincial parks policy and legislation, to recognize a similar informal sounding-board committee that was chaired by the Member for Stony Plain, Mr. Purdy. A good deal of the work that went into the parks position paper tabled last year, and therefore that goes into the new legislation this year, came from the work by that informal committee led by the Member for Stony Plain.

Also I'd like to recognize that one of the major, and probably the most major new direction that was a part of provincial parks policy, namely the direction of going where people are with metropolitan provincial parks, stemmed initially from a resolution sponsored by the now Minister of Telephones and Utilities, Mr. Farran, and seconded by the Member for Edmonton Norwood, Mrs. Chichak. I also recall the effective comments made by the Member for Calgary McKnight in this regard, particularly on that new dimension of provincial parks policy going toward metropolitan provincial parks, such as on Fish Creek in Calgary.

The bill we have before us, Bill No. 33, The Provincial Parks Act, 1974, reflects the provincial parks position paper and is meant to be a legislative basis for the implementation of that policy for the immediate future and, with revision through the future as time might require it, to be reflected in future policy of provincial parks by the Government of Alberta, whoever they may be in the future.

There are seven parameters to this provincial parks policy, Mr. Speaker, and since they are the bench mark on which Bill No. 33, The Provincial Parks Act, 1974, is based, I would to review those seven parameters of the provincial parks policy as specified less than a year ago.

The first of these, Mr. Speaker, is that we would go in the direction of expansion of provincial parks and especially in the direction of expanding provincial parks relative to their capability to offer outdoor recreation opportunity to people; not merely to suddenly - at times often related to elections - declare parks that have no planning either physically or financially, but instead to gear our expansion commitment to the kind of commitment it takes to provide the additional outdoor recreational opportunity for Alberta people and their visitors.

The commitment, as a minimum, was to triple the provincial parks' capability to offer that opportunity over three years. We're now going into the second year. Providing for the land acquisition for new park space - and I point out by the way, Mr. Speaker, that though the area is entirely within the city of Calgary, Fish Creek provincial park will be the fifth largest provincial park in the province. That indicates that we have a very large number of parks that are very small. It takes land acquisition to achieve this new park space.

The direction has also been, and we are well into this, to upgrade present provincial parks such as Aspen Beach - a very important and major example - Pembina River and several others that I could mention if it were desired, expanding the outdoor

recreation opportunity that comes about that way. Moreover, it is to take those parks that had been declared with no planning and no budget commitment and develop those undeveloped parks into areas that could offer the recreation opportunity for people in Alberta and visitors to Alberta, recognizing the importance of tourism. So that is the first parameter, Mr. Speaker, the parameter of expanding the provincial parks system in Alberta.

The second policy parameter is that of natural ecology, with a decision that provincial parks should be developed in harmony with their natural attributes and in this way taking the position that the ecological character of these parks is to be emphasized; that the outdoor recreation opportunity, in contrast to more intensive indoor types of recreation development, should be emphasized; that we should preserve - and this is one place along with the wilderness concept, incidentally, where preservation does have a role in a sensible discussion of resource management - a natural setting in perpetuity in the hope, Mr. Speaker, that we might in our lifetimes use the park and leave a natural setting that is even more desirable at the end of our lifetimes, when we are done using it, than it was before. In the course of this it is essential to protect them from mechanized use and certain other intensive developments, and we intend to do that fully on new parks that we might establish. I do recognize that there's some debate with respect to what degree of prohibition we should have.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, it is the policy position regarding provincial parks that parks need to be more accessible to the people of Alberta. Here is where the metropolitan parks come into play and into focus as a part of the provincial parks policy of the government. I've already mentioned Fish Creek in Calgary, and eighteen months from that announcement it is intended to announce a comparable metropolitan provincial park for Edmonton.

We certainly need to take strides, particularly in the metropolitan provincial parks, to recognize that senior citizens and the disadvantaged, economically, physically or mentally, have a special need for access to these parks and that we should, wherever possible, emphasize the opportunity for family outings. Finally, in the involvement of people in the provincial park system, both with respect to location and the development of the parks, we have taken the position that we need to have more public involvement in the planning process of these parks. I think it's well known that the planning advisory committee is at work on the Fish Creek park in Calgary.

Fourthly, Mr. Speaker, is the question of resource development. It is a difficult question in a lot of areas. There are conflicts which need to be resolved. We have resolved some of them already since this policy was issued. We need some of these existing long-standing conflicts resolved, primarily on the basis that if the development versus recreation conflict is substantial, then the reconciliation ought to be in the direction of choosing recreation.

In the instances where the development can occur - in many instances we have, of course, oil and gas developments that are producing within the boundaries of provincial parks - we should have the strictest possible supervision of these operations and of course rigid reclamation requirements for them.

An example of this, Mr. Speaker, is the Big Knife Provincial Park in the constituency of Camrose, where we very recently were able to buy out the coal lease that was there in order to remove the conflict. It was clearly a conflict, because it's a surface mining proposition in that area. We have now removed that conflict so that it stands as a situation where the coal lease does not overlap the boundary with the provincial park anymore. That is a good example of a resource development conflict of long standing that should have been faced up to long before but now has been faced up to and resolved.

