

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Friday, April 26, 1974

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

## PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. members will undoubtedly have noticed a display on the north wall of the Chamber. When I was asked for leave to introduce the display, I was informed of similar things having been done previously under the chairmanship of my respected predecessor. But I wasn't aware until this morning that on those occasions the unanimous leave of the House had been asked beforehand. I would therefore ask hon. members not to regard the occasion as a precedent.

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to introduce to you and through you to the Legislature, Grade 6 students from Princeton School in my constituency of Edmonton Belmont. There are about 60 students and attending with them are two teachers Mrs. Rybotycki and Mr. Roebrock. They are in the public gallery. I should like to ask them to rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure this morning to introduce 12 students from McKay Avenue Junior High School in my constituency of Edmonton Centre. Mr. Speaker, they are accompanied this morning by their teacher Mr. Ristola. They are seated in the members gallery and I would ask them to rise and be recognized by the members of the Assembly.

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to introduce some 60 Grade 6 students from Brentwood School in the Sherwood Park portion of my constituency. They are accompanied by Mrs. Archibald and Mrs. Baker. They are attending this morning, which I expect to be one of the most exciting mornings in the history of this Legislature. I'll ask them please to stand and be recognized.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to have the opportunity this morning to introduce to you and through you, to all hon. members, 40 students from Dr. E. P. Scarlett High School in my constituency in Calgary.

It's also a particular pleasure also to welcome a grandson of a member of the Legislature, the hon. Member for Drumheller. So I would ask them to stand and be recognized.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Grandson?

[Laughter]

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I was hoping the hon. member would explain, but the note I have - it's twice-removed.

#### TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to file the Annual Report of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation for the fiscal year 1972-73.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a reply to Question No. 114 as requested by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table, for the information of hon. members, two annual reports of the Provincial Auditor; the first on the Alberta Investment Fund for the year ending December 31, 1973, and the second for the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation for the year ending December 31, 1973.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Annual Report of the Corrections Branch for the year ending March 31, 1973. It is not required by statute, but I thought it might be of general interest.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

#### Office of the Premier

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, today is a very exciting day, not just for the capital city of Alberta, but for Alberta at large. As hon. members are aware, the government announced some time ago it would be embarking upon a new, novel and unique approach to provincial parks, recognizing the concentration of population. There was a definite feeling that more needed to be done to provide recreation facilities, and access to them, for many of our citizens living in the two metropolitan centres of Alberta because so many of them are in a position where circumstances prevent them from taking advantage, through private automobile transportation, and from having full use of the provincial parks of the province. Although we have a program of expanding the provincial parks as they presently exist, the two metropolitan provincial parks are an important breakthrough for Alberta as far as an approach in terms of Canada.

We've had a tremendous reaction to the Fish Creek Provincial Park in Calgary. I was advised yesterday that they now have, in terms of questionnaires as to the use of the provincial park in Calgary, over 29,000 individual questionnaires which have come back from citizens showing interest in the proper use. And I think that is a tremendous response.

We had some concern - and it was discussed at the time the park was announced - as to the park in Calgary being in the southern extremity, because of the topography of the area, and the plans with regard to Fish Creek as to its accessibility by the citizens living in the northern part of Calgary. But the City of Calgary has cooperated very well in terms of transportation and I am informed that of the 29,000 questionnaires in Calgary, 35 per cent of them came from north of the river and from the northern part of the city and that indicates its use.

Mr. Speaker, as has been discussed in this Legislature, a number of sites have been considered for a provincial park within the Edmonton area. There was a useful debate in the Legislature on the matter. And so the 16 Edmonton area MLAs formed themselves into a group to look at this matter as an assignment, as something they wanted to participate in

doing. They examined all the various sites and worked with the responsible ministers who were involved.

All 16 Edmonton area MLAs have developed what we think is truly a unique proposal for a \$30 to \$35 million Capital City Recreation Park for Edmonton. The project includes creating a 9-mile-long lake of the North Saskatchewan River with extensive park and recreation facilities on each side of the river valley.

I would describe the plan as the most exciting and novel approach to assuring the quality of life for families in metropolitan centres as yet proposed for Canadian cities. The plan is endorsed by the Alberta government even though it will cost a considerable amount of money in comparison with previous provincial construction parks budgets. We are prepared, Mr. Speaker, to commit such funds because we believe it is a concept that will be enjoyed by more Albertans than perhaps any other single provincial project, and because we have special responsibilities here in this Legislature to maintain the beauty of Alberta's capital area which ties these Legislature Grounds with the proposed Capital City Recreation Park.

The plan was presented to the city council, the aldermen of Edmonton, yesterday by the Edmonton MLAs. The initial response of the mayor and the aldermen to the concept was positive and favourable. This morning, when it was publicly unveiled, the mayor went further than that. In thinking about it overnight, he was most enthusiastic about the project and felt that it would truly make Edmonton outstanding as a capital city in terms of use and appreciation of the facilities by our citizens and by our visitors to this capital city. There was a very positive response by the mayor.

