

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Friday, March 22, 1974

[The House met at 10:00 o'clock.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. We have no Order Papers.

MR. SPEAKER:

The printer is having a little difficulty because of our starting early on Friday, but I'm told they'll be here very shortly and we'll have them before we start the Orders of the Day.

TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the answer to Question No. 105 and also the Annual Report for the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission. Copies will be circulated for all hon. members.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to file a statement of the government's position in respect of the matter of school board assessments. I have copies of the statement for all members of the Assembly.

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Annual Report of Northern Alberta Development Council.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report of Alberta Highways and Transport.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Rural Development

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to announce revisions to the Alberta Municipal Waterworks Assistance Program. The program assists municipalities in securing adequate municipal water supplies.

The revisions to the program include:

1. For all communities the financial assistance available is to be increased from \$150 per capita to \$300 per capita. This assistance is to be in the form of a 50 per cent grant and a 50 per cent loan.

2. For communities with a population under 500 people, the qualifying \$75 per capita debt requirement is to be waived.

3. For communities which do not presently have any water supply and distribution system, this program is to be extended to include a portion of the distribution system as well as the water supply system.

4. These revisions are to apply to all new works initiated in 1974.

The changes are expected to cost an additional \$2,500,000 over five years, bringing the total cost of the program to supply Alberta communities with adequate water supplies to \$8,500,000; \$4,250,000 of which is to be grants and \$4,250,000 to be loans. Applications for assistance will continue to be administered by the Department of the Environment.

The changes are necessary for two major reasons: first, that the response to the initial program had been larger than was originally anticipated, with over 100 communities indicating an interest in the program; secondly, rising construction costs had made it necessary to increase the per capita assistance to individual communities so that each community could afford to develop an adequate water supply.

The revisions are expected to help ensure that acceptable health and living standards are maintained in Alberta's smaller communities, that the smaller communities will be kept viable by lessening their financial burdens, and that the province's balanced growth concept will be supported.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, we welcome the announcement made by the minister [in charge of] rural development. Mr. Speaker, I think the minister touched upon two very valid points when he mentioned the rising costs of construction, also the insidious effects of inflation that municipal governments, along with citizens in this province and this country, have to face. So when we are looking at this program, Mr. Speaker, the addition is welcome. But I also say we must all be aware of the rising costs of construction and inflation.

Might I also say, Mr. Speaker, that this, too, might well fit into that area of some sort of 'anticipation' as far as the budget is concerned. Nevertheless, we welcome the announcement and recognize what the government is trying to do.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Beef Subsidy

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask what the results are of the meeting which was held in Calgary yesterday regarding the price of cattle?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, the House should perhaps be aware of who was at the meeting. It consisted of representation from cattlemen's associations from Ontario to British Columbia. We were the only provincial administration present at the meeting but there was federal representation there.

The essence of the meeting, Mr. Speaker, was that the cattlemen across this country registered a pretty strong objection to the kind of program that came out of Ottawa, and suggested that the subsidy program be replaced by a balanced quota system of American cattle coming into Canada. And while, Mr. Speaker, we can certainly appreciate and indeed agree with the resolution the cattle people have passed, the meeting did not resolve what, in my view, is a pretty important thing, and that is to re-establish the markets in Alberta.

Towards that end, we have made some suggestions to the market areas in Alberta to allow them to establish some sort of base on which we can re-establish a market so our

producers can sell. I am particularly strong, Mr. Speaker, in suggesting to them that the subsidy should not be included in the bidding price for cattle and that, in fact, it should be paid directly to the producer.

We are working towards that end and, hopefully, we can have next week a re-establishment of the markets in Alberta, based on a North American price concept which will give our producers the benefit of that market place and, in addition to that, whatever the federal government is going to pay in the form of a subsidy. But again, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, our concern is that that 7 cents in fact gets back to the producer of cattle in Alberta.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is the Government of Alberta still of the view that there is a need for a monitoring service to be provided by the Alberta Department of Agriculture, perhaps through the brand inspectors? Also, does the Government of Alberta still feel that a reasonable basis for pricing would be Omaha A2s plus perhaps \$3 a hundredweight, as a reasonable basis for starting pricing in Alberta?

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we do. First of all, with regard to the monitoring, that will go ahead and we will be monitoring transactions throughout the province in an attempt - I can see a great deal of difficulty on behalf of some producers getting their subsidy, and we will do all we can to try to make sure it gets to them.

We now have had some clarification from Ottawa with regard to ownership. You have to have ownership of the cattle for at least 30 days before you will be eligible for the subsidy. We think that that is a good modification and, indeed, worth while. We're still concerned that the time limit on A3s and A4s will tend to produce an overflow of those kinds of cattle in the next two or three weeks which could have a depressing effect on the market - and it would be an unnatural effect on the market. We're trying to get that time limit removed.

MR. CLARK:

One further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Do the Alberta Department of Agriculture and the minister share the view expressed by a number of cattlemen that, come late this summer, we're going to see extremely high cattle prices as a result of what's happening to the market in the United States now?

MR. SPEAKER:

The question is certainly a question asking for the minister's personal opinion. If it can be rephrased or if the minister could arrange the answer as if it were to a question that was in order we ...

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, with great respect, and I respect the minister's opinion, I really asked for the department and the government's opinion on this particular matter.

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the answer has to be a personal opinion. I suppose in the cattle industry today it's very difficult to find anybody who shares your opinion. Everybody has a different view as to what might happen. I just remind the House this has been a direct result of unwarranted interference by other government levels in the cattle industry which has caused real chaos.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Municipal Waterworks Assistance Program

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, this question arises out of the recent announcement by the Minister Without Portfolio responsible for rural development. The question is, does the water assistance program include improvement districts?

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

This program, Mr. Speaker, is to assist small communities, which takes in the hamlets, villages and towns. It's a revision of the program as outlined in Position Paper No. 17. If the Minister of the Environment wishes to elaborate on that, I'll turn it over to him.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the program is universal across the province and applies to improvement districts.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Calgary Court House

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Public Works. Can he advise what the target date is for completion of the addition to the courthouse in Calgary? In case the minister wasn't awake when I asked, I'll repeat the question, Mr. Speaker.

Could the minister advise what the target date is for the completion of the addition to the main courthouse, Calgary?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, I have this information here, if I can just take a second to look it up. No, I haven't got it. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take that question on advisement, and I'll provide an answer later.

MR. LUDWIG:

No supplementaries.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona.

Drilling Incentive Program

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question today to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. It's in regard to concerns that have come to my attention from oil companies complaining that when they bid on offset wells that have been discovery wells under the incentive program, they are bidding with cash, whereas the people who have complied with the incentive program are bidding with credits. Is there going to be any change so the bids will be much fairer?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, no changes are contemplated. I might advise the hon. member, when we were revising our drilling incentive program and had discussions with industry, some members of industry did express concern that they were accumulating credits faster than they could redeem them. When we discussed the possibilities of extending the redemption from, say, royalties and taxation under The Mineral Taxation Act, to also include bonuses, they did pose this question. The problem that could arise is that there might be a situation in which companies were using the credits for bidding against a company using cash. The best evidence the department has been getting is that this just hasn't been a really serious problem.

On the other hand, I should mention, Mr. Speaker, that at the time of consideration of the drilling incentive program, we did receive indications from eastern financial interests that they were very excited about our drilling incentive program and would like to come in to Alberta to take advantage to drill for natural gas. We wanted to make sure we gave them the opportunity to do that. I think all hon. members would want to make sure eastern Canadians had the opportunity to come in and drill for natural gas.

As a result of those statements, Mr. Speaker, they did express some concern that if this new, or fresh, money came into Alberta to drill, they wouldn't be able to utilize the credits because they hadn't built up any royalties. So it would seem to the members of the committee and the Executive Council, when they considered this, that they would like to give them this opportunity to come in. At the same time there didn't appear to be the disadvantages that were expressed by certain members of the industry, so they did proceed to extend the redemption to include bonuses.

Suffield Block

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister, then I take it there are going to be no changes? And now that you've mentioned Suffield, Mr. Minister, I wonder if you'd remark ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please address the Chair.

MR. DIXON:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. To the minister, is there any hope then of the companies using the other route? If you're not going to make any changes, is there any way where they can use their credits to bid on the Suffield Block?

MR. DICKIE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think in my statement I did mention there were no proposed changes, so I think that clarifies the first part of your question.

Dealing with the Suffield situation, of course, the hon. members are aware that it is proposed to transfer the acreage to the Alberta Energy Company, and the directors of the Alberta Energy Company will then deal with the way they will proceed with the development of the Suffield Block. We could anticipate, I think, Mr. Speaker, that they would have requests for proposals from industry to see how they would like to carry out the development of the Suffield Block.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Home-owners' Tax Rebate

MR. KOZIAK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. In light of the notice which accompanied the property assessment notices from the City of Edmonton, indicating that the assessment of single-family homes had been increased, is there anything that the single-family owner and residential owner can expect by way of relief which would offset the increase in the assessment?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Ask the mayor.

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, that legislation was passed by the Legislature last year under the Alberta Property Tax Reduction Plan provisions, so that the municipalities throughout Alberta would all assess properties on the same basis, so that benefits which were based on assessed value could be paid back fairly to all citizens throughout Alberta on the same basis.

But I think what some citizens in Edmonton perhaps have missed is that at the same time that the assessment was standardized throughout the province, the Legislature had also passed legislation permitting split mill rates. So certainly there is no reason the Edmonton City Council or any council couldn't pass a mill rate that would keep residential tax bills even with last year, notwithstanding a change in assessment, or in fact even reduce them if they want to. This year, I would think that the fact that the province is now no longer requisitioning for educational purposes on residential property, the fact

that municipal assistance has gone up and that the guidelines have been removed, that Edmonton citizens could perhaps expect even a reduction in their taxes.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Tar Sands - Research

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. It concerns the proposed Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority.

Can the minister advise the House whether any criteria have been drawn up or any policy adopted yet with respect to contracting out research to private industry from the Authority?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I anticipate being in a position to introduce that bill very shortly. I think it would be appropriate, at that time, to deal with questions of that nature.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question. Can the minister advise whether any consideration has yet been given with respect to patent rights?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, again that is a question dealt with in the bill and I think it would be appropriate to deal with it at the time of the introduction of the bill, the reading or the committee stage of the bill.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, one further supplementary question in light of the minister's two previous answers. Is any consideration being given to a background paper which can be tabled prior to introduction of the bill, because it is a very important matter and I think members would want time to review it.