We quite boldly, Mr. Speaker, take the position that there is a role for private enterprise in providing outdoor recreation opportunity in Alberta. This ought to be encouraged outside provincial parks as an important potential for rural development, particularly in the areas of intensive capital involvement such as campground facilities that, in many cases, are quite luxurious. In those kinds of instances it seems entirely proper that this be a private development on a commercial basis. These kinds of opportunities are demanded by people. The choice as to where the bulk of these should be supplied should certainly rest in substantial portion with private enterprise.

At the same time, these operations need to be subject to proper health and environmental standards. As the minister responsible for tourism reflected about a week ago, there is a major study underway to help facilitate this kind of development of campsite development and operation for people. This work is going forward, and I think we can look forward to an even better future in that regard.

We are using and intend to use as a part of the work with the private sector, private consultants to a very extensive degree in provincial parks planning.

These are five parameters of the parks policy, Mr. Speaker. The sixth is the position we have taken that we generally need larger provincial parks in Alberta.

I made mention of the fact that most of the provincial parks are small, as witness the fact that Fish Creek will be in fact the fifth largest provincial park in Alberta.

With these small parks - many of them are beautiful - I can say that from having now visited 38 of Alberta's provincial parks personally, and having visited that many, I know we can have a more balanced system by adding for the most part larger parks in the future. So we can end up with a highly balanced outdoor recreation capability that can be offered and have different sizes and different natural settings reflected in the various parks around the province.

But above all, it is clear within this context that more park space is needed. There is a need to emphasize open space. In a lot of our provincial parks there really isn't much open space available. The larger parks ought to be zoned for different recreation uses so we can more closely offer the complete gamut of recreational opportunity within the individual larger parks, and also it opens up some of the other possibilities for innovative, interpretive programs that are certainly needed and very much appreciated in the instances where we're able to provide this. One example where we're able to provide this, as the Member for Bow Valley certainly knows and I think shows a pride in, is the Dinosaur Provincial Park, a beautiful one, that has an outstanding interpretative program. And let me say, Mr. Speaker, that wasn't started by me, that was ongoing at the time I came to this responsibility. It's just excellent and we need more of it.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, a policy parameter that may sound a bit like motherhood, except that you observe it hasn't been getting done. That is the question of integrated planning in provincial parks, including input from the province into national parks policy, recognizing that 70 per cent of the national park space of Canada is in the five national parks located in Alberta. It's my understanding and impression, Mr. Speaker, that up to the last two and a half years, extremely limited, if any, opportunity was taken by this province to make its input. Integrated planning with where the national parks are going and some influence on where they are going is badly needed, as well obviously with other parks, such as the important municipal parks that we have around the province.

Certainly forest reserves and public land management, particularly on the eastern slopes of the Rockies, fits very closely into this and holds it absolutely essential that the integrated planning include considerations of what is offered and what opportunities there are on the eastern slopes.

The historical, cultural and wilderness values can be exemplified and improved in the opportunities that are available to people to enjoy these kinds of values through their provincial parks. In each instance there are some examples of this now. I think we need to emphasize this even more and, as a matter of fact, regard the historical and cultural background of some of these parks we now have and some of the potentials for expansion in the future as indeed a part of their natural setting.

As I have mentioned before, but I would re-emphasize now, we should recognize the importance of tourism in the province and the role that provincial parks play as a feature that attracts tourists to Alberta, not necessarily contending that they would want to stay in provincial parks during the entire course of their visit to Alberta, but that someone might visit the family of one of the members here and be partly attracted to Alberta and make that visit on the basis of the beautiful provincial parks and the provincial parks system and competent management we're striving towards. I think that Bill No. 33, The Provincial Parks Act, gives us an even better opportunity to provide that in the future.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 33, The Provincial Parks Act, is based on the policy, as I have described it, for provincial parks in Alberta that has been presented to this Legislature, and stands as a bench mark from which the legislation sits. Secondly, Bill No. 33 is intended as a basis for future expansion and betterment in all ways that everyone might be able to suggest, including members of the Legislature. I want to assure everyone at this point that we feel entirely open to suggestions now and in the future for all possible ways through which we might make it better, because I know that if there's one thing that all members are together on it is that we want the best possible provincial parks system in Alberta that we can provide.

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View had it, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. minister invites suggestions, I hope I can take him seriously. When I first looked at Bill No. 33 I thought it was a good bill. But the more the minister spoke, the more I wondered whether he probably belongs more in the wilderness than in the parks.

There are some matters in this bill that I think ought to be looked at very seriously and I wonder who talked the minister into putting these in. I am looking at Page 4, Section 2 and it's a principle involved, Mr. Speaker. I don't want to deal with a section because according to my interpretation we can't deal with bills clause-by-clause on second reading. But a principle is involved in this case. It says here,

The Lieutenant Governor in Council may, with respect to parks, make regulations varying, substituting, adding to or making inapplicable thereto the provisions of any of the following Acts or regulations ...

I don't understand how anyone else but the Legislature can make any legislation inapplicable to anything.

I mean, can this be a situation like one we had before, where a minister stated that a certain act in this House was in abeyance? So I believe that is wrong and perhaps the hon. minister ought to be advised whether the Lieutenant Governor in Council may make any legislation inapplicable to anything if it's there, and the minister perhaps ought to look at amendment. But in asking the members of the Legislative Assembly to allow someone to sort of declare an act invalid or not applicable, I believe we are encroaching on the authority that the minister doesn't have. I mean that he is trying to get into this act authority that he ought not to ask for and that perhaps ought not to be given. We may be agreeing that the Lieutenant Governor in Council may in fact repeal certain legislation so far as any other act is concerned. Generally, this has to be done by way of amendment to legislation. So I believe that in that regard I wouldn't agree with this part of the bill at all.