Just before the House convened, Mr. Speaker, I went on a helicopter trip with the mayor and we covered the entire area. Certainly seeing it and its potential on this spring day is something that I hope all members would have a chance to do.

The Minister of the Environment, Mr. Speaker, has described the project as much more than just a park.

The main features and advantages of the plan are:

- (1) The creation of a lake almost nine miles long by nearly one-half mile wide to improve the beauty and uniqueness of the river valley. The lake develops from the construction of an adjustable 15-foot weir (a flow control structure) near the Beverly Bridge. You can see it, hon. members, if I could point it out, as the orange strip across the river towards the right-hand side of the drawing. It will back up the river to create a lake as far upstream as the Legislature Building. It will increase substantially the water recreation potential of the river. I believe the Minister of the Environment has tabled a report with regard to the weir and its technical factors. The summer sports, which the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation has been involved in, will include canoeing, kayaking, paddle-boating, sailing and swimming. In the winter the frozen lake will be converted to an ideal setting for family skating and cross-country skiing. If one has had the opportunity to see how this develops a community, I bring out the comparison of the Rideau Canal in Ottawa on a winter day.
- (2) The river banks will be converted into a "water conservation area" - that is the brown-coloured portion - running the full length of the lake and encompassing a minimum of a 150-foot set-back from each shore. There will be five pedestrian and bicycle river crossings strategically located along the valley. An example of one of them, the one that crosses from the Legislature Building, is the middle sketch here at the top on this side, and the four can be seen as the small lines that interspace through the river diagram itself. The area will be landscaped and terraced in a manner for outdoor enjoyment by the citizens, with footpaths, bicycle trails, observation posts - which are the blue circles - park benches and horticultural displays.
- (3) The plan includes a series of new provincial and city parks [and] recreation areas involving over 3,000 acres of green area. The north side - starting from the right-hand portion - includes Rundle Park, and - in the drawing over to the far right - the new Hermitage site - coming back down - the Highlands Golf Course in the middle, Kinnaird Ravine and all adjoining riverside property. The south side will include a large area known as the Strathcona Park Site - which is in green to the right at the end - and there is a great deal of reclamation to be done. It is not a desirable area now, and in our view one of the important things in these developments is to take some of the least desirable areas and upgrade them. In addition, on the Strathcona Park site there will be a Natural Resource Science Centre depicting Alberta's natural resources. In addition, on the south side of the river the Gold Bar Ravine, the Riverside Golf Course, and all adjoining vacant river front property will be incorporated within the park project.

The park features are proposed to be designed for maximum family outdoor use and a wide range of recreation facilities including picnic areas and sports use such as golf, tobogganing and hiking.

It is proposed, Mr. Speaker, that the park and recreation complex, which will be totally funded on a capital basis by the provincial government, will be planned on a cooperative basis between the city and the province. The Minister of Lands and Forests has stated that there are many feasible alternatives for development and administration to assure that the project is operated in accordance with the overall recreation needs and plans for the city of Edmonton. The "water conservation area", such as the weir and the banks, will naturally have to be the prime responsibility of the provincial government, together with the Natural Resource Science Centre.

Mr. Speaker, we seek the concurrence and full cooperation of the City of Edmonton in this basic concept. We welcome any additional ideas or modifications from city representatives or from members of the Legislative Assembly. It's a basic concept which doesn't, in any way, mean that changes cannot be made in it, and we would welcome them from all sides and corners of the Legislature.

The schedule would be - and I'm getting us involved in commitments - to target for five years but to do our very best to have this project fully completed by the time the visitors come from all over the world in 1978 for the Commonwealth Games.

[Applause]

Mr. Speaker, we felt that if we were going to do this at this time, it would only be wise for us to take an additional action. The area that is involved here will become a restricted development area by order in council and regulation, as of now. But, in addition, we are declaring a restricted development area from the city outskirts - to the top of those maps - all the way down to Fort Saskatchewan and the Clover Bar constituency, and upstream from the city limits all the way up to Devon, for the people of Alberta and for their future enjoyment.

Mr. Speaker, the particular river valley site for a provincial park in the Edmonton area was developed by the Edmonton MLAs over other possible sites for the following six reasons:

- (1) It provides water recreation capacity which is very limited in the Edmonton area.
- (2) It could be designed so that the largest number of Albertans could use the facilities, particularly those not having the use of private automobiles for transportation.
- (3) It will directly serve a part of the city having the least accessible park and recreation areas.
- (4) It takes advantage of the unique features of Edmonton topography in the river valley and should create the impetus to generally upgrade the river valley.
- (5) It would encourage the eastern industrial part of the city to upgrade its appearance and environmental aspects.
- (6) It encompasses the provincial government's special responsibility with regard to the capital city needs and Legislature Grounds plans.