MR. DICKIE:

No, there has been no position paper prepared for the introduction of the bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

Seed Grain

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. What is the seed situation in areas of unthreshed grain? Will there be sufficient good seed for 1974?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, the information I have from my departmental officials is that there is, in fact, an adequate supply of seed grain in the province for this spring. It may entail, though, some movement of seed from areas which have been harvested into the areas which were not so fortunate and unable to get their crops off.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Commonwealth Games

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. the Provincial Treasurer. A short explanation is required.

In view of the favourable decision by the citizens of Edmonton on the plebiscite, it appears that the City of Edmonton will now have to go on the open market and borrow up to \$11 million at high interest rates. In view of the excellent financial position of the province at this time ...

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is getting quite into the area of argument.

MR. TAYLOR:

I'm sorry. Is the government prepared to loan part, or all, of these capital costs to the City of Edmonton at a reasonable rate of interest?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member's question, I think I would have to state:

First, I think the help of the provincial government is well known relative to the financing of the Commonwealth Games in one-third of the capital cost;

Secondly, any loan policy of the province to municipalities must, in my view, be fair to all municipalities. Basically, at the present time, through the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation, with a per capita allowance based on the population low interest rates are available to municipalities.

The fact that a particular city or municipality has used up their per capita allotment is, in my view, their responsibility. Certainly the City of Edmonton has annually a per capita amount that they can borrow from AMFC at low interest rates. How they use that, or whether they use that all for other purposes, I believe, is their business and their affair.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary to the hon. minister. Has the City of Edmonton yet applied for this loan?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, what happens annually, as the members know, is that I introduce a bill from the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation, that funds are received - approximately \$100 million - which are allocated for municipal borrowings in the province at low interest rates. Each municipality assesses its need on a per capita basis and has up to the per capita limit, and then it submits that to the province. As yet, the City of Edmonton has not communicated its per capita needs, but when it does it will be all allocated on that basis.

MR. TAYLOR:

One further supplementary. Since this is a special event and happens once only, would a provincial loan on this occasion not only keep the money within the province but save the people of Edmonton a very large sum of money, money that would go outside the province in interest ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member is clearly making a representation.

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Expropriation Bill

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is with reference to the expropriation bill introduced in the last session. Is the government going to be introducing a bill this session? It's a major bill; what is the holdup?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, yes the government will be introducing that bill this session.

MR. LUDWIG:

If it is a major bill, Mr. Speaker, we don't want it introduced in the last week of the session.

[Interjections]

MR. HYNDMAN:

We have been assessing a great deal of public comment and useful suggestions that have come in over the past eight months, and we are incorporating them into the bill, so that it will be a fine piece of legislation.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, is the hon. minister suggesting that last year's bill became obsolete ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order. Order please.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER:

I should like to inform the members of the Assembly that I am tabling the report of the Provincial Library which perhaps I should have done a few minutes ago.

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. Hon. Mr. Hyndman proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

Be it resolved that Standing Order Number 5 be suspended in order that the Assembly may sit at 8:00 p.m. on Friday, March 22.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[The motion was carried.]

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS
(Second Reading)

Bill No. 33 The Provincial Parks Act, 1974

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, considering the length I spoke last night on the same bill, I will now just speak a few moments.

Mr. Speaker, speaking on the principle of Bill No. 33, I believe it is one of the finest bills that has been presented in the House. I certainly give the Department of Lands and Forests credit, and the minister in particular.

What I'm mostly pleased about, Mr. Speaker, is that this bill will give assistance to municipalities, to counties, and also to IDs and special areas. The municipalities in those areas have struggled for a number of years to maintain small parks in their local areas. I think it is commendable that the bill will give assistance in this direction.

I also am pleased, Mr. Minister, Mr. Speaker, [with] improvements and the beautification of public lands. This has to deal with lands adjacent to towns and some adjacent to villages which the Crown still holds. In most cases, this land was left in an obnoxious manner because of the debris and the junk piled on the Crown lands. I hope that the minister will see that part of these funds are expended in that manner.

Now I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the minister can, or will, indicate if there will be any further expansion in the parks, maybe not some of the larger parks, but some of the smaller parks in smaller communities, where the Crown does hold land. Either lease these lands to the municipalities, to the towns adjacent, or the IDs whereby provincial funds and funds from contributing bodies can be used to make recreation centres for people so that the distance required to go to the larger parks isn't necessary.

In closing my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would only hope that the minister would consider my constituency - I think he knows of the area that I am dealing with - and under this new bill, find ways and means to establish either a municipal, ID or government park. I think this is the only constituency, to my knowledge, that has not got any recreational area within its boundary, either public or private. I hope the minister will comment on that. We have in my constituency Buck Lake and the Brazeau Reservoir. Two sides of Buck Lake are Crown land and the Brazeau Reservoir and canal are 24 miles surrounded entirely by Crown land. I certainly hope the minister will comment on that.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, just very briefly on Bill No. 33. I certainly concur with the bill and I believe it is very important that we increase our recreational facilities, certainly in the area of provincial parks. I certainly believe in the expansion of them, but there are a couple of points, actually questions, that I would like the minister to respond to. He mentioned, in his dissertation when he opened the debate, the large number of small parks within the province. I am left with the impression - and maybe it's a false one - that there are too many small parks, that he favours large parks within the province. It would seem to me that a good mix would be the ideal type of situation. Would the minister indicate what he thinks, then, the optimum size of a provincial park or a recreational centre should be before it's a feasible type of operation?

Another thing - if the minister could also indicate - will it be possible in small, or in provincial parks, for individuals to lease property for summer residences? In some, for instance, Beauvais Lake west of Pincher Creek, there is a tremendous demand for small residential lots for leasing. It would appear there has been a stall or freeze on this type of operation, and if this becomes permanent - does the minister of the department have any notion of cancelling existing leases, and if so, how will the private property that is there be disposed of, or what will be the procedure in that regard? I think this is rather important to a lot of people.

Also I think it's important too that the minister give consideration to working with the Department of Highways in two areas.

Number one, I think it is pointless to have provincial parks that are inaccessible by at least dust-proof roads. Park Lake near Lethbridge is a really good example. I think that, up until a few years ago, when there was just a gravel road, you took your life in your hands by travelling even those few miles to get there. When the traffic was heavy and there were a lot of people trying to get out there, this became a real problem. So I would think that this should be taken into consideration when parks are developed or new ones are built or allocated.

Also, I think there has been something said about the campsites along the roads. There again I believe it would be very wise if these came under the jurisdiction of the parks department. I think they should be fixed up. I think there should be plantings there and at no time, I believe, should there be any type of costs for people to drop into those places. Whether they should be overnight-stopping places, that becomes another question. But as far as people driving along the highway, I think these rest stops, these camp kitchens and camp facilities, are of tremendous value to people. They really look forward to them just to break the day, to break a little bit of their drive, to stop and have a cup of coffee or a sandwich I think is something we should encourage and increase.

The final point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make is with reference to what two or three speakers have already indicated, the power that the minister has in the bill. I recognize that someone has to have the authority. There is no question about it. If we are going to have a thing, it has to be looked after and someone has to be in charge. Naturally, we assume and we hope that the authority that is given there will not be used to the full extent, but certainly a good measure of common sense will always be in order. I think this is always a good thing. But the big problems comes, as someone had mentioned, [with] the delegation of this power. There are some people, Mr. Speaker, who are just incapable of handling power. They can't refrain from saying, now, this is my big moment and I'm really going to show my power here. They have a sort of an inferiority complex, I guess - maybe their wives are beating them up at home, but they are really going to get even out here. I think this is really an important thing - the type of people who are given power and the way in which they impose it on other people for reasons which are marginally valid. So these are the types of things and the questions that I would hope the minister could respond to.

MR. LEE:

Mr. Speaker, in briefly commenting on this bill and expressing my support for it, I want to make just a few comments about the development of Alberta's first urban-provincial park - the Fish Creek Park in Calgary - and once again to commend the minister and his department for this initiative.

Already the effects of Fish Creek Park in Calgary have been felt within the community. One of the expressions that a number of Calgary members made last year was that establishing this park in Calgary would release for the City of Calgary those funds that could be established for smaller parks within the city itself. Just next to my particular constituency the result has been the reservation by the City of Calgary of a large portion of Nose Hill for possible development as a city park. The Fish Creek Park itself - some 2,800 acres of park - will certainly service those southern parts of the city which require park area.

But what I want to comment on this morning is not so much the park itself, but the manner in which the planning is being undertaken for this particular park. I commend the minister for the approach he has taken in planning by the establishment of the Fish Creek Planning Advisory Committee which is a cross-sectional kind of appointment of citizens within Calgary to assist in the development of the park.

Since Fish Creek will be, I understand, the largest urban park in Canada - the first in Alberta - it does have a kind of unique position in a planning sense. Since it is unique in a planning sense, I would hope that it would be an unique kind of urban park, unique not only because of the topography, the historical value of certain parts of that particular part of the city, but also unique in the kinds of systems that we can build into this park for its usage by the citizens of Calgary.

It has been expressed on a number of occasions that within large urban areas there is a real difficulty in accessibility by citizens - especially those in the lower income areas - in actually getting to parks and appreciating them. I mentioned this last year, but the hon. Member for Calgary Bow constituency has a park right within his constituency and it is amazing to see the interest with which citizens approach that particular park. It's just mobbed each weekend and all days of the week. The reason is, it is reasonably accessible, but certainly too small.

I would hope that we could build this same accessibility into the Fish Creek Park. I know that, in its initial planning, the advisory committee has been working with the city closely in looking at things like transportation to and from the park, transportation within the park itself.

In chatting with members of the advisory committee though, I'm impressed by the approach they're taking with the planning. Just to outline some of the things the advisory committee will be doing within the next few weeks and months, I understand that in the establishment of a blueprint for this park, the first thing they have established is a consultation with those technical people within the Department of Lands and Forests, Parks Division, and also with the recreation branch of the City of Calgary, in drawing from them the kinds of expertise they can bring to the planning of the park. They have also - in response to what the minister mentioned last night - established a contact with a private group to assist in the planning of the park.