The next problem I see with this bill is on Page 5, Section 11.

The Minister may by order

(a) close all or any part of a park for such periods as he considers necessary ...

That's a pretty broad power. I believe that he should outline in a bill under which circumstances he may close. There may be a fire, there may be a flood. But I don't know what the minister might want to do just for any reason at all at his whim and fancy. He might just decide that next week he's going into the park and he'd like it empty; he's got that power. I wouldn't mind if we knew exactly what he meant with this, but he could close all or any part of a park for such periods as he considers necessary, and this sometimes happens. Someone in the park decides to close a road, put a bar across a road after someone else drives 20 miles to go up that road, and some employee of the park decides that you can't go there. This is not exactly management; this is sometimes bureaucratic control and if you ask a park employee why that was done he doesn't have to tell you. He just shuts the gate right in front of you, and you can go back those 20 miles, and hopes that you won't say anything.

So that is another power on which I think the minister ought to elaborate a bit. Certainly he has elaborated on everything else, but on those specifics where we ought to know what's going on he omitted it. He gave these things rather a wide berth.

There's another remark that the hon. minister made and it touches on commercial development. This could be good to a certain extent, but it can disturb an awful lot of people because there are parks that are perhaps close to the city that require some facilities. But how do we know that we're not dealing with parks that are further out in the country and we are going to be ending up with commercial facilities? We might end up with service stations, restaurants, motels or living quarters, living facilities. Is this what the people want? Is this what he's telling us that he will do, and if so, is it spelled out sufficiently?

One more concern I have is where the minister may appoint park officials to enforce the act. Does this give him the right to appoint anyone who would have police powers? I read the act. I believe that this would authorize the minister to appoint employees, as Section 16 says:

The Minister may authorize the Director or any other employee of the Department of Lands and Forests to exercise any of the powers conferred upon him by this Act.

Would that mean policing authorities? I'd like that explained more thoroughly because, as I stated, the hon. minister gave us a tremendously long spiel on why the act, but some of these specific sections are of the type that we need explained. I believe that the minister ought to do it before we are asked to vote on the principle of this bill.

In particular I am concerned about that part that I mentioned at the beginning where the Lieutenant Governor in Council may suspend any of the following acts or regulations thereunder; that is, The Public Lands Act and regulations thereunder, The Forests Act,

1971, The Wildlife Act, The Forest and Prairie Protection Act, and I can't just for the world understand why someone would seek powers ...

MR. APPLEBY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. On a point of order. I believe that on second reading it is a matter of discussion of the principle of a bill, and the hon. member is being pretty specific about clauses that he is indicating he wants discussed at this time. I don't think that's in order.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I am dealing with the principle of the suspension of legislation that is set out in this bill and I have explained why I am doing it. I have often objected to dealing clause-by-clause in bills, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that you have ruled that since an act may have various clauses that may in fact be principles you are permitting this. If your honour should rule that this is so then I would be pleased to know.

MR. SPEAKER:

Well, I must say that I haven't so far been alarmed in particular by any digressions from relevance by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View. There may be some instances, and I think perhaps this is one, where it may be necessary to refer to specific sections as embodying a certain principle.

MR. LUDWIG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am just complying with the hon. minister's request to give suggestions, and in particular I would like him to elaborate on this one.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe I have already recognized the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview and then the hon. Member for Lethbridge East.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think perhaps we should take note of the time at which I am starting to speak, although I don't think I will use all of my time this evening. I am pleased to give my support to this particular bill for a number of reasons, not necessarily in the general context of the development and ungrading of parks and use within the province. I think that the minister has quite adequately covered that area and other members will I'm sure.

I just wanted to make a few points with regard to the policy that this government has been moving into with regard to provincial parks and its responsibility with respect to development adjacent to or within the vicinity of urban centres, particularly the major centres where there is a concentration of population of a half million or more. I think it's important to recognize that the density of the population within the two large urban centres in Edmonton and Calgary certainly requires the assistance of more than just what local government can manage under the availability that it has for the raising of funds. So this Bill No. 33, I think bears out the focus that this government has been moving into with regard to its provincial parks policy.

I noted in the bill that it enables the minister to indicate certain classifications of parks. I think this is extremely good because I think that we can look at the development of more than simply one all-purpose or multi-purpose park. We could perhaps have a more effective way of planning or have facilities that would provide a large number of uses. Not necessarily as the location of one park does the location of land in one area lend itself to the development or various uses of a park.

What I have in mind primarily in this regard is that we certainly have a need for the establishment of a park that would be classified or used for wildlife habitat in a location where there is a natural setting. With regard to this wildlife, I think that a natural setting has the water availability where you can have a brooding and nesting area for waterfowl or other wildlife. The use of this type of park, with respect to use by students and adults in the educational process, I think is extremely important.

I think for too long a time we have overlooked the fact that people and their children who have lived in the major urban centres for many years have perhaps never visited for any length of time, or had the educational benefit of, the wildlife habitat in its natural form. This has been limited to many young people, and their appreciation and recognition of this life in nature is certainly very lacking, because one can teach or attempt to

teach many things within the classroom through print, but the experiences are never really appreciated in the same kind of manner as real life experiences.