Mr. Speaker, the ministers responsible and I myself will be happy to answer questions on the matter. I conclude by saying that our objective in this whole approach is to improve the quality of life for as many of our citizens as possible without limitation because of their income position. I think it's truly an exciting and unique and novel project for Alberta.

[Applause]

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to comment on the announcement made by the Premier regarding the proposed Capital City Recreation Park for Edmonton, let me say from the outset that we, on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, see this indeed as an exciting concept. Initially, having had the opportunity to hear the comments which the Premier has made this morning, having had an opportunity to look at the display that is in the Assembly, it certainly appears on the surface, Mr. Speaker, to be a very worth-while and, as I say, a good concept.

I can assure the government, Mr. Speaker, that the members on this side of the House, in the remainder of this session and following this session, will attempt to make a number of what we think are positive suggestions as to how the project might be improved. I do think there are perhaps three or four areas that we might well look at.

One relates to the comments the Premier made regarding restricted development. It seems to me that in the area downstream from the east end of the park, we presently have a sizeable amount of industrial development in that area. May very well be that the Department of the Environment will have to reassess the standards it presently has for industry in that particular portion of the city of Edmonton.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we would genuinely hope that the government will be successful in having this park finished by the time of the Commonwealth Games. That seems to me to be a good reason, not only because of the anticipated number of visitors from various Commonwealth countries, but in addition to that, with the costs now involved from an inflationary standpoint, once the decision has been made to go ahead and the land is acquired, the sooner we can finish the project the better it will be, not only for Edmontonians but for Albertans, not just from a recreational standpoint either but from the standpoint of the expenditure of public funds.

We on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, will be extremely interested and would hope the government will make available to us at an early date the amount of land it will be necessary to purchase. We would hope that we will not find ourselves in the same situation we did with the park in Calgary, where we weren't able to get the information on the provincial park that is being built in the city of Calgary.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, in addition to the environmental concerns on the east end of the park, let me also say that I am sure all Edmontonians and Albertans will be concerned about the quality of water in this lake. We trust the Department of the Environment will certainly keep more than a watching monitoring service on that.

In general, Mr. Speaker, it looks like a good and exciting concept. We look forward to help in improving the concept.

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

#### Petroleum Administration Act

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Attorney General and ask the Attorney General if the government has yet received an invitation from the federal House of Commons - the subcommittee dealing with the Petroleum Administration Act?

MR. LEITCH:

My recollection, Mr. Speaker, is that the hon. Premier answered that question in the affirmative a few days ago in the House, and indicated that I would be appearing before that committee, representing the province's views.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a follow-up question to the Attorney General. I believe the Premier said the government anticipated an invitation to appear before the committee. My question is, has the government received this?

MR. LEITCH:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK:

Is the Attorney General in a position, Mr. Speaker, to indicate to the House when he will be appearing before the committee?

MR. LEITCH:

No, Mr. Speaker. There were a number of alternative dates suggested by the chairman of the committee. We will be considering those within the next day or so. I would expect that by early next week I would know the date of the appearance.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney General or to the Premier. Has the Premier or the Attorney General been in correspondence or communication with the Prime Minister?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, no, in the sense that the letter I mentioned has not yet been sent. It's my hope to complete the drafting of it this afternoon and I would hope it would be in the mail and sent by Monday.

[Laughter]

I'd better check that. It would be my intention to make sure that it's sent by telex by Monday.

Excess Profit Tax

MR. CLARK:

A second question, Mr. Speaker, to the Provincial Treasurer. Has the Provincial Treasurer had any discussions with the federal Minister of Finance regarding a proposed excess profit tax, from the federal government standpoint?

MR. MINIELY:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question. Has the Provincial Treasurer taken the initiative in drawing to the attention of the federal government the feelings of the Government of Alberta on the proposed excess profit tax?

MR. MINIELY:

Well, I believe, Mr. Speaker, we'd have to see the legislation. There's no definition of what the excess profit tax involves until we are able to examine the legislation on the matter. I've had a phone call in to the Minister of Finance the last couple of days. It's been difficult to reach him because I'm sure he's in the process of the budget now. I anticipate perhaps I'll hear from him within the next day or two.

MR. CLARK:

One further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Provincial Treasurer. Since the comments emanating from Ottawa regarding the possibility of an excess profit tax, the Provincial Treasurer has not been in contact to discuss that aspect with the federal Minister of Finance? Is that what you're saying?

MR. MINIELY:

Well, yes, Mr. Speaker. I think when I answered the first question I indicated clearly that I have had no discussion with the Minister of Finance regarding the excess profit tax and I have received no indication as to what this might involve other than what all hon. members have, reading in the news media.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc followed by the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen.