But it is the way they are going to advance from now on that really encourages me. My understanding is that they have already made a request for submissions, letters out to the various people, various groups that are involved and interested in this area.

Towards the end of this month, I understand, or early in April, in all the newspapers in Calgary there will be a questionnaire attached to the daily edition. This questionnaire will solicit views from the citizenry throughout the city. Every individual who gets one of the four newspapers in Calgary will have an opportunity to respond to this questionnaire.

This questionnaire will then be developed, along with submissions received, into a preliminary plan for the development of the park. But they are not going to stop there. They are going to take this preliminary plan and then publicize it and have public hearings on the plan itself. After the public hearings, and perhaps with modifications of this plan, a final plan will then be developed and forwarded to the Government of Alberta, to the minister, for implementation and usage as he sees fit.

Just in closing, I really want to commend this particular approach to the planning of a park, the planning of a new, unique park. For me, it's a unique model, a model for public participation which I would hope we could use throughout the departments of our government. I am convinced this urban park in Calgary will be truly a people and a family park.

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Speaker, in talking to Bill No. 33, I appreciate the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight's approach. I think I have been requesting for the last two years an identical approach to our provincial park.

In Section 4 I think the advisory committee - I was going to ask questions as to how they were going to be appointed, what make-up and whether they were going to be local - but I understand; I will accept your Fish Creek Park approach. It's very acceptable.

But I'd like a little bit of clarification in Section 4, "The minister may ... (I think that word should be "shall") ... from time to time appoint persons to advisory committees ...", because what is really happening to our provincial park, in my view and that of the people of my constituency in the east end, is premeditated murder. And I say it sincerely. I would appreciate it if the minister would take initial steps to set up this advisory committee under the same terms and references as Fish Creek Park.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in ...

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Camrose followed by the hon. Member for Wainwright.

MR. STROMBERG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My remarks on this bill - I certainly think the minister should be congratulated for quite, I might say, an interesting and tremendous bill.

Mr. Speaker, in our constituency we are quite impressed with the way the Department of Lands and Forests goes about acquiring the land, the amount of surveying that is done, the archaeologists who go through, the master plan that is drawn up, and then the public hearings which are held in the community for any group or individual who wants input to these hearings.

What I would like to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, is the idea presently being used in the United States and in Germany. Here in Alberta, with our strip mines and under The Land Surface Conservation and Reclamation Act, the coal companies are to fill in their backfill to, I believe, about a 15 per cent grade. It's an expense to the coal companies. Why could we not develop our abandoned strip mines into provincial parks for recreational use? We could so design it when the coal companies are doing their backfill. We could have lakes, we could have golf courses, quite an exciting area through there. I

understand both the United States and Germany are doing this and I would like to hear the minister's comments on this suggestion.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in Bill No. 33, The Provincial Parks Act, I was very interested in the professorial-type dissertation that the minister gave in introducing this bill on second reading. I noticed with interest, though, that he didn't really refer to sections in the bill as such. He just went into his different points. While I find these interesting, I'm interested also in trying to compare the original parks Act to this one. Personally, I find very little difference.

In dealing with the points that the minister raised under the seven points - certainly the direction of expansion of provincial parks - I think as the population grows we need that expansion. As the economy grows and affluence comes, there are more people who will be using these and looking for them. With reference to parks that have been set up or established as parks and nothing has been done to them: I know as a farmer that I can't farm land I haven't got. Certainly, when you get the land you have the possibility of doing something with it.

The upgrading of these parks is a process that's been going on for many, many years. In doing that, the natural ecology and the uses of these parks as the people want them is looked into and should be looked into.

The matter of accessibility of parks - the metropolitan parks have been mentioned, and I think we have one here in the city of Edmonton that is a pride to Edmontonians, Mayfair Park. Another one, with the population of the size - I'm not talking about the province having it, it's a city park - the Mayfair one is an example of what can be done within a city.

I think that certainly the time has come for these parks in the large areas because we have half a million people in this area or more who are right near to it.

But I would suggest to the minister that he look at still more parks out in the more remote areas as well. He has on his file a request from my area for additional provincial parks there.

The part about the senior citizens and the disabled being able to get to these parks is a very valid one. I think that this will be looked after.

On the matter of resource development, I think that we in Alberta are very fortunate that we have a lot of Crown land. The minister has outlined which comes first, resource use for the public or, in other words, resource use for the public through the various dispositions that may be necessary in some cases. I think of the matter of coal mining in the Big Knife area, the lease there has been taken back, which indicates to me that there is probably enough coal there without that lease being used as well.

Now the role for private enterprise is one that concerns me when it gets into parks. I think that as a public in the province of Alberta we can afford enough money to have some of these things developed for the public so that without any appreciable cost we can have the benefits of these things. I would sure hate to see the day that our roadside campsites, our provincial parks are set up on such a scale that every time you move you are going to have to pay some money. I'm thinking in particular of some of the campsites. When you travel on the highway you are urged to rest for a while, if you get into a position where you are going to have to stop and pay I think it's going far too far in this day of affluence and so on.

In the matter of planning, I think this is something that has gone on in many of the parks and I commend the minister for continuing it. Certainly when we look at the budgets of this province - you can look from 1965 to maybe 1975, the budget will have gone up about four times. I think it's only right that the people of Alberta, through the government, put more money into the funds for recreation, forming of parks and campsites and so on.

I was rather interested in the minister making the remarks that there were substantial revisions of The Provincial Parks Act, a completely new provincial parks act. In closing the debate, I'd just like him to point out in the written text - I'm not talking about what he said in discussing policy, but in the written text of The Provincial Parks Act - to compare Bill No. 33 of 1974 to Chapter 288 to the Revised Statutes of Alberta.

All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is the new bill is shorter on definitions. It has eliminated the provincial parks board as such. Orders in council may now become ministerial orders. It provides for classification, and that could certainly have been provided for under the other one as well. I submit that it's basically the same legislation and I'm rather interested that very few of the members - I think the Member for Highwood did point this out.

There is one exception and this is one that is inserted here. It is sort of an insidious thing and it gives me a lot of concern. It's Section 9 (2), and I'll read it as follows. This is in the new bill.

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:

- (a) The Public Lands Act and the regulations thereunder, or
- (b) The Forests Act, 1971 and regulations thereunder, or
- (c) The Wildlife Act and regulations thereunder, or
- (d) The Forest and Prairie Protection Act and regulations thereunder.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to me this is undermining the power of the Legislative Assembly because all these Acts are approved by the members of this Assembly, and by one stroke of the pen it is proposed here that the minister may submit to cabinet anything that may change any of those pieces of legislation as they relate to parks. Mr. Speaker, to me this is certainly going too far in the field of government by order in council.

One other point in closing, and I'd just like to mention this. The minister has made a point of having visited all 38 provincial parks and I commend him for it. I would suggest to him that I could show him some interesting slides taken by myself of these provincial parks. And I would also suggest to the minister that if you are going out to see a provincial park as John Q. Citizen sees it, you not have a press release that you're coming, that the red carpet isn't out there, but you drop ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please address the Chair.

MR. RUSTE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the minister that if he's going out to visit a park that he doesn't have a press release made out, doesn't have the red carpet rolled out, but just drops in as the average citizen would drop in and then he sees conditions as they are. This is what I've done when I've visited provincial parks.

Now, with that, Mr. Speaker, I would just like the minister to explain the difference between the printed text of the bill that we have before us and what was there originally.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly followed by the hon. Member for Macleod.

MR. DIACHUK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to make a few comments on Bill No. 33, The Provincial Parks Act, 1974 for two reasons. One, a comment or two on the minister's presentation, reasons that I make a comment or two on the minister's presentation, and one or two comments on some of the debate that has taken place here last night and today.

The concept of the new bill that will provide a new dimension in provincial parks in Alberta is very encouraging. The forward approach, the exciting approach is one that no one can disagree with and I whole-heartedly endorse. The move that was taking place in the Calgary area and now is under study in the Edmonton area with regard to a provincial-urban park is definitely acceptable to all urban and rural people.

The question of the facilities that will be used for the enjoyment of outdoor recreation is very important. We must designate provincial parks separate from wilderness parks and wilderness areas, because from my understanding of the debate that has taken place in this Assembly in the last several years, in wilderness areas you hardly can enjoy any outdoor recreation. You must only walk through a wilderness area, you don't even dare ride on horseback.

Therefore, the parks, as set out in The Provincial Parks Act, 1974, should be used as outdoor recreation in different areas of the province, as has been elaborated by the hon. minister, Mr. Speaker, and by some of the members of the Assembly, for different purposes and different uses in different parts of the province.

I do have some support for private enterprise in provincial parks. I feel that unless we have some input from the private sector we will never know what our civil service

people are doing within the means that are possible and within the price that they are asking.

You know there is an area for input from private enterprise. It's competitive. It provides our civil service competition, and at the same time it may even bring in new areas, new phases and a new approach to the use of provincial parks. Let us not downgrade private enterprise in provincial parks. It's very easy to say that it's nice to use a provincial park free without any price. Now who are you fooling? Who is anyone fooling? Who am I fooling? Somebody still pays for it - John Q. Public, through the taxes. It's not paid immediately by the user of that roadside camp or the provincial park, but it's paid through the budget in some way.

Several comments that were made on a specific part of the bill, Section 9(2), just puzzle me. How can you honestly, how can anyone honestly, how can I honestly look at a concept of a provincial park, Mr. Speaker, without giving that legislation full autonomy in that park? Unless the regulations are strong enough that they do not permit Mines and Minerals to go in and explore, the Department of Highways to build a road, or even the Department of the Environment to go in and put a study through a provincial park - unless the regulations pertaining to a provincial park are strong enough override the regulations of other departments, we are going to have chaos in a provincial park.

I support the concept that a regulation as set out in Section 9(2) of the Act would override the legislation and the regulations of the several Acts that are outlined. I want to support the minister on this bill, and I want to say that I am looking forward to input, particularly in the Edmonton area and in the constituency of Edmonton Beverly, to further urban parks and possibly more than one for Edmonton. The City of Calgary has one. Maybe in the Edmonton area we may have more than one but not on as large a scale as they were fortunate enough to be able to acquire land for in Calgary.