I am pleased that within this bill there is provision to have classifications of different parks. I am thinking about the act that was performed this afternoon just prior to 5:30.

DR. WARRACK:

It was wild.

MRS. CHICHAK:

It was wild.

With regard to the other use of a park, that being of a recreational nature for people, or a more leisurely area within a park, I think that particularly within the two major urban centres - and I am thinking now, of course, of the Edmonton area - we have some very excellent land areas for this kind of development. But I think it is extremely necessary that we be careful in how we select these park facilities and develop them. I think we need to take into consideration the type or the classification of people and that primarily we wish to be sure that they have the ability to have use of such a facility. Here I am thinking of that classification of people in a lower income bracket, who perhaps don't have independent transportation means, who perhaps, due to age, are not as able to travel long distances throughout the country. So I think that when we consider areas for locating such parks we must take these things into consideration. I know that our policies as to priorities have generally been, since we have come into office, based on need. I think this relates to the development of provincial urban parks as well.

I think it's important to be sure that in the development of the urban parks there are many areas of access, that these are not limited. When we talk about the use of parks by tourists and attracting tourists, I think that certainly this can be a real plus where you have a major park, or two or three provincial parks, in the area of a major centre. Because then you provide not only the kinds of attractions that normally are found within the city to attract the tourist to spend his or her vacation, but he will not have to leave in order to have the recreational kind of vacation as well. So I think the two do go hand in hand and I'm pleased to support this bill.

Thank you.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the discussion of the principle of Bill No. 33, I share with all hon. members the very real sense of pride that we have in our present parks system in Alberta. There is clearly no doubt that it is one of the best parks systems in the country at this time.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. NOTLEY:

Part of that, of course, is due to the real pioneering work by many community groups who, first of all, got parks off the ground, then worked very hard raising money to keep them going. And then the former government, I think to its credit, moved into this field and developed a first-rate parks system.

When I look at Bill No. 33, I have to say that it is a bill which contains lights and shadows. There are certainly parts of the bill that I think are an excellent improvement over the present situation. There is, however, one feature of it, which I'll come to in a moment, where I have some rather serious reservations.

But dealing first of all with the points made by the hon. minister from the provincial parks policy position paper of May, 1973; clearly nobody is going to be opposed to the principle of expansion, Mr. Speaker. I think we would all agree, with more emphasis on leisure in the years ahead, that one of the best investments we can make is to expand our provincial parks system.

Similarly, the second principle, natural ecology, is one which I'm sure we can all support, too. I would just register this caveat, however. Where some of these parks have been built largely as a result of community effort in the first place, and where the change being made is not one which is going to change the ecology of the area, I think that some caution might be in order.

Perhaps to illustrate what I mean, Mr. Speaker - I'm sure the minister has had this brought to his attention - we have Lac Cardinal Provincial Park, which is approximately 15 miles west of Peace River. Now, on the grounds of Lac Cardinal Provincial Park we have the Bear Lake stampede grounds. It's always been one ground for both operations. Now, I suppose the stampede grounds in a number of the provincial parks that I can think of and visualize in Alberta would be totally inconsistent with the rest of the environment, but I don't think that that is true in the case of the Bear Lake stampede grounds and Lac Cardinal. So while I agree with proposition 2 in the parks position paper, I think we have to just caution our moves with a certain amount of common sense and keep in mind that most of the parks, and Lac Cardinal is a clear case in point, most of these parks were pioneered by local efforts. The land was granted by the municipality in question, turned over to the provincial government, and therefore it seems to me that we have to keep that in mind.

The third point is more emphasis on metropolitan parks. Fine, I think we support that as well. I will say just a couple of things in a moment about access to parks for low-income people, but let me just mention that with respect to metro parks I would like to suggest that for the city of Edmonton - I know that the minister will probably have a lot of suggestions as to what we should do for this urban park in Edmonton - but frankly I think that in the city of Edmonton we have probably one of the most beautiful river valleys anywhere in Canada that has yet to be destroyed by development of one kind or another. I would like to suggest that it would be worth while for the province to sit down with the City of Edmonton and consider taking over that portion of the river valley which is not now presently city parks and to develop it as a provincial park.

I believe that properly planned by some of the excellent parks planning people we already have in the department, we could develop perhaps the best urban park in North America. I submit that developing the park in the river valley is really an exciting possibility which to me is far superior to buying up development land for houses some place and starting from scratch in an attempt to build an urban park. There is one other advantage too. The river valley is easily accessible within the city of Edmonton.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while we can talk about urban parks as a useful step in our efforts to make parks more accessible to low-income people, I submit that we have to go a little bit further than that. It's my understanding from talking to people in parks planning that the various surveys done on the use of parks generally demonstrate that the people who make use of provincial parks, even in Alberta, tend to be higher-income people. That is, there is a much greater usage of parks by those people with at least some disposable income and as you get to lower levels the use of parks is not nearly as great.