Capital City Park Costs

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier could give the House some indication of the cost of the proposed park? Secondly, if he couldn't, [could he] outline very briefly what other options were examined, or if it's too lengthy to answer on the question of options, could that information be made available to the members?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, answering the one on options first - they were, mainly, basically land-based options and I think the best way to answer that perhaps would be to have the Minister of Lands and Forests prepare an appropriate document for tabling as to relative sites that were involved.

The reasons I think I expressed for selecting this one involved primarily the water potential, the accessibility and the need to give an advantage to those large numbers of citizens who are in the part of the city which has, at the moment, the least park and recreation.

With regard to the matter of the \$30 to \$35 million of capital cost, I'd refer that question to the Minister of Environment who could perhaps briefly outline it, and then over the course of time we could perhaps develop it in a more definitive way.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, at this point we see the costs as being composed somewhat like this. The weir structure itself would cost in the order of \$5 million. We have excellent figures in this regard, as we have just completed the Caresland weir on the Bow and we are rebuilding the W.I.D. weir in Calgary. The river crossings at four points, the pedestrian and bicycle crossings, have been estimated over a fairly wide range depending on the type of structure that is chosen. We have tentatively chosen a type of structure which will cost approximately \$1 million per structure, or about \$4 million for the four structures.

In terms of property acquisition, there are a number of places that property has to be acquired, particularly in the Strathcona site. We have identified this to the extent of, in total, between \$3 and \$4 million.

With respect to maintaining the quality of water in the river with respect to contact-based recreation, we have estimated this in a number of different ways as to what has to be done. The present costs that would be attributable to this park are envisioned anywhere from \$.5 to \$3 million.

We anticipate that the actual cost of landscaping, bank stabilization, rip-rapping where necessary and terracing would average, across the nine-mile area, in the order of \$1 million per mile on both sides, making it in the order of \$18 million. This totals up to approximately \$32 to \$35 million.

I would suggest that on a concept like this, depending on the degree and extent to which we wish to provide recreational facilities, that the costs can rise if you want to get more magnanimous in what you are offering. Tentatively, as I indicated, we are looking at \$30 or \$35 million - or are prepared to commit that amount - in terms of developing this whole area and also providing promenade and bicycle paths from the High Level Bridge right down to the weir, past the weir and into the Hermitage area which is shown over here on this chart.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that at this time we'll give the hon. members just a general idea of the sort of thinking and planning we have been considering.

DR. BUCK:

A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Will the Edmonton power plant be moved? It's a little difficult to skate on water. The only man who can do that is the Deputy Premier. But I would like to know if that power plant will have to be moved downstream, so the lake can freeze over in the winter?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, we have quite a bit of data in terms of the tailing of the thermal pollution or, if you wish, the hot water, from the Edmonton power plant. That photograph, being really an infra-red photograph, indicates the tailing quite nicely as the white mark coming out along the shore. We anticipate that with the larger depth of water, that tailing will diminish in length. However, we do not anticipate that any winter-based recreational sports will occur from the Dawson Bridge upstream, that is, from the power plant to the Dawson Bridge. Winter sports will be identified more from the Dawson Bridge up to the weir site, in this direction. It will be possible, without too much difficulty, to use the weir itself to backflood and provide some flooding for skating.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. It concerns his comment about costs possibly being higher. Has there been any tentative agreement between the city with respect to the province funding costs over and above the \$32 to \$35 million, or will that be dealt with by the city?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I had better answer that question. On a capital basis I think it's completely clear that the funding will be entirely by the provincial government. When we work out the details of the operating arrangements with regard to operation and maintenance of the park area - the portion in green - the city officials will be

working out an estimate as to what that operating and maintenance cost will be annually. We frankly don't know what it is at the moment.

When we've reached that, they will evaluate that in terms of their total position relative to parks and recreation. We've said to them that we want this project to go [ahead] without hindering or encumbering in any way other park plans that they would have within the Edmonton metropolitan area. So if they are in the position that those costs are very extensive and they can't handle it, it's our intention to make some special arrangements with them. We are in the same process of evaluation with the City of Calgary and will be looking at it in the same way with the City of Calgary.

DR. BUCK:

A supplementary to the Minister of Lands and Forests. Could the minister give the Legislature any indication as to how far back from the river the land will be frozen between the end of that and Fort Saskatchewan, along the river valley there? Is it miles, or a short distance?

DR. WARRACK:

I'm sorry. I'm not quite sure I understand the member's question exactly. If it refers to the matter of the restricted development area, that would be under The Department of the Environment Act. If my colleague heard your question thoroughly, he may be able to respond accurately.

MR. YURKO:

Basically, Mr. Speaker, we will be following the river bank - that's the high river bank - so the valley itself will be declared a restricted development area. In a number of places this will run up the ravine for quite a way so that the ravines will also be protected.