Land, naturally, is needed. We do have a wonderful, fairly bountiful river here flowing through Edmonton - the North Saskatchewan River. It's got history. It still has future potential and it would even thrill me if there were a possibility of declaring that whole North Saskatchewan River valley throughout the City of Edmonton as a provincial park.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Might we just interrupt for a moment? The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation would like to have the leave of the House to revert to introduction of visitors.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. SORENSON:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly 36 junior high students from Lougheed which is in my constituency. It is situated on the beautiful Greenhead Route, although things are pretty white in that area today.

They are accompanied today by their principal Mr. Leeson, and their teacher Mrs. Barbara Sax. Also in attendance are their parents Mrs. Simpson, Mrs. Ness, Mrs. Losness, Mrs. Kroetsch, Mrs. Waite and Mr. Horricks, and bus drivers Mr. Potter and Mr. Ness. They are seated in the public gallery and I would request that they stand and be recognized at this time.

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe I had recognized the hon. Member for Macleod.

Bill No. 33 The Provincial Parks Act, 1974 (Cont.)

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to add a few words - I hope constructively - to this good debate on provincial parks. Look at the whole parks situation in Alberta. We have here a major share of the national park area in Canada and probably some of the largest areas in the country devoted to provincial parks. We have municipal parks. If we're not careful we're going to be 'overparked'.

When we are talking about the park concept, I want to congratulate the minister and thank him for enlarging Willow Creek Park and Park Lake, Park Lake particularly, which was badly overcrowded. This will be a great asset to my area, when you consider the two parks that I have. One is on Willow Creek, in a natural setting. Park Lake, of course, being an irrigation-balancing lake, isn't ideal. The setting is ideal but when the lake rises and lowers - it wasn't designed really for a park in a sense.

But one of the things that I would like to bring to the minister's attention is that we have three levels of parks that we have been talking about, national parks, provincial parks and municipal parks. Now in the major cities, Calgary, Edmonton, Lethbridge, Medicine Hat and Red Deer, in fact many towns, have municipal parks departments. We have one here right on the Legislature grounds. While we don't call it a municipal park, it is a park area. These are the areas where people can come - a boy with his girlfriend, or a father and mother with their little children - and take advantage of nature, the beautiful surroundings and the grass. This I think is good, because a lot of these people cannot get out to a provincial park or a national park.

There are a lot of people, and we tend, maybe, to think of those when we are thinking of parks, people who go out to fish for a weekend or take their families for weekend camping. This is fine, we have to have parks for them. But there are a great many people in apartments with small families, or senior citizens stuck with babysitting grandchildren for the weekend, while maybe their parents went out to the national park - who would just like to go out and sit in natural surroundings and let the children play and just soak up the sun and - whatever you do out in the park.

I think, for municipal parks, we have no complaints. I think many of the parks that the cities have are really well worth while; they are beautifully kept. The pride of the cities particularly in their parks is a good representation of just what pride these people take in their own community - a good representation to people coming into the city. But what I am concerned about is, when we get into municipal parks, Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, Red Deer have one; we have spent \$11 million to give a provincial park to Calgary - and I have no quarrel with that, I don't say that we have to give \$11 million to Edmonton, because as long as they are given the same amount of area, they shouldn't complain too much.

This is fine. This again is a large municipal park concept, even though it is a provincial park, operated from the city. These are the parks, particularly the one in Calgary - even though it is a provincial park, it has a municipal concept in that it is close to the city. You even have a bus service from the city right into your provincial park and you are going to take tremendous advantage, it is going to be a wonderful asset, even though it is run by the province. It takes the responsibility off the municipality.

Now we have other municipalities, such as Lethbridge with Indian Battle Park, we have Medicine Hat and Red Deer, and I think a per capita grant should be given to those people to develop those parks which would be alternatives to the provincial park. This would be, for example, a grant given to these cities to develop a park, because when you get a city of 25,000 or more, you have the same problems you have in a city, such as one the size of Edmonton or Calgary, where there are people who cannot get out to the provincial parks or to the national parks, but they could say get somebody, a taxi, to run them down to the municipal park, which is really larger than the municipality can handle.

I think if a grant were given to them to develop this park, it would have several advantages. One is that, once having made the grant, the park is then still under local control, it receives contributions from the local M.D. and its upkeep and maintenance is supported by the municipality. This gives us an alternative. I don't think it is the minister's intention to own all the parks in Alberta. We have a national parks system, we have a provincial parks system which is different in concept possibly from the national park. They are all in varied settings and represent different types of parks, different types of environment, to the people within the province.

I do feel then that the municipal park should, in the larger areas, receive grants to be an alternative to the provincial park. It would require a grant, a per capita grant, maybe once in a five-year period and then the municipality can keep up the maintenance.

Now, the fourth one I would like the minister to look at is the regional park concept. This is an area, for example - and I'm sort of coming home to my own area - where we have Keho Lake Park. Now Keho Lake is a storage lake for irrigation, but there is a beautiful park there. It was built primarily from grants which were given in 1967 to commemorate our nation's centennial. The towns of Barons, Nohleford, Picture Butte and the county of Lethbridge all went together to form this park, and it was called Keho Park. This park has a golf course and various other amenities, ballparks and the like. But it has been highly overused by people from the city of Lethbridge, and even as far Calgary and all the towns surrounding it who never put one cent into it. Yet now the maintenance is left up to the County of Lethbridge.

I would suggest there are other parks in the province where in much the same manner, there may be a small town which can't afford a municipal park of its own, but in the rural municipality there is a beauty spot. If several municipalities, and I am talking about urban municipalities such as towns or villages, and the municipal government wishes to develop a park cooperatively, grants should be made available to them, not on an individual basis, but according to this regional concept. They could develop a municipal park with say, two or three who could afford it going in together, then they don't really need a provincial park. Or again it's an alternative to the provincial park. There are a great number of places within our country where a bend in the river or a small lake could be developed into a municipal park, a regional park if you want to call it that, where one municipality can't afford it, but two or three would like to go in together and form a regional park. It would again be another substitute or an alternative for the provincial park.

One of the things I have against provincial parks in one sense is that we are getting to the concept where the people are relying continually upon government to do everything for them. They expect, for example, in the national parks a certain standard of service. They quite forget that while the national park system is funded, maybe, by the federal government, the \$2 licence that you pay to get into the place for the year is really put up by most of the citizens within the province. The people who are living within the province in which the national park is situated, such as Banff and Jasper, they've got you where the hair is short because it is on a national highway and you can't even get through there unless you - if you don't even step off the highway you still have to pay \$2 to get through. If you are just driving through this is fine. Now this is one way of getting money. I think the provincial parks - we're going to get to the stage - if we're going to supply the full facilities in our parks, we should be looking at a sticker system where a person pays \$2 or whatever the charge may be for the year. He is then able to go to every provincial park, the same way we have the national parks. This may be yet to come. I would like the minister to think on the term, particularly, of regional parks.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Athabasca followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall.

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker, just briefly on the matter of provincial parks. I must say I am very pleased to see the new act and I would also like to say that the act itself is not the only indication that there is a new policy as far as provincial parks in Alberta is concerned.

Within the department there is a new feeling and a new sort of attitude that parks are definitely on the way and there is a plan for the future. I think that is a recognition that has been necessary for a long time and I commend the minister for having developed this attitude within that department and branch.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that many of the hon. members have made suggestions here during this debate that they would like to see emphasis placed on the development of a provincial park in their own particular constituencies. They have made mention of some particular site that would be suitable for such a development. It's not my intention to do this, Mr. Speaker, because in the Athabasca constituency we already have two provincial parks fully developed, the Long Lake Provincial Park and the Cross Lake Provincial Park, and we have one in a stage of development at Calling Lake.

Speaking about the fact that a policy was necessary within the department, I might refer to the Calling Lake Park because this was a park that was very hastily conceived during August of 1971, with no preplanning and nothing done in the way of organization beforehand. Suddenly there was some money allocated, somebody was put in charge and said, you go out and hire a number of young people, make sure they are all over 18 years of age, put them to work out there and start developing a park. I knew all these young people and after this episode was over, on August 31, some of them talked to me about this. They said, we really didn't know what we were doing, and it didn't seem as though anybody in charge knew what they were doing, but anyway, we voted for you, Mr. Appleby.

As far as Calling Lake is concerned though, there has been a great deal of work done on this park ever since. I might caution people who are given a commitment through the parks branch that they are going to have a park, they don't need to think this will be something that will arrive overnight. In the last two years there has been a great deal of work done on the Calling Lake Provincial Park area, soil surveys, water surveys, inventory taken of flora and fauna, negotiations with people who hold timber quotas or leases for other purposes, gas and oil sites, traplines and so on. The whole package deal takes a great deal of assessment before the actual development takes place, as the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight has also mentioned.

I would like to take issue with the hon. Member for Wainwright when he suggests that maybe our minister has been out visiting parks on a red carpet basis, because this comes home to me very vividly.

About 11:00 o'clock one night last summer I had a phone call from the hon. minister and he said, I think I can get away tomorrow. Can I come up and look around? I was very pleased and he was at my place the next morning before 7:00 o'clock. We had breakfast, we went out, we visited the parks, we visited the campsites, we talked with guides, we talked with commercial fishermen, we talked with trappers. Nobody knew the minister was coming, but of course they were all highly delighted he was there, and to meet with him and talk with him on a face-to-face basis. I think probably one of the most significant developments of the day was toward evening, it was getting along about 9:00 or 10:00 o'clock at night and we went into an area where the local people had applied for a recreational lease.

We drove into the yard of the man who was heading up this local development. I introduced the hon. minister and he said, well, I'll take you down and show you where we want this development. So he took his four-wheel drive vehicle and we drove as far as we could. Then we walked through the bush and looked at the site and discussed it and so on and so forth. Coming back the hon. minister was walking ahead with one of the sons of this gentleman, and this man said to me, who did you say this guy was? I said, well, this is Allan Warrack. He said, well what does he do?

MR. LUDWIG:

Shoots bears with a muzzleloader.