Well, Mr. Speaker, one thing that we might consider, perhaps in conjunction with the department in charge of tourism, is borrowing some of the programs that they have in Europe where you have low-cost family vacation plans partially subsidized by the state, perhaps combined, or tied to the person's income level. I think that kind of thing may, in fact, be the best approach to open the horizons for many low-income families, especially in our two major cities, so they will have a chance to really explore the beauties of this province, not just the provincial parks but our national parks in Alberta that are indeed just as impressive.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the way in which we open the opportunities for low-income people to enjoy the recreation potentials of our park system is really an important thing and perhaps deserves a good deal of consideration in the months and years that lie ahead.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the fourth principle - resource development - again I think that I support the general thrust of this position. If there is going to be any reconciliation between parks and industry the emphasis seems to be in the right place, that is in preserving our provincial parks. As far as larger parks are concerned, integrated planning is fine. But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know a little more about what the minister means by integrated planning. We've heard his comments about working more closely with the federal government as far as the national parks are concerned - that's fine - but I think that perhaps jurisdictional confusion arises between the Department of Highways, which has control over various highway campsites, the Department of Lands and Forests and the provincial parks branch. I would suggest that it would probably be worth while if we brought our parks programming under one authority, so that we could have at least some jurisdictional coherence in our policy.

As far as integrated planning is concerned, the minister mentioned other aspects, historical, cultural and wilderness values. Again, in a sense that is like motherhood. Nevertheless I think that there are exciting possibilities when you consider the tremendous history that we have in Alberta, and the opportunity to build on that history, to take advantage of an interest in history as we plan future provincial parks.

It always occurred to me, when I travelled down to the Coal Branch after the various mining towns had closed down, that there would have been an excellent opportunity in years past to develop almost a Barkerville concept in one of those communities. It seems to me that the more we can broaden our whole approach to parks planning to take advantage of not



-----

just the wilderness values, but our historical and cultural background as well, the better a parks system we are going to achieve.

Well Mr. Speaker, I have gone over six of the various points and haven't found any major problem with them, but I have to confess that as the devil's advocate I have to stop on point five, and that is private enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, this is really the Trojan hores, in my judgment, which I find unacceptable. I would say, first of all, with respect to dealing with the question, that I have some real reservations about the use of private consultants in provincial parks planning. Now, I can well appreciate that on a specific project there might be a good deal of merit in having a private consultant - on a specific project.

But I think there is a great deal of difference between a specific project and long-term planning. I think that if you are going to have the long-term point of view, then we should either make use of the very competent people we have in parks planning or, if need be, expand the staff.

Now, the second concern I have is that as we expand the role for private enterprise, inevitably as the mix changes - now the minister can point out that there are already private campgrounds and he can say this has no effect on rates, and that is true, because while there are private campgrounds in Alberta, the majority of campgrounds are not - but as that mix changes, I would suggest that what you are going to have pretty clearly is a growing demand for higher rates.

I don't think there is any way a private campground can possibly operate on the rates that are charged in the public campgrounds today. As a matter of fact, I know perfectly well they can't.

My submission is that if we encourage private enterprise to set up campgrounds near resource centres - by that I mean near water - I think you are going to find that before too long you will have demands for increased rates.

Now, at first the government campground rates won't go up, but before too long the demands will change and the demands will be that the government is undercutting private enterprise. As a consequence, I think you will find happening in Alberta what has happened in Ontario where the rates in the public campgrounds have gone up to parallel the rates in private campgrounds.

I think that having private campgrounds adjacent to large cities is perhaps feasible. My argument is that we shouldn't really permit private enterprise to set up campgrounds near recreation resources. We want to have campgrounds just outside of the city limits of Edmonton or Calgary - that is perhaps a different matter and I suspect that with a longer season they would be able to make ends meet without unduly upsetting the balance for the province as a whole.

But I would hate to see the rates in our campgrounds spiral. It's very important that these rates be kept as low as possible, as reasonable as possible, if in fact we are serious about what we say when we talk about accessibility. I think that if we're going to spend public money on parks in this province, and every member of this House is agreed that we should, then clearly it's important that those parks be accessible to low-income people as well as high-income people. I would hate to see that in our determination to open up an area for the private sector we ultimately end up with a more restrictive parks situation than we have at the present time.

Now there is a role for small business, clearly, in parks planning. Right now in the various provincial parks, concessions are operated, and it is my understanding that every year bids are put in to operate concessions. That's fine, that's small business, there's nothing wrong with that. But it seems to me that there is a great difference between operating a hot dog stand or selling pop or what have you on a very small basis on the one hand, and getting into the campsite business where you are going to have to charge realistic rates in order to make ends meet.

We have all sorts of other interesting problems. If we are going to encourage private enterprise in this field, what do we mean by private enterprise? Is it going to be people in the area? Are they going to have first preference, or is it going to be whoever gets in there first? I think there are all sorts of possibilities for abuse.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I submit that one of the really good things about this province has been the first-rate parks system and the fact that campsites are available at reasonable rates. In the case of the camp kitchens - the ones that are set up by the Department of Highways - there is no charge. I think it's just so important that if we are concerned about the quality of life at all in this province, we have to make sure that every step we take is a step which is designed to guarantee greater accessibility to these recreational opportunities for low-income as well as our higher-income people. So, Mr.

Speaker, I have to say at this stage that despite what I have heard from the minister about this exciting and bold new move into private enterprise, I remain unconvinced.

Having said that though, the bill, at least as it relates to the other points, contains some valuable suggestions. I just close by saying we have an excellent parks system in Alberta. The objective, I am sure, of all of us, regardless of which side of the House we sit on, is to continue to work to try to make it even better.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Member for Lethbridge East followed by the hon. Member for Stony Plain.

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on Bill No. 33, The Provincial Parks Act, I had hoped I would get up to speak before my friend from Calgary Mountain View. I might have found the minister in a little gayer mood. But I want to put in a pitch ...