I think all members should understand what a restricted development area is. It is established under The Department of the Environment Act. A regulation is passed by order in council, and that then indicates that no development can be undertaken unless specific approval is received from the provincial government.

Now that doesn't suggest that no development will occur. Developments conducive to, or compatible with, maintaining the river valley over a longer term base as a beautiful recreational area will be permitted, but it's really placing the entire control of development of the whole river valley in both directions - up to Fort Saskatchewan in one direction, and up to Devon in the other direction - directly under provincial control.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen followed by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

#### Matrimonial Property

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Attorney General or the Solicitor General. How will copies of the working paper on matrimonial property, which was tabled yesterday, be made available to the public?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Solicitor General may be able to supplement this. I haven't as yet been able to discuss it with the Institute of Law Research and Reform, but we are most anxious, because of the importance of this subject, to ensure that it is readily available throughout Alberta. While I can't comment on the specific arrangements until I have discussed it with the institute, I propose to do that in the immediate future, in conjunction with the hon. Solicitor General, to ensure that it is readily available.

MR. FRENCH:

Is there a supplementary answer?

MISS HUNLEY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, if I may provide some additional information. We have checked with the Institute of Law Research and Reform and they were also announcing it in their initial



press release yesterday. But they are doing a wide distribution themselves and are using some of the directory listings that we have in the Women's Bureau. They've sent out some press releases. They have a fairly limited plan for additional publicity but we feel it is so important that, through the office of the Women's Bureau, we intend to have a publicity campaign in order to focus attention on it, because it is of interest not only to women, but to all Albertans and we are most anxious that it get widely circulated and widely discussed.

Any person who wishes a copy can obtain one from the Institute of Law Research and Reform. Aside from that, they have been doing some mail-outs and I would expect that the Women's Bureau will also be doing that.

MR. FRENCH:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Should members of the Legislature procure their copies from the institute, or could arrangements be made that we could pick them up from this building?

MISS HUNLEY:

I understood that each member would be receiving one, but I think it would be of service, for additional copies, if we could obtain some and make them available through the Women's Bureau. I would be pleased to give that undertaking.

MR. FRENCH:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will there be public forums held this summer to ascertain public opinion?

MISS HUNLEY:

It's really being handled by the Institute of Law Research and Reform. I have the impression that they may be doing that but I'm not too sure.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

#### Crump Commission Report

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, this question is to the hon. the Premier. In view of the recommendations by the Crump Commission report that the province encourage technological research in the coal industry, and also because of the implications in the Energy Resources Conservation Report on coal that there will be a considerable acceleration, is the government giving consideration to setting up research funds in a similar manner as those for research in the tar sands?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I'll refer that question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned yesterday, the recommendations of the Crump Commission report as well as the recommendations of the Energy Resources Conservation Board will be considered by cabinet. I can advise the hon. member that one of the areas we have looked at is this question of research, although a considerable amount has been done with the Research Council. Whether a special vehicle now will be needed or not is one of the questions we will be considering in the future.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Oil Sands - Ecological Factors

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Environment. By way of explanation, it relates to the report of the Conservation and Utilization Committee. Mr. Speaker, the question to the hon. minister - is in view of the warning contained in the report that a build-up of sulphur from a number of plants in the tar sands region could produce a killer fog similar to the London fog of 1952 - does the government at this time share this concern and is it of the view that the utilization committee is accurate in expressing that concern?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the Government of Alberta has reviewed basically all possible concerns in terms of the massive development of the Athabasca oil sands. We recognize that within a not very large area there will be a major concentration of industry. As a result, there will be a cumulative effect from a number of plants, particularly in respect to climatic and meteorological conditions. However, there will be other effects. No one at this time can predict what the effect may be when we have a multiplicity of plants running and discharging sulphur dioxide, but we do know we have to study the problem in some depth. In this regard we are establishing long-term research programs to examine the climatology of the area as well as the meteorological conditions in the area.

I might also say that when the Syncrude plant was approved, we had already anticipated plant clusters in terms of sulphur dioxide release and had requested that our normal standard of .17 parts per million ambient sulphur concentrations be reduced to .05 so that the Syncrude plant has been cut down by a factor of three times, in anticipation of build-up.

I do say again, Mr. Speaker, at this time all we do know is there may be a problem in the future. We will be studying it with considerable intensity.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can the minister advise whether cabinet has had an opportunity to formally review the three papers which he tabled in the Legislature from the Conservation and Utilization Committee?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the cabinet doesn't review every report which is put out by government. If it did, it would do nothing else but read for 24 hours a day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. BENOIT:

Excuses!