MR. APPLEBY:

I said, well, he is the Minister of Lands and Forests. He said, you mean he runs the department? I said, yes, he's the fellow in charge. He said, well, you know, now I see it myself but I still don't believe that this could ever happen. That's the type of way that the minister went out and looked these sort of things over.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aw.

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker, in northeastern Alberta - and I don't want to confine these remarks just to the Athabasca constituency - I think we probably have more sites suitable for provincial parks than you could find anywhere else in the province. I'm reminded of the slogan on the licence plates from Minnesota which says, "The land of 10,000 lakes." I think we have a lot more than that in northeastern Alberta, and many of them are very, very suitable for the development of provincial parks. I know we are going to need more parks and I commend to the minister, and submit to him, that this is a good area to look for sites for future parks.

The facility for these locations for provincial parks is actually something we have as a sort of endowment or inheritance because we live in Alberta. When we start planning provincial parks we must not think we are planning for tomorrow, or next month or next year. We are actually, Mr. Speaker, planning a memorial that will be with us for all time. That is why it is so important that we have a policy for all time and I think this is what we are going to get from now on.

MR. HO LEM:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In rising to speak to this bill regarding provincial parks, I would like to begin by saying that I agree with the philosophies, principles and intent of this bill, that is, to provide more provincial parks for future Albertans. This should be a policy which both sides of the House endorse, particularly at this time when there is more money coming into the public purse by way of windfall profits. Certainly the government should take a good look at this situation, because if we do not - further down the road because of the inflationary trends and the increasing escalation in cost of land - certainly it may not be a good proposition later on.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on two points mentioned today, namely, a point about the provincial parks being located in Calgary and Edmonton, and secondly, make a few remarks regarding private enterprise in the parks in Alberta.

First, when we refer to the Fish Creek Park in Calgary, Mr. Speaker, I think this is a great misnomer. This is indeed not a fish creek park, it is a fished-out creek park. Those of you who have tried to go fishing at Fish Creek would know what I mean. I think the hon. minister across the way is looking at me. If he has ever tried his luck at fishing at Fish Creek he would know what I am talking about.

DR. WARRACK:

We also know who's to blame.

MR. HO LEM:

So if we are going to continue, Mr. Minister, to call this Fish Creek Park, perhaps a program of restocking this area should certainly be taken into consideration. And I say it seriously.

In the area of the Fish Creek Park, when we first heard of it - and this was quite some time ago - all the Calgary members, and indeed members from all parts of Alberta, were very happy. We find the Conservative side was certainly congratulating itself. They were patting themselves on the back for this wonderful thing they were going to provide for the City of Calgary and I agreed at that time. I thought it was a wonderful thing, Mr. Speaker.

However, since that time and now, I have second thoughts on this. Mind you, I want to make it abundantly clear that I am still in favour of the park ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Fence-sitter.

MR. HO LEM:

... but there are many problems which have cropped up since then. We talk about the cost. At first it was suggested it could be done for \$4 million and, of course, we find that now even the land itself is not all assembled and there are holdouts. Now what the final outcome might be I don't know. This is a problem which has to be faced, and faced on a very fair basis to all concerned. When you talk about being fair, you have to talk about the prices paid for the properties already assembled. Then what about the second level of acquisition where the prices have escalated? What do you say? Do we compensate the others who have not received so much, who had properties right adjacent to those being acquired? So this is an area that is going to cause a lot of controversy among the people owning properties and living in that particular area.

Just going on to the actual acquisition of land. Quite a bit of that land was slated for perhaps residential development and the area surrounding this Fish Creek area was slated for residential development. We find now that this area, which was slated and planned for residential development, is frozen and is taken off the market for development of homes. What now happens is, of course, that there is going to be a shortage of land available for the development of residential homes. This again contributes to shortages. Shortages contribute to inflation, and what happens? The whole area of Calgary and all the young people who are looking for land to build homes are affected. They are penalized because of this escalation.

I believe it is the government's responsibility that when you take a big piece of land away from development, certainly there should be alternatives for the provision of other lands for development for other purposes. This is very, very sound thinking, I believe, and I think that this should be taken into consideration by the government.

It has been suggested by the Member for Calgary McKnight that this is a wonderful thing. We are going to provide Calgary with a provincial park, thus relieving the City of Calgary itself from financial burdens in the provision of a provincial park, which is all right. They can use this money, he suggests, to provide for other parks in other areas of the city. This, on the surface, seems like a fair idea. He has suggested that perhaps the Nose Hill area would be acceptable as a reasonable alternative. Well, I don't know whether the members in this House would realize that the Nose Hill area is in this member's constituency. This is very nice. I can make suggestions that it should be in Calgary McCall. However, this is just one of the things that come to mind at this time. Of course, being a member trying to be re-elected, I don't blame you for coming out with these remarks.

AN. HON. MEMBER:

That's the cost.

MR. HO LEM:

On the second point, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about private enterprise going into the business of parks in Alberta, I think back about the park that was developed by Mr. Ernie Lutz in Calgary. He had conceived and implemented the idea of a park close to Calgary and it was called Happy Valley. At that time he owned that property and he had developed a recreational park for the use of Calgarians, including a ski run and a swimming pool. The area was along the Bow River. It was close to the city of Calgary. However, financially it turned out to be a disaster. And I am sorry to say that he had to sell at a very, very low cost in order to get out. These are the problems and dangers associated with private enterprise coming into park development.

Still talking about Happy Valley, this park has been in operation in Calgary for quite some years now. The City of Calgary, Mr. Speaker, has expressed interest in buying this park. For some political reasons, it never did get off the ground. But I would suggest to the minister that this would be an excellent park for the province to pick up, in that it is now available for sale. It's on the Trans-Canada Highway. It's very close to a high concentration of the population and it's on the river banks. It's about the last good piece of area available for this type of development.

I see the hon. Attorney General looked at me when I mentioned Happy Valley and its location. I hoped you might go along with that suggestion that it might be a good idea. But I think we should really look at this Happy Valley acquisition, the possibility of acquiring Happy Valley, because at the present time, Mr. Minister, you may provide for this in your budgeting. I don't know what it is, but I have that feeling ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please address the Chair.

MR. HO LEM:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. Having just put out the idea to the hon. minister, I hope the hon. minister might just take this idea into consideration.

Thank you very much.

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, I hadn't planned on speaking on the bill. However, I see it brings up some interesting possibilities and I would like to obtain the minister's thinking on the development of theme parks.

For instance, in the United States they are currently cashing in on it. They have Disneyland, Knott's Berry Farm, Opry World in Nashville, Astro World in Houston. They are just household words in Canada and thousands of our residents leave each year just to visit Disneyland and some of these theme parks. We have a couple in Alberta. The City of Edmonton has Storyland Valley Zoo and the Alberta Game Farm out of Edmonton, and these are a great attraction to tourists.

The closest park we have is Big Knife Park. I would like to see more than just a "point of interest" sign there because there is a history connected with this area. I want to commend the minister for clearing up the controversy over the lease with the coal company in that area.

We have a great and wonderful history in Alberta. I think especially of our relations with our Native people, the Indians; back a hundred or so years ago, in the days of Crowfoot and the coming of the North West Mounted Police - perhaps a park could be established along these lines.

I'd also like to mention a fantastic setting in my constituency. I know that the minister is aware of it. There will be a study conducted there this summer. It's between the towns of Loughheed and Hardisty. It's a very romantic place, I'm sure, because Mr. Loughheed married Belle Hardisty and no doubt they perhaps parked out along this beautiful chain of lakes. We have requested the minister, however, to change the name of the lakes. At the present time they are known as Bott Lakes, and I know the fish and game associations from Hardisty and Loughheed have asked, if there is a park developed there, that we have a different name. Bots, of course, is a disease of cattle caused by a botfly when larvae infest the stomach and the intestines, so that would not be a good name for a park.

However, it is the area where we have the famous rib stones, where the Manitou stone was found and where large collections of Indian relics have come from. Treaty Hill is in that area. So we are looking forward to a provincial park in that area in the near future. I would hope, perhaps, that it would have an Indian setting, a Native setting. Perhaps we could have a 30-foot statue of ...

MR. DIXON:

The Minister of Agriculture?

MR. SORENSON:

... Chief Crowfoot and a statue perhaps honouring the RCMP. I wouldn't feel too badly if there was also a statue of Mr. Lougheed and of Belle Hardisty.

MR. DIXON:

Hear, hear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. minister close the debate?

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to make any remarks on this very interesting subject of Bill No. 33. However, in the interests of furthering Chamber of Commerce efforts of all the hon. members of this particular Legislature, I want to draw attention to two very unique geological phenomena that would be of interest to many people in the Province of Alberta and that are situated, by some good fortune, in the wonderful constituency of Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

I refer to one, Gargantua, the largest cave that has thus far been located in the Rockies. To get into this cave, of course requires considerable expertise. It is not a place where laymen should venture. However, from the standpoint of people having some pleasure from it, there would have to be some provision made for utilizing it. There are caves in different parts of the world that do attract a lot of people, but they would have to have some commercialization. I would not see the government getting involved in the business of conducting cave tours. I would think somewhere in that area it would represent an involvement by private enterprise.

We also have the Arch of the Dinosaurs which is located at about 7,400 feet. It is a natural arch that is formed between two mountains, the largest and highest one probably in Canada, if not in the world.

Then we have the famous Window Mountain, which is a mountain that has a genuine window in it. You can have your picture taken there, if you are prepared to climb from the base, where the beautiful lake is located, up the side of the mountain. From there you can gaze north to the frozen parts of Edmonton and so on, and south to the glorious parts of my constituency.

So, generally, I endorse this particular bill. I can foresee that there will be more and more necessity for parks in the future. I think it will be appreciated very much now, and far more by succeeding generations, if a very meaningful and positive park policy is followed by those who are planning today.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, just two short questions to the minister on this bill, regarding the Fish Creek Park in Calgary. I wonder if the minister could outline to the House while he is closing the debate as to who gave the original idea of Fish Creek Park to the government?