[Interjections]

The minister went ahead and said how important parks were and how they should be close to people, senior citizens and crippled children, people who can't get around, and how he's willing to help all areas build these parks. I'd like to mention to the minister that we have an ideal place in Lethbridge which can be reached by city bus, and I'm sure the people of Lethbridge would be glad to have some help to enlarge this park. I hear the minister is going to enlarge Park Lake this year. But that is quite a distance from Lethbridge and for senior citizens it's not so accessible. As I was saying, in Lethbridge we have an ideal place on the river bottom with room for expansion that's a natural setting for a park. I hope the minister would look into this to see what could be done to expand and help this park for our senior citizens of Lethbridge.

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to get involved in this debate this evening, especially since I was the chairman of the committee that investigated parks policy for the minister some two years ago. We deliberated on quite a few occasions, had quite a few breakfast meetings, to come up with this policy, and I think the impact of it was fairly substantial in coming up with a parks policy.

We found, in looking at the whole issue across the Dominion of Canada, that there was actually no parks policy except in the Province of Alberta, and we went from that one and expanded it. In the role we played we fundamentally said that provincial parks were for the benefit of all people.

I would like to refer for a few minutes to the concept of the urban park, the Fish Creek park in Calgary and the one that will be announced here for the Edmonton area.

Going into the act itself and looking into the regulations, I would like to suggest to the minister - and this is something I have discussed in the Legislature before - a day-use fee for parks. In 1972 we had in the neighbourhood of four million people who visited provincial parks in Alberta. We could break that down to four people per automobile - something in the neighbourhood of one million cars. If even two dollars was charged per car you would end up with something in the neighbourhood of two million dollars which could go back into the parks budget for running and operation of the parks.

Further into our policy paper, we discussed grazing leases to some extent. There are some provincial parks in the province of Alberta that still have grazing leases. Our recommendation was that grazing leases should not go forth once the provincial park is going to be expanded for public facilities. We know now that there are many parks in the province of Alberta that have not been expanded to the full complement of their use, especially in the southern part of the province. Cypress Hills Provincial Park has a grazing lease, and this should probably be maintained until such time as the park is fully utilized.

Getting into public accommodations, the Member for Spirit River-Fairview didn't like the idea of free enterprise getting involved. I wonder why. I don't think we should have free enterprise right inside the park for public accommodations in the way of motels or hotels. These should probably be on the perimeter and the fringe area of the park itself. But for the concession areas and so on, I think we have got to carry on with the basic policy that we have been used to in the past number of years - that's your commercial stores and so on.

The last point that I want to dwell on, Mr. Speaker, is the park warden and the utilization of the park warden. I live two miles from Wabamun Provincial Park and I know, from visiting with the park wardens on a number of occasions, that they have had trouble

with law enforcement in the provincial park. I wonder if the minister couldn't have the law enforcement policies broadened somewhat so that they could have the powers to search for and seize liquor and so on for holding until members of the RCMP or other police forces arrive on the scene to take care of these people. According to the provincial act we have in front of us now, the park warden has the power to ask them to be discharged from the park, but he has no power to hold and seize. I would ask the minister to look at this.

Earlier in the evening, we were into The Wildlife Amendment Act. I pointed out in this Legislature before that park wardens probably can be utilized to a greater extent than they are right now. Mind you, they are doing an excellent job in the park. But the slow time of the year is from September to November and I think that, with a bit of a course in law enforcement on the game regulations in The Game Act, these people could also be utilized for game guardians within the hunting season of the province. This would certainly alleviate the problem we have now with the lack of law enforcement officers.

That's about all my remarks in regard to the act. It was a pleasure once again working on this policy paper and I would like to thank the members who worked with me on it.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member from Drumheller.

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to make just two comments on the bill. The first principle I would like to deal with is the principle of seizures. Seizures have become common and were also included in the former Act, but I frankly disagree with the parks officers being given the authority to seize. I think it's not fair play because the things that are seized are so different in value. One man may have a \$20 or a \$30 .22 - another man may have a \$1,000 rifle, and there's no justice in seizure, even though it may be argued that it may be returned later. I rather think it's going too far to say to a parks officer, you can seize anything you want to seize. And the powers are pretty wide under the act. As a matter of fact, the powers are given to seize any article. The word "thing" is used quite a bit in the section, but the thing may be seized whether it is found in the possession of the person alleged to have committed the contravention or not. I think this is going too far.

I think I know what the act is trying to get at. But I think the charge should be laid against the person who is due to have committed the offence and if there is going to be a penalty, the penalty should be awarded by a court of law and not by a parks officer. Now, you may say that when the seized article or the seized thing is returned, and in many cases it is returned, the error has been rectified or justice has been restored. But that many times is not the case. Sometimes an article may be seized held for a week or for a month or for a year, and this is something that belongs to somebody else. It's the principle of seizures that I think is wrong. I think if a person has committed an offence in a provincial park, the same as if a person commits an offence on the highway, that person should be charged. The RCMP is not empowered to take my car from me because I go through a red light. The RCMP is not empowered to take a truck from a person because he commits an offence of speeding or even criminal negligence, and the park wardens should not have this authority either.

Now you may say that this was done by the previous government and it was, but probably by the previous governments. But I don't think that makes it right, and many times there were injustices rendered through seizures under the last government and under the government before that. And wherever this type of thing is done, in my view there are going to be injustices.