MR. YURKO:

But all major problems which are anticipated in these reports are brought to cabinet at one point or another, in discussion of budgets, in discussion of policy, in discussion of programs which have to be structured during the course of any major development.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can the minister advise the Assembly whether he concurs with the views of his assistant deputy minister [in] the reports carried of a speech in which he warned that excessive development could lead to a biological wasteland in the tar sands region?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, as usual, all technical people like to forecast things which may happen, with the anticipation that action will be taken so they don't happen. I have some very good people in the department who are always anticipating with respect to getting more programs and more budgets. So somebody has to, in fact, weigh some of these matters and put them in proper perspective.

The particular individual who spoke is a very qualified man. I just want to suggest that the government has said that from a policy basis, a fund will be set up to guarantee

that each site will be reclaimed to a greater biological productivity than it had in its natural state. Much of the area there is now a wasteland in that it is muskeg and its biological productivity is very low indeed. It is expected that this will be upgraded substantially after full reclamation of each and every site.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a further ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly we could come back to this topic if there is time. The questions, the supplementaries and the answers seem to be building up to a major statement by the minister.

MR. NOTLEY:

Could I just ask one quick final supplementary question?

MR. SPEAKER:

Might we come back to the topic if there is time left. There are a number of members who have not yet asked their first question.

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

#### Parks Policy

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. the Premier. I was wondering what effect this capital park development will have on the use of parks in other areas of Alberta?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is clearly asking for an opinion, but perhaps if there is research to that effect in the possession of the government it might be ... [Inaudible].

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I think that that's not so much a matter of opinion as fact, in terms of what will happen. What will happen, Mr. Speaker, is that we will probably see a lessening of the utilization factor in some of our provincial parks throughout the rural parts of the province, in the sense that a larger number of the citizens of the Edmonton area - and the same with the Calgary metropolitan provincial park at Fish Creek - will be using those park facilities, on crowded summer weekends particularly. I think it will reduce the strain and pressure on the provincial parks throughout the province and hence probably improve the ability of the citizens in those areas adjacent to those provincial parks to enjoy them even that much better. That would be, in my view, a very probable result.

MR. LUDWIG:

A pretty poor opinion.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

#### Companies Branch

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. Some time ago I asked him a question with regard to the movement of the Companies Branch. I wonder whether he could advise us whether any decision has been made in that regard?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, a decision has been made. As I indicated earlier, there was an investigation of the procedures used by the Companies Branch relative to expediting company registrations and so on. That being satisfied, we are continuing that study.

A decision has been made to move the Companies Branch eventually into the central core of the city. The time frame for that is dependent upon facilities being available. There is a possibility right now of moving them, within the next few weeks, into the Petroleum Plaza but then being confronted with a further move later on. We're hoping we can shorten the time frame and have one move.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, does the minister's answer indicate that the intended move of the Companies Branch from its present location will therefore be delayed considerably?

MR. DOWLING:

No, I don't, Mr. Speaker. It won't be delayed at all. As a matter of fact it will be expedited. As I suggested, we could move within the next few weeks into Petroleum Plaza. We are now in a position of making a decision between making that move and then a further move, or making just the one move perhaps a few weeks down the road.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, could the hon. minister advise of the stage of construction of the building into which it is intended to move the Companies Branch?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, I didn't indicate anything about construction. I said there were some alternatives we are looking at. It has nothing to do with construction.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, do I gather from that answer then that the intended move and where the move is going to be made is not definite at the present time?

MR. DOWLING:

The move relative to the Petroleum Plaza is an absolute possibility, Mr. Speaker. Anything beyond that is under negotiation and discussion with the Department of Public Works' officials and my own.

MR. FRENCH:

Passing the buck.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, could the hon. minister advise if he is looking for additional space for the Companies Branch in the building in which it is now located?

MR. DOWLING:

No, Mr. Speaker, we haven't contemplated expanding the facility in the present location, but perhaps to consolidate it by changing our procedure slightly.

MR. SPEAKER:

Perhaps we might come back to this one. We're running short of time.

The hon. Member for Whitecourt followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge East.

#### Flood Damage Payments

MR. TRYNCHY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Agriculture. Can the hon. minister give any indication as to when a decision will be made in regard to payment to the areas which are suffering flood damage and loss of crop due to being snowed under or washed away by recent flood waters?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, we've met with the Agricultural Development Committee chairman and farm organizations in the area. We are in the process now of doing a preliminary survey of the entire area by helicopter. Early this morning we did the Bonnyville-St. Paul-Two Hills area. Next week we will be doing the balance of the area in the mornings and we hope by

mid-week we will be able to make some definite announcement as to how and when we will be looking after the matter.

MR. TRYNCHY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the hon. minister give any indication if the \$30 million he talked about the other day is a close figure or will it be in excess of that amount?

DR. HORNER:

I would think, Mr. Speaker, from the initial estimates I have, and certainly from our trip this morning, that figure is very close to what the total damage will be.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Will the areas be designated by counties, or is there a delineation of the area that will be involved? If there are further areas that come in later on, will they be considered?