One suggestion I have, Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, is to look at acquiring a piece of land adjacent to the park - and I'm thinking now of the area west of the extreme west end of the park. I can see problems with transportation, because you've purchased all the land in the valley and apparently to the bank limits, but there is very little opportunity for people, in this mobile age, to find a spot to park. We don't want to interfere with the trees in the valley. To me it would be an ideal spot to pick up some extra land that has already been cleared over the years for farming purposes. This would make an ideal site for bringing the people into the area, and any of those who want to take advantage of the park, as far as the picnic grounds and the trees, could do so without having the automobile interfering with them. Because you have certainly isolated

the area there, as far as development is concerned, as the hon. Member for Calgary McCall has mentioned.

This is one of the serious situations that has arisen from that park. It is going to raise the cost of any future development in the area, as far as development of homes or industry. I was wondering if there have been any negotiations with the house builders, with the City of Calgary, as to how we're going to overcome the isolation that we have brought about by taking a strip right through the centre of where the development was going to proceed to the south and to the west, in particular, of the land that is west of the park, between say Highway 22 and the banks of Fish Creek and the Indian reserve? Has there been any study made on the effect on that area? Is there going to be some sort of financial assistance or commitment from the government to assist in getting the utility right-of-way through the area, to save additional expense of having to go all the way around the park? What are the plans as far as the government is concerned? Has the Stampede Board offered to help in any way with this Fish Creek Park - because apparently they were willing to go in there themselves as an extension of the Stampede grounds. This is the reason I asked my first question as to who came up with the original idea, and in particular, of buying the section east of the Macleod Trail.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. minister conclude the debate?

DR. WARRACK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. At the outset, in concluding the debate, I would like to thank, really, all hon. members who spoke on The Provincial Parks Act, Bill No. 33, and recognize that this was, I think, one of the best debates we have had, and certainly, as far as bills I have had the honour to bring forward to the Legislature, I think the best debate among those bills.

I'll again work from back to front with respect to remarking on the points made. Of course, I will not have time to mention them all.

The matter of whose original idea it was to have a metropolitan-provincial park in Calgary, specifically on Fish Creek - the answer to that is really very clear, Mr. Speaker. It's very clear from the parks resolution asking for just that thing in the 1972 Legislature. That was the resolution that was sponsored by the Member for Calgary North Hill, now the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities, and seconded by the Member for Edmonton Norwood, who also spoke on the bill with respect to Edmonton. There are a number of others who spoke on the bill, particularly the Member for Calgary McKnight who also served on Mr. Purdy's informal Parks Policy Review Committee for me, and in that way helped to initiate this forward step.

Aside from that and some of the detail, perhaps trivial ...

MR. DIXON:

On a point of order, could I clarify my question because the minister may have misunderstood what I meant. I meant, who were the people who originally started, who said to you, well this is the place to buy this provincial park? This is what I'm after.

We all passed the resolution. We're all in favour of motherhood. We're all in favour of more parks. What I'm wanting to know is, who originally came to you and said, look you can purchase this particular piece of land?

[Interjections]

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, that's exactly the question I just finished answering.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh!

DR. WARRACK:

I didn't realize from some of the petty points brought up by the last speaker that he thought I was taking over the administration of the City of Calgary. There was no such intent. But at the same time, with respect to some of the matters he does bring up, I'll have some of the people who deal with those kinds of details take a look at it.

I could mention to the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest - darn it, he's gone - that I have indeed discovered that Allison Creek as he mentioned recently in question

period is in his constituency, I was also interested in the comments he made with respect to the caves in that area and I know there are some others too, including just west of Nanton and Window Mountain.

With respect to the remarks of the Member for Sedgewick-Coronation, if I understood correctly, he was suggesting that we undertake in the provincial park system - and he might nod, or otherwise, to be sure that I'm right - that we undertake theme park situations such as Disneyland and Astro World or whatever it is in Texas, within the provincial parks concept. If that's in fact his suggestion, I would like to strongly disagree. In fact, what we're talking about are natural parks with natural characteristics as parks of the province, which has nothing to do with whether these large, concrete-oriented extravaganzas are attractions. I've been to Disneyland with my family myself and it was great, but not as a provincial park.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

DR. WARRACK:

Relative to Big Knife Provincial Park, I was surprised actually that the member mentioned that we needed some signs to indicate the historical significance of the park. I wonder if he's been there? I have, and there is a sign that says just that.

I'm not sure about the question on lakes. There is some sort of system that's used in naming lakes and so forth, and I don't do it in any case. But relative to the suggestion for provincial parks, we do get many of them and follow them up as earnestly as we can. I think all members appreciate the fact that this is a very time-consuming task and that we can get trapped into the position of assessing so many new suggestions for parks that there's no capability left to do the work in development of parks.

The Member for Calgary McCall - darn it, he's gone too - mentioned Fish Creek and that it's fished out and ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Are there two suckers?

DR. WARRACK:

... there are no fish in it. I don't think there's even that, as a matter of fact.

There are two suckers in it? I see.

We also have Sheep Creek and we don't have any sheep in that ...

[Laughter]

... But certainly with respect to Fish Creek, if it doesn't have any fish it's not because, as a matter of fact, it's fished out, it's because the habitat over the years, under the previous government, was destroyed ...

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

DR. WARRACK:

... and that's the reason of course ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

That's right.

DR. WARRACK:

... that there's none there.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That's right. Agreed. There's nothing for fishing, nothing for fishing.

DR. WARRACK:

Relative to its restoration, I refer to the Buck for Wildlife program that I've mentioned on one or two occasions in the House and also to the fact that in, I believe,

May 1973, we did have an official opening of the fish hatchery in Calgary. It was a delightful affair except for the Donnybrook that the Member for Calgary Mountain View managed to get himself into with the Mayor of Calgary, which kind of spoiled it a little.

[Interjections]

Regarding the problems as mentioned by the Member for Calgary McCall, he is obviously confused about cost figures and he can easily update himself because the information on the matter of land acquisitions has been tabled. Also he's overlooked the fact that we bought a great deal of additional land by a unique opportunity that was afforded to us by Burns Ranches where we were able to buy a Y-configuration of land on each side of Fish Creek along the Bow River and therefore we were able to capture a great deal more watercourse shoreland. That's where a great deal of the additional money was spent and I have no doubt in my mind that it was money very well spent.

Again, I was really surprised, and I guess he's probably the only member who has taken a position against Fish Creek Provincial Park. I need not elaborate since the member is not here, but I am surprised he would take that kind of position, relative to the question of the financial capability of Calgary to proceed with its own parks operation. That was a point Mayor Sykes agreed to, as a matter of fact, at the time of announcement, that this would be helpful. Because it's clearly the case, Mr. Speaker, that it's our intention with the metropolitan-provincial parks for these recreational opportunities to be incremental to what is available through the civic parks administration and management.

I very much appreciated the remarks of the Member for Athabasca, particularly in three ways. First of all, the ludicrous way the old government in its tiring, stale days, mishandled the Calling Lake situation was a great lesson of how not to run a government ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

DR. WARRACK:

... and a great lesson also that people can react to treating them cynically like they did in such an instance as that, and that they lose confidence in that kind of a government, and of course that happened.

In addition, saving me from having to do it, I very much appreciated the hon. Member for Athabasca setting straight the remarks of the Member for Wainwright, which seemed a little below the belt, because there has not been a single occasion where as a matter of visiting a provincial park, there's been any news release or fanfare relative to it ...

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh!

DR. WARRACK:

... and in nearly every instance - I'm just telling it like it is whether you like it or not - in nearly every instance it has been the manner as described by the hon. member. As a matter of fact, I normally see virtually the whole park, including noting whether the restrooms are clean or not, before they even know that I'm there.

[Interjections]

Isn't that the way you'd do it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No ...

DR. WARRACK:

I think the answer is fairly clearly, no.

Thirdly, the direction rather than the parochial constituency-by-constituency approach that was reflected in some of the debate, the direction of looking towards the lake resources of northeast Alberta for future recreation opportunities has just got to be an excellent example. Having been in that area a good bit, including opening the Blue Feather Fish Derby in Lac La Biche in early August last year, it was very clear to me that we have a potential there that can perhaps even match the recreation future outdoor potential that we have in the eastern slopes of the Rockies. I think that he's quite right and we need to put our minds to the best possible use of this particular great resource we have in that part of Alberta.

I enjoyed the remarks - very constructive suggestions within them - by the Member for Macleod relative to some of the matters pertaining to national parks and the necessary integrated planning that clearly is needed there. If you look at it in levels of government, with the Province of Alberta and provincial parks being sandwiched between national parks and municipal parks, I think the member was quite right in looking in both directions of the sandwich - to national parks and some of the emerging problems there, and what this means to us in our responsibilities, and also the question of municipal parks and the kinds of needs that they have.

I am increasingly convinced that the point the hon. member makes is right. There are financial problems that are gradually, year by year, worsening and squeezing local governments a bit more with respect to the municipal parks they have established.

I would just like to disagree, if I could, with respect, Mr. Speaker, to just one point. Much of the financial woe of local governments, of municipalities, counties, towns, villages and so forth that is upon them in 1974 really comes about because of one-time capital grants that, for various good purposes in the past, have been made. For example, the centennial grant and Keho Lake. I have been there and it's excellent.

Keho Lake is an example of a very substantial park being developed on a capital-grant basis, but as I think every member of the Legislature knows, and certainly I am increasingly educated in this regard by the Provincial Treasurer, every time you spend a capital dollar you are automatically committing operating-cost dollars into the future. So if you make a one-time only capital grant to a project, and there is no ongoing provision for the financial capability to carry it on in a way that we would all have pride in, then I think you lead automatically into a financial crunch. That's appearing now and can only, I think, get worse.

The point of disagreement is - if I heard the member correctly - he was suggesting that capital grants were needed. I am more inclined to think that maybe that is what we ought not to do, or else be very prudent about any consideration such as that and think more in terms of the ongoing financial burdens. I believe that is where the real crunch is.

The suggestion on regional parks with local counties, municipalities and so forth getting together for a regional park is an excellent one. While I have addressed my mind to some extent to the constructive suggestion of some type of support system for local government parks, I hadn't really thought before of the possibility of a separate regional situation that might be an incentive for local governments to get together and cooperate to have a park entity that might fit, something that's available rather than a lot of smaller ones that might, in total, not be quite as good an offer. I think that's really a good point.