I would like to get back to what in my opinion is the proper method of dealing with offences. When a person commits an offence the charge is laid and a court hears the charge. And then if the court wants to confiscate, the court has the authority to do it. But the confiscation shouldn't be done by a person, particularly when the person may not even have been alleged to have committed the offence, let alone have committed the offence - the article may be seized.

And when you notice the types of things that may be seized, it may be a motor, a vehicle, an aircraft, a boat or any equipment, appliance or other article. In Section 3 it says "thing". I don't know just exactly what "thing" means, but I suppose it means almost anything that hasn't got life. I don't think it would go beyond that. I wouldn't think they would want to seize a man's wife or a man's girlfriend and hold her in custody because of something that the person was alleged - but any "thing", I would think is something without life.

I want to register my complaint about seizures. I think this is wrong. I believe we are taking the authority of the court and if my vehicle is to be seized then I think the court should seize it. If my rifle is to be seized, the court should seize it, not a park officer who, before I am even found guilty, is seizing something that belongs to me or something that belongs to somebody else.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I haven't had anything seized personally, but I know scores of people who have had "things", using that word again, seized. I know a good number of them were wrong in principle where there was an injustice and the court rectified it, but sometimes only after a loss or inconvenience and a great deal of worry on the part of the person who owned the particular things.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to register my complaint against the seizures, and I would ask the hon. minister to give some thought to this, because it is being done in other jurisdictions or because it has been done and because it is a convenient method for a parks officer to use, and sometimes authority can be misused in that respect. I don't think there is any reason to continue this practice of seizures of something, certainly before the man is even found guilty. I believe this is an injustice and I would hope that this could be rectified by the present minister on the present government.

The second principle in the bill about which I want to speak briefly is the one mentioned by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, that contained in Section 2. I think we have to read this section to establish what we are trying to get at, the principle we are trying to get at. It gives the Lieutenant Governor in Council or the cabinet authority to - I will find the right page, Page 4, Section 2: "... The Lieutenant Governor in Council may, with respect to parks, make regulations varying, ...". Make regulations - I think that's necessary, but make regulations varying, "... substituting, adding to or making inapplicable ..." provisions passed by the Legislature in other certain Acts such as The Public Lands Act - I shouldn't say "such as" - in these four Acts: The Public Lands Act, The Forests Act, The Wildlife Act, The Forest and Prairie Protection Act.

I have no objections to the Lieutenant Governor in Council making regulations, changing regulations under these Acts, but I have great objection to any section of an act being changed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council when that act has been passed by the Legislature. I believe that would be a very serious thing in our parliamentary form of government. The House of Commons in Ottawa and the Legislatures in our provinces are supreme. The government is responsible to the Legislature, and if we ever get to the place where the cabinet or the Lieutenant Governor in Council, the government, can change legislation, add to, substitute or make inapplicable laws passed by the Legislature, then we are, in effect, making the government supreme and the Legislature subservient to the government. That type of government will not work in a parliamentary system.

The government must be responsible to the Legislature, whether there is one in opposition or almost an equal number to the government. That is immaterial. The Legislature must be supreme, and if it isn't, then our whole parliamentary system breaks down. One of the things in which it is supreme is, if a law is passed by the Legislature that law must stand until it's changed by either that Legislature or some subsequent Legislature. It surely can't be changed by the government. The government is responsible to carry that through, if it has to act on it at all, as long as it is on the statute books. That's why we have the repeal of acts from time to time that become inapplicable. If there are sections in these acts that need to be changed to suit the policy and the philosophy of the government in power in regard to provincial parks, then these acts should be brought to the Legislature and the changes should be made. But it should not be made by regulation. I would ask the hon. minister to give this particular point very careful consideration. I would hope that he would bring in an amendment making sure that the Legislature is left supreme and that the Lieutenant Governor in Council will remain responsible to the Legislature.

Now, those are the two points that I wanted to deal with. There are just two other points I want to mention.

The first one is that the thing I like about this act is that the minister is responsible. There is no place in this act that I can see where the minister is trying to waive responsibility or to pass the responsibility on to some other body or some other board or some other commission. I think this is a splendid thing. Too many times today governments are governing at arm's length. They're passing their authority over to a board in order to avoid the responsibility for decisions. I don't see that in this act and I want to congratulate the hon. minister for taking the responsibility. If there's criticism, that will come; if there's commendation, then it will be necessary for him to take that too. That's responsible government. That's one of the duties of a minister, who must take the commendation and the criticism as well, being responsible to the Legislature and to the people of the province. That part of the act I like very much.

The other part I want to just mention, and I hope it's in order - I'm not speaking about provincial parks now - I'm speaking about camp kitchens, which is very similar.

I was very happy the other day to hear the hon. minister and the hon. Minister of Highways and Transport say that there is no thought of doing away with or withdrawing from the camp kitchen program. This program has enabled thousands of our people to have a holiday who otherwise could not have a holiday.

There's a place for the motels. There's a place for the private sector. But let's not say that because people happen to be poor or happen to have seven or eight children and can't afford to stay in a motel or a hotel or the private sector, they must be denied a holiday. Our camp kitchens make that possible and the kitchens in the forestry reserves make that possible. There is a charge now in some provincial parks, but not in all, and there again there is some hope that they can still go to the camp kitchens, their youngsters can relax, they can fish in many of them, play in all of them and have a holiday, where, if they had to go to a motel, they just couldn't afford it and would just have to stay home.