DR. HCRNER:

Well I think, Mr. Speaker, that our government has a record of considering these situations as they arise, and we certainly would, if other areas in the province were affected. At the moment, it will be done on a county basis because that's the organizational structure we have through our ag. development committee.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge East followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall.

#### Parks Policy (Cont.)

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Lands and Forests. Has the minister any plans to extend the policy with regard to parks in cities? I have in mind Indian Battle Park in Lethbridge on the Oldman River.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, the policy to which we refer, and which is referred in the parks' position paper tabled in the House one year ago, deals with metropolitan provincial parks, thinking in terms, of course, of Calgary and Edmonton as the two overwhelmingly largest centres in Alberta, which, at the same time, have had the least opportunity for outdoor family recreation in those cities.

With respect to Indian Battle Park specifically, I have been through that park and I know it well. It is set up and run by the City of Lethbridge and is a very admirable item as an attraction in the city of Lethbridge.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

#### Film Industry - Alberta

MR. HO LEM:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question today, in the absence of the hon. minister, Mr. Peacock, is addressed to the hon. the Premier.

Could the hon. Premier advise what progress is being made by the film industry in Alberta? Is it encouraging?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I don't have that information available to me at the present time. I would have to consult with the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I would like to take the matter as notice and will, either directly or through the minister, report back to the hon. member.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker ...

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I am advised that the acting Minister of Industry and Commerce can shed some light on the matter.

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, I can, just very briefly, indicate that the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce did indicate to me that there has been some progress made, relative to the development of a film industry in Alberta. I can't give you the details of that, but I do know, for sure, there has been one film commissioned for total production within the province.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. Premier advise whether the film titled The Life of Premier Lougheed, which was recently undertaken by an Alberta company, is now completed? Mr. Speaker, does the Premier consider the production to be of such high calibre that it might warrant an Academy Award?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, my only ...

MR. SPEAKER:

It would scarcely be within the duties of the government to anticipate what films might qualify for Academy Awards, but under the circumstances I would think the Premier would really want to comment on the answer.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, if I heard the question correctly, my only response is that there used to be a program entitled Candid Camera, and maybe it's still on.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, addressed to the hon. Deputy Premier. Can the hon. minister advise who might be in line for the best supporting actor award?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[Interjections]

Perhaps the hon. member might pursue his career as a film critic if there is time left at the end of the question period.

[Laughter]

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

#### Natural Gas Export

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, my question today is in reference to the present government moratorium on export of natural gas to the eastern Canada market. I was wondering, in light of the recent announcement by TransCanada Pipelines, that they are going to review all their contracts following the recent private arbitration of higher prices in Alberta, is the government, Mr. Speaker, considering early action to lift its present embargo and release extra gas for export to eastern Canada?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, it's a very important question and the answer would be this. That matter has not come actively before the energy committee of cabinet for consideration. My feeling is that we should, because of the timing, await a report by the Energy Resources

Conservation Board of their final hearings on future energy requirements for Alberta, scheduled for June of this year, which report we anticipate in July, before taking into consideration any further export, or removal from this province, of natural gas because of our possible potential needs here. So I think the matter will stay in abeyance at its present position until that time.

We think that the policy we have taken, since we assumed office, of not authorizing any additional natural gas from the province has proven to be, to this date, a very important decision by the government.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation followed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

#### Telephone Operators

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities. It is in relation to a question I asked the hon. minister earlier, regarding telephone operators and certain weight requirements for employment. Has the hon. minister checked the situation to see whether there is, in fact, cause for concern?

DR. HORNER:

There is, in heavyweights.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, like many corporations, AGT has a desire to hire employees in good health. This is not only for general efficiency ...

MR. LUDWIG:

How about a limit?

MR. FARRAN:

... and alertness but also because it has an actuarial effect on the welfare of other employees through the pension plan and group insurance.

The overweight guideline referred to by the hon. member is for the corporation doctor who is advised to check when an applicant has excess weight over 50 per cent above average. It is not a hard and fast rule, but they check then to see if this excess weight may be detrimental to good health. Telephone operators, Mr. Speaker, do a lot of sitting - like MLAs - but it's not for any danger to the furniture, it's all related to good health.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

#### Expo - High School Bands

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that we do have a few extra dollars around and nobody shoots Santa Claus, I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, from the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation if the minister's department has established any guidelines as to assistance for high school bands going to Expo in Spokane?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, we now have established a master plan because we have found there are several bands who, it seems, wanted to go in the same week. We are going to ask these bands if they would consider going another week maybe with an incentive - like an increased grant. As soon as the mail strike is over, all these people will receive the information that they will be receiving a grant and the extent of the grant.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Boxcars - Grain Movement

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Has there been any noticeable improvement in the boxcar situation, insofar as hauling grain to the coast is concerned, since the boxcar coordinator was appointed in Ottawa?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I might say this. There has been some improvement in the movement of grain to the coast, in relation to the use of terminal elevators, both here in Edmonton and in Lethbridge particularly, and the use of the trucking contract to move grain into those terminals for drying and cleaning and then unit-training out of there.