I would like to express the view I share with the member on the last point which he didn't press too hard, but I really think is worth pressing more often and harder. That's this problem of the over-reliant, government-responsible-for-everything kind of viewpoint that we can inadvertently force onto people to some extent. Perhaps in Alberta we should even worry about attracting the non-doers - the lazy people - with respect to coming to the province. I think this has always been a province of incentive and initiative.

The remarks from the Member for Edmonton Beverly were certainly very helpful and I think countered very effectively the point made by the members for Wainwright, Drumheller and Calgary Mountain View relative to the one particular section in the act. I will comment further on that in a few minutes. The point the Member for Edmonton Beverly made is that this is a parks concept and this legislation is for a parks concept. It is perfectly right that you have legislation that allows you to make regulations relative to parks in contrast to the land that they happen to be sitting on. Now that is something that clearly the Member for Wainwright neither understands now nor when he was Minister of Lands and Forests. But that is a major change in concept in this legislation as compared with the old.

The provisions for zoning and classification are there and they're important and that's also different. I thought the comment with respect to the private-sector checks and balances was an important point that could be made relative to the use of the private sector to some degree, at least, in some of the planning work that we undertake.

Continuing to respond to the remarks of the Member for Wainwright, he seems to agree with our policy, for example, of land acquisition, and removal of the conflict at Big Lake. I just wonder why he didn't do it because those problems and needs were there when he had the responsibility.

Above all, with respect to metropolitan-provincial parks, I would like the member to understand, as I think nearly all of us do in the Legislature, that the metropolitan-provincial parks - let me re-emphasize - are meant to be incremental parks, outdoor recreation experience opportunities beyond what we would otherwise have. So the business

of Mayfair and so forth is a civic matter. What we are thinking of is something incremental to that. That's the case both in Calgary and Edmonton.

Relative to comparison of acts, if it lets the member sleep a lot better, he can look at it the way he likes. In any case we have the objectives in this act which weren't there before, the classification and zoning matters, as I mentioned. The point made by the hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly relative to establishing the capacity to handle a parks concept in the parks act wasn't there before, and several other changes, as a matter of fact, that the Member for Wainwright pointed out himself.

I must make sure not to overlook and thank the Member for Camrose, in his quiet and effective way, for his help with respect to removing the resource development conflict that existed in Big Knife Provincial Park at the time of the opportunity to do this. Of course, this conflict was just recently removed. Also, that member, Mr. Speaker, served on the pretty informal committee of park review.

The suggestion certainly, for the future, of abandoned, reclaimed and - if you like - used-up coal mines being developed for future park purposes is an excellent and innovative one and I think that at the design stage of all of these, from this day forward, we ought to be taking into account that possibility.

I appreciate the concurrence of the Member for Lesser Slave Lake with respect to the parks policy. I thought he said on Wednesday that he didn't anticipate there would be anything other than The Wildlife Act that he would agree with me on.

MR. BARTON:

Just two. Just two.

DR. WARRACK:

Since he was not here last night I'll repeat what I said then. If he thinks he is going to disagree with me about everything else, let him put some resolutions on the Order Paper that reflect those disagreements and take me on.

With respect to the matter of public meetings and involvement, on September 10, 1973, I went to a public meeting at Slave Lake for a discussion with people of that area who had some concerns about the developments we are undertaking there. It was a small meeting in contrast to what the hon. member said it would be and the hon. member was not there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame. Shame.

DR. WARRACK:

I think that I would simply commend for rereading to all members the remarks of the Member for Calgary McKnight on two bases. One, the whole question of the concept of the Fish Creek Provincial Park as it was established and the concerns that went into handling it as well as possible, the approach of public involvement through the advisory committee and the way they, in turn, are involving the public of Calgary.

Secondly, if all members might notice, the sequence of development that has been worked out in the public involvement process; the tour that has been developed there, the questionnaire that is about to, or perhaps even has, just come out on the public's view in Calgary of park development on Fish Creek, the preliminary plan that will be developed and put forward for further public consideration, the hearings anticipated as a result of that public plans development and finally, arriving at a concept plan that is really one from the public involvement of the city of Calgary, which the park is meant to serve. We will then take that and proceed in the Parks Division with our detailed department planning on that major and important project.

I might mention, for the interest of members, that very soon in Calgary, on CFAC television, there will be a full program on the work and features of Fish Creek Provincial Park. Last Tuesday night I did my part of the taping for that, and that is why I was not here.

The Member for Drayton Valley pointed out also, prior to anyone else really, the importance of local parks, and the essential nature of recognizing that in local areas there may be different local needs that should be met with those local parks. There was the possible need for some system of financial support for them. Also, he mentioned the Brazeau Dam mess that was left by the old government, and I was very grateful for his comments in thanking the government for the clean-up that we have undertaken there on PEP programs through recent winters.

The remarks of the Member for Lethbridge West were very helpful. I did want to clarify one thing that I had apparently had not been very clear about. When I made my remarks about larger parks, Mr. Speaker - I want to be clear about this - I'm not really thinking about some typical, perhaps you would say model, type of park that should be a provincial park. What my thinking is, as a matter of parks policy, is that we should have a portfolio of features, a portfolio of locations, and a portfolio of sizes of provincial parks across the province. Since we have a large number of smaller ones here now, I'm not suggesting that we get rid of any of these parks, we don't have too many of them, but we will have proper balance after we have, in future years, added larger parks. Then I think we will have the balance that we need. That is the point that I really did want to make.

With respect to the intensive developments, I would draw the members' attention to the fact that in the position paper, we are referring to not having these intensive developments in new - notice the word "new" - provincial parks.

MR. LUDWIG:

On a point of order, I believe it is quite obvious that the hon. minister has lost contact with his bill and he has bored everybody and now he ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order. Order please. As the hon. member may have noticed, the debate has been quite broad on the question of parks and in my respectful opinion, it is appropriate for a bill of this type, which is a new bill and covers a broad area.

DR. WARRACK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I was responding specifically to comments made by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West. I would suggest the Member for Mountain View save his intemperate remarks for his colleague.

With respect to park expansion, I do want to confirm that we have been able to make a substantial land acquisition on the other side of Park Lake. I'm sure the member has been there, as have I, and knows the area I'm talking about. We do have a real opportunity for a major expansion in that area. I also notice the point he makes with respect to suggesting that there be no fee, at least for day-use of parks.

Yes, and I almost missed it, the hon. member did make another extremely important point. That is the question of powers in many of the acts that have any enforcement feature about them - powers to the government, be they cabinet or minister, or the practical fact that these powers have to be delegated simply in order to operate. That is a concern that I really do share. I'd like to state a philosophy in that regard, Mr. Speaker, and also commit myself to follow that philosophy to the upmost I possibly can. That really is the philosophy that power ought to be underused, that to some extent if you have to use power strongly, it is often a result of bad management, as a matter of fact. The authorities that might on very rare occasions be necessary, I hope do not need to be necessary.

I would be less than honest if I didn't say we have had some instances of problems like this. Enforcement forces, no matter where they are, be they police, or parks or wildlife [officers], often do attract the kind of person at the outset the hon. member mentions. This is the reason we try to be so careful in the screening of them, so we are not hiring people who come to a job because they enjoy the use of power - that's just who we don't want.

I just want to assure the member that I am very conscious of that point. Also, and I think this was true under the previous government as well, we have had relatively little problem in that regard, when you consider that the park visitations we have had are ranging from 4.5 million to 5.5 million visitors per year. I really think, under the previous government and now, that that area is being pretty adequately handled. I certainly feel conscious about it.

I think the Member for Highwood made the same sort of, I think, now-demolished remarks as the Member for Edmonton Wainwright. I think the Member for Highwood is worrying about trying to sort of piggyback on this government to the next election. He mentioned that this government has had more time and more money. Maybe more money, but that is because we are not at sixteen and two-thirds per cent royalty anymore either. But more time, Mr. Speaker? We have had two and a half years, and they had thirty-six.

I'd like to deal, no perhaps I'll wait ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

... beg the following question ...

DR. WARRACK:

Don't get excited.

I was going to deal with the question of the area of the act that Mr. Taylor, the Member for Drumheller, had expressed concern about, and also the Member for Mountain View and the Member for Wainwright. Perhaps I'll wait since he doesn't happen to be here at the moment. He certainly made some good points that I would want to respond to. Perhaps I will do it as I conclude.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. minister be able to conclude shortly? I believe that the clock indicates that he might.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, the honest answer is no. I have difficulties subduing my enthusiasm about provincial parks. I'd be prepared to finish up, on the commitment that I would do it as quickly as I can, if the House would like me to do so. Otherwise I would have no choice but to conclude ...

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it the House agrees that the hon. minister may conclude.

DR. WARRACK:

Thank you very much. I will be as brief as I can.

Relative to this section on page 4, subsection 2. This is the matter that deals with the other four Acts listed. Please notice a number of things. First of all, Mr. Speaker, please notice the point that the Member for Edmonton Beverly made with respect to a specific parks concept in contrast to the provisions that are in The Public Lands Act, The Forests Act, The Wildlife Act, and The Forest and Prairie Protection Act. That is the first point, Mr. Speaker.

Secondly, I would ask that there be recognition of the fact that the provisions here only apply within the boundaries of provincial parks. In other words, there is no implication of any change in these four Acts anywhere else other than in provincial parks.

Please notice thirdly that all these acts are in the jurisdiction and responsibility of the Department of Lands and Forests.

Fourthly, and perhaps most importantly, I have queried this very point with Legislative Counsel. The explanation was that in this way we could have additional or different park-concept regulations within provincial parks boundaries as protections for our parks resources beyond what could be provided in the four Acts listed.

I really think that if you take into account those considerations, I think it removes the concerns there relative to whether this is a useful area for the act to have. This was the way Legislative Counsel developed it in order to have the regulations for the park concept be as applicable as possible under the act. I am also informed by Legislative Counsel that this is not the first time this type of legislative provision has been in acts in Alberta.