So I'm happy the hon. minister has made a firm declaration that there's no thought of doing away with camp kitchens along our highways and in our forest reserves.

MR. BENOIT:

Well, Mr. Speaker. I guess I still have the floor. Thank you.

I wanted to begin, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I highly concur in and support the bill in principle. I do so in spite of some of the smaller details that we might object to, because it is so like its predecessor which was passed ten years ago that it is hardly distinguishable from it. The sections have been juggled a little bit but the parks policy and program, generally speaking, is the same in both bills. It has served well for ten years. The other one did and I'm sure that this one will do the same, probably for even longer than that.

At that time and in the 1970s even, the parks policy and program of Alberta was second to none in Canada as has been mentioned already by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. This government has done a highly commendable job of continuing this program and elaborating on it. That is the way it ought to be.

They have had more time, more money, and we are living in a more affluent society. Therefore some of the suggestions with regard to larger parks and open parks, things of that sort, are a necessity. That is definitely an ongoing program. I think that we can join together in pushing this kind of program, which will keep Alberta head and shoulders above the other provinces in the Dominion in this area, because if there is anything that will be an attraction to tourists and will be a help to our own folks in Alberta, it is a good parks program, especially as the cities get larger the people want to get out. If they are not provided with parks that are necessary in which to find their recreation, they are going to find themselves wandering all over private property, which we don't particularly want. At least those who own the private property don't want it. I'm sure nobody else wants the people interfering with the rights of others.

With regard to the comparison between the two acts, I have to smile a little bit when I see some of the things that have been said. It has been noted that in the previous Act there were some deficiencies and they have been carried over in this act. There had been some deletions and some additions to this one, some minor changes, but generally speaking the two acts run very close together. The other had 15 sections this one has 16 sections, if you don't count the one that says you repeal the previous Act.

I was noting the fact that the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View was talking about the ministerial authority to close the parks in this act but that same authority was given to the minister in the previous Act. I also noted the hon. Member for Drumheller was talking about how responsibility had not been delegated, but Section 16 in this act says that "The Minister may authorize the Director or any other employee of The Department of Lands and Forests to exercise any of the powers conferred upon him by this Act." In Section 11 we have a similar one ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

I didn't mention that.

MR. BENOIT:

No. Okay.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That's what he said.

MR. BENOIT:

I slipped, if you didn't mention it.

In Section 11 we have also the ministerial authority and power extended to considerable length. Section 12 is a new section giving parks wardens considerable authority to do a number of things and that wasn't in the other Act, but Sections 11 and Section 16 of this act can do the same thing without it being in the act. So really, the two acts run very close together and complement one another and provide for one another an assistance.

I want to speak a little bit, Mr. Speaker, on the fifth largest park in Alberta and I want to say it in such a way that I don't get myself hung up here.

First of all, I want to say that I highly commend the idea of metropolitan provincial parks. Now, as to them being extremely large, I am not certain that is the best thing. The Fish Creek park will be the fifth largest park in Alberta. I have no idea how it compares as to cost, but I imagine it probably cost ten times more than all the other parks in Alberta so far as the acquisition price is concerned. That is only a guess. I may be way out, Mr. Speaker, but I know that the cost would be terrific because most of the other parks are on Crown land or utilize Crown land.

If we are going to have metropolitan provincial parks at this late date, within the limits of the metropolitan areas, we are going to have to look at considerable expense.

Most of the metropolitan centres already have some very nice parks, but with the increase in population people may not all be able to be contained within these parks.

The reason I suggest that we ought not to have overly large metropolitan parks is because in these days, particularly, most of the people want to get away from the city and we would do better to have our larger parks some 50 miles away from the city, if we could locate them in such proximity, so the people could get far enough away to forget the noise and the pollution and whatever they were trying to avoid.

Having said that, however, Mr. Speaker, I do want to say that there is nothing wrong with this and also with the statement the minister made that we need larger parks today. That is quite evident. We have a larger population and people go to the parks now with much more equipment than they used to. They have more time to do more things in the parks than they used to be able to do or had the time to do. So larger parks will be a necessity and, being more affluent, there is no reason in the world why we shouldn't have larger parks.

Although it has been said by a number of others, I want to also say it again, that with regard to the roadside campsites, both under the jurisdiction of the Department of Highways as well as under the jurisdiction of the Department of Lands and Forests, I hope that no one will even create a cause for a rumour to the effect that they will be dissolved or done away with in any way. Because if there is anything that has attracted tourists to Alberta, and if there is anything that has drawn comments of commendation to the Province of Alberta for the past 20 years, it has been these roadside campsites, probably more than anything else we have including our national parks. Many, many, indeed, have been the favourable commendations with regard to these stopping places. They serve not only the tourists, but they do a wonderful service to those who can't afford to have a more lavish holiday, as the hon. Member for Drumheller so ably pointed out.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I think I will conclude by commending the minister for bringing in this bill. I support it, except in some details which I will discuss when we come to Committee of the Whole to discuss this matter.

Otherwise, they are holding true to the promise which they made in the campaign. They are doing just like the Social Creditors, only more.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drayton Valley followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, may I adjourn the debate?

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CLARK:

Best speech you've made today.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Right.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I move that we adjourn until ten o'clock tomorrow morning.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.

[The House rose at 10:22 o'clock.]