The question of seizures though, Mr. Speaker - and I really do want to say that I am concerned about that as well. I guess why these sorts of provisions were in the old Parks Act and, I guess, are in virtually all enforcement-related acts, is the fact that you have the difficulty of it being necessary to act on the spot to protect park resources and to protect other citizens of the public. You simply need that authority on occasion. In terms of seizing the thing - or item - that is involved, it is often impossible to be looking at the prosecution of an offender without the thing that is involved. Now, the hon. member's point - and it's quite right, without a doubt - is that in the event the person is acquitted, you have in the meantime held the articles or things that had been seized.

That certainly is a disadvantage to this kind of provision. But I had given a good deal of attention to this myself and I really don't see any alternative before us, with respect to handling the kinds of matters we're often faced with in order to be fair, and

yet take that degree of risk, [as] the member rightly points out, with respect to the possibility of holding something seized for a period of time, even though the person might end up being acquitted.

The remarks from the hon. Member for Stony Plain, I'll just say I obviously appreciated most of all - although with at least one exception. Most of the remarks that he had made are certainly in accord with my thinking and with the parks legislation on the Policy Paper, which is not surprising inasmuch as he had a very substantial role in its development and preparation.

The Member for Lethbridge East, please call me happy, not gay. Okay?

[Laughter]

Come on, live a little, you guys.

But I think the member wanted to imply a suggestion for a future park location on the Oldman River, but wasn't very specific. If he would send me a note to be sure that I know just the area he is talking about, I would very much appreciate that.

To the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview: I think really we were in very substantial agreement all the way through, which he largely indicated during the course of his remarks. There is one thing, though, that I do want to clarify, and I think perhaps a slight misreading of our parks' Position Paper that led to the uncertainty. That has to do with Lac Cardinal Provincial Park - the stampede grounds. As a matter of fact, I opened the North Peace Stampede there recently and saw the situation. The statement that is in the Position Paper has to do with this:

Alberta's Parks lands will be protected from mechanized use such as snowmobiles and all-terrain-vehicles Other activities such as townsites, swimming pools, organized athletic games, rodeos, and private cottages will be regarded as conflicts in new Parks.

So I think the clarification is noting the word "new". It's possible that those situations that we have, and Lac Cardinal may be one, in the future there will need to be some resolution as to location and this can be certainly worked out, but the thinking there is in terms of a mutual-agreement approach rather than anything else.

I noted a number of other suggestions - and I am hurrying on just a bit, Mr. Speaker. With respect to the suggestion of campsites, there was a suggestion of confusion. There is no confusion in the government, although there may be some confusion amongst some members of the public with respect to the question of highway campsites; these are the provincial parks and the fact that we have camping facilities in provincial parks.

The basic point of it is, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Highways needs to have people handling highway maintenance anyway, so those people are there and those capabilities and equipment are there anyway. It would really be a duplication if we went with the same sort of equipment, up the same roads, to do the same job they are now doing. That basically explains why it's more cost-effective and sensible to be operating the way they presently are, with respect to highway campsites being handled by the Department of Highways.

There was - and I don't know whether this might worry the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview - really no substantial disagreement about the remarks made relative to private enterprise. It doesn't disturb me because I think this is not a question of anything but, what is the best kind of parks system we can offer to the people? I would clarify that in terms of the use of private consultants we have been, and are, on an ongoing basis, using them on a project basis with the long-term planning being done within the Provincial Parks Division of the department. I think that was one of the concerns that had been expressed.

Certainly the question of what investments and what fee structures and so forth is a major part of the travel industry study that is being undertaken at the initiative of the hon. Member for Edson and the minister responsible for tourism, Bob Dowling.

The remarks of the member for Edmonton Norwood - and this is the second last speaker, Mr. Speaker - were certainly articulate and clear, pointing out the need for parks, particularly in a metropolitan setting and especially in certain areas within that metropolitan setting, especially for the disadvantaged people who might be economically, physically, mentally or otherwise handicapped, and in those ways, disadvantaged.

The point was well made also, Mr. Speaker, with respect not only to the appreciation side of education related to parks in outdoor recreation, but also the question of a greater understanding of the ecology that is Alberta.

Finally, with respect to the first speaker, the Member for Calgary Mountain View, I've already dealt with the first point on page 4, subsection (2), but there were two other points made as well that I would want to respond to.

One is the question of whether the minister should, by order, have the power to "close all or any part of a park for such periods as he considers necessary;". This is what we do, Mr. Speaker, when we are in the construction redevelopment of a park such as we presently are at Little Bow Provincial Park, Mr. Speaker. We've just got to, in some of these cases, exclude the public, remembering that there are a lot of children who are part of the public who come to these parks and there is a considerable danger there. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, if anyone has any feeling that this minister or any future minister who might be responsible for parks and the parks act is misusing those powers, there is the opportunity as a member, and by petition, to bring that case before this Legislature. With that provision there as a protection for a call to explain actions - which I am certainly prepared to do - then I think we can rest assured of no serious concern in that regard.

Finally, leaving aside his confusion about the commercial factors in private enterprise, the point on page 5, relative to "... powers conferred upon him ...", "him" being the director or any employee of the parks division, "... by this Act", I believe that the member misread it slightly inasmuch as Section 16 refers to only "... powers conferred ... by this Act", and so that constrains them. And in addition [I would like] to remind all members that the act itself only applies to parks within provincial boundaries of parks, and not beyond. Those considerably limit the powers as compared with what had insidiously been suggested by the hon. member.

With those brief remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the support of all hon. members for second reading of Bill No. 33, The Provincial Parks Act, 1974.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the motion for second reading of bill No. 33, The Provincial Parks Act, 1974, would all those in favour please say aye.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 33 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 38 The Agricultural Pests Act, 1974

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 38, The Agricultural Pests Act, 1974. Mr. Speaker, this act replaces the original Agricultural Pests Act which was passed 13 years ago in 1960. Naturally, Mr. Speaker, after a period of time such as that, there is need for considerable upgrading and clarification of the Act, and this is one of the useful functions the new act will fulfil.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that most of the items of clarification, as you read the act, are quite obvious if one compares the new act with the old one. For this reason my remarks will not be very extensive. However, Mr. Speaker, there are some sections of the new act which are innovative and I will mention these briefly.

Under the previous Act, Mr. Speaker, the Lieutenant-Governor could, by regulation, cause any animal, bird, insect, plant or disease considered to be harmful, or harming in any way crops, livestock or property, to be designated as a pest and provision was made under that Act for destruction of the pest. Under the new act, by regulation, the Lieutenant-Governor can designate that any animal, bird, insect, plant or disease may be designated as either a "pest" or a "nuisance".

Now if something is classified as a pest under the act, then there is an obligation upon the owner or the occupier of premises wherever that pest is located to destroy such pest. This, Mr. Speaker, is where the word, "shall" destroy comes into the act and it becomes very clear what has to be done. However, Mr. Speaker, with the introduction of the term "nuisance", as applied to an animal, bird, insect, plant or disease, then the owner or occupier of premises may be called upon to destroy the nuisance, and the word "may" is inserted into the act.

Now there might be some question, Mr. Speaker, as where the distinction is between whether somebody would want to call it a nuisance and have it destroyed or not have it destroyed. I might give an example perhaps of an animal such as a coyote. If somebody had a coyote on his premises, or coyotes on their premises, and they had grain out in swaths that were being eaten up by mice and they thought the coyotes were being useful in killing off the mice, then that person might say, even though it's a nuisance animal, it's useful to me and I will not have it destroyed. Of course, in that case, if the hon.

Member for Sedgewick-Coronation were here, this is where he might probably begin to promote his coyote appreciation day.

Mr. Speaker, the other category of the nuisance would be if somebody perhaps had a flock of sheep and the coyote, even though classified as a nuisance, was molesting the sheep, then he might want to have the animal destroyed. That would be the difference in the way the nuisance animal might be treated under different circumstances.

Another animal that we might possibly consider as a nuisance animal, or could be classified as a nuisance animal, might be a skunk. Some people might want to destroy it because it was inundating their chicken house and killing off the chickens or eating the eggs, and somebody else might want it as a pet. So there would be a difference there. This, of course, Mr. Speaker, brings in the two things, the pest and the nuisance, as actually designating "shall" or "may". If the hon. members who had so much difficulty with "shall" and "may" under Bill No. 21 can realize the difference here, then they can, in fact, appreciate what is trying to be done under these new amendments.

So many sections of the old act are not designated as they were before. One was grasshopper control. This now comes under the umbrella of insect control because, of course, 13 years ago we didn't have the Bertha army worm and we never know what other insects might become pests or nuisances. So it is put under one general umbrella now for control purposes.

Another area that has been extensively added to is that of dealing with bacterial ring rot as far as potatoes are concerned. With the emphasis and thrust in the Department of Agriculture on processing of primary products here in the province, it has become vitally necessary that very extensive control should exist for controlling bacterial ring rot and the production of the primary product as far as potatoes are concerned. This is why it is included.

Something else, Mr. Speaker, as I finalize my remarks. I would draw the attention of hon. members to the fact that the new act is coordinated with The Wildlife Act and regulations and also The Agricultural Chemical Act and regulations and I would point out that this was necessary, and these additions have been made with the concurrence and cooperation of these two other branches of government.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, in second reading of Bill No. 38 ...

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I wonder if the honourable gentleman opposite would consider adjourning debate so we could move on with the customary budget motions. He would then be the first speaker when we come back to this bill.

MR. BUCKWELL:

I would be delighted to adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

[The motion was carried.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the permission of the House to revert to Government Motions and to Tabling Returns so the Provincial Treasurer can table some returns in connection with the budget.

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. Government House Leader the requested consent?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS (CONT.)

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table with the members of the Assembly three reports. First, the Annual Report of the Municipal Loans Revolving Fund under Section 16 of The Municipal Capital Expenditure Loans Act. Second, the report on pledged securities as required under Section 82 of The Financial Administration Act; and third, copies of orders issued under The Emergency Guarantee Act in accordance with the requirements of Chapter 41 of that Act.

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS (CONT.)

2. Mr. Lougheed proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

Be it resolved that the Address be engrossed and presented to His Honour, the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, by such members of the Assembly as are members of the Executive Council.

[The motion was carried.]

3. Mr. Hyndman proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

Be it resolved that this Assembly do resolve itself into Committee to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

[The motion was carried.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move the [House] do now adjourn until 8:00 o'clock this evening.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 12:29 o'clock.]