Insofar as the question of whether the appointment of the boxcar czar has really helped, I'd have to make some inquiries and report back to the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Irrigation Project - Eastern Block

MR. WYSE:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Could the minister inform the House of the current status of the proposed Redcliff-Ronalane Irrigation Project? I understand it's also named the Eastern Block of the Bow River Development.

MR. YURKO:

Well, Mr. Premier, a number of policies were established with respect to the eastern block and with respect to the takeover which was accomplished on April 4. But there is now agreement, between the eastern block and the western block, to form one unified block, one irrigation district. The Minister of Agriculture may wish to add something to this.

MR. LUDWIG:

Did you bow to the Premier afterwards?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member is referring to that area in which those people in the Medicine Hat area are interested in expanding the irrigation potential?

Our irrigation division is looking at that and working with the people in the area. If we can expand the irrigable acres there, we certainly will try to do so. I'm sure everyone is aware, Mr. Speaker, that expansion of irrigation does not now depend on land topography because of the massive use of sprinkling equipment.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What is the preliminary assessment of the potential of the area in terms of irrigated-related agricultural development?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the potential is practically unlimited, provided we can have the proper direction and support for a very diversified cropping pattern. In other words, I would say that the potential in the irrigation areas is tremendous if we can get vegetable and other types of production that can't be produced anywhere else in Alberta in the larger sense. I refer specifically to beans and corn as two of the crops we would like to see expanded in a major way.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, as I seem to have acquired an additional degree of enlightenment from the Minister of Agriculture, I would like the record to indicate that I was thinking of a different area when I answered in the way I did.



MR. CLARK:

We accept it.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. I understand that in the next ten years, provincial government plans to double the number of acres that are currently under irrigation. Is the Redcliff-Ronalane Project included in the minister's calculations?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't want to be definitive because that has to do with a study of the soil, its capability and other factors that are concerned with having an adequate irrigation area.

I think, certainly as a general overall policy, Mr. Speaker, having regard to food production and the capacity of that area to produce food, we should target to try to double the number of irrigated acres that we have in the province.

MR. WYSE:

Just one last ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly we could come back to this topic. We are running very short of time. There's still ...

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

#### Oil Sands - Environment Reports

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of the Environment and ask him whether or not the reports he tabled in the House this week have been reviewed by the energy committee of the cabinet?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the reports themselves haven't, to my knowledge, been reviewed by the energy committee, but nevertheless I'm certain the general area of concern has been discussed in considerable detail.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In light of the environmental concern documented in all three reports, is the government considering any change in the timetable for construction of the tar sands plants?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, with regard to that question, I believe I've been clear in the House that the energy committee of cabinet will be bringing to cabinet, over the course of the next three to, perhaps, six months a statement of guidelines on oil sands development which involved, as the Speech from the Throne indicated, both ownership and environmental matters.

The general assessment we have at the moment is that in terms of development it's quite clear that the environmental situation can be adequately handled. We are going to be in a position here of providing, I think, a tremendous opportunity for meaningful jobs for the citizens not only of Alberta, but of Canada. We would hope that with the sort of environmental steps that we've taken to date, hon. members on both sides of the House would encourage the creation of new and meaningful jobs in this province.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

Metric System - Highway Signs

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Highways. Has a date been set between federal and provincial governments for the conversion of highway signs to the metric system?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that question is a little premature.

MR. LUDWIG:

For you?

MR. SORENSON:

A supplementary to the minister. Will any metric signs of any type be placed along our road system in 1974, as has already been done in Ontario?

MR. LUDWIG:

It's "premature".

MR. COPITHORNE:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUDWIG:

Why not?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Why?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]

\* \* \* \* \*

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of the Whole Assembly will come to order.

Bill No. 18 The Clean Air Amendment Act, 1974

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Any questions or comments?

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, in dealing with Section 2 of Bill 18, it says "the following clause", and adds this amendment:

- (a) prescribing the maximum permissible concentration of any air contaminant for all or any part of Alberta;

Does this include within buildings or just outside them?

MR. CHAMBERS:

I would think that would be a fairly universal regulation.

MR. LUDWIG:

Would it then include within buildings?

MR. CHAMBERS:

Yes, that would be the interpretation of it.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. member can tell us whether or not there are any regulations in Alberta governing the pollution control equipment that we have on our cars?

MR. CHAMBERS:

I believe that, in debate on second reading, the minister indicated he had no intention of enforcing that regulation at this time. However, I think it's important that it be in the act. For example, that particular item covers not only motor vehicles but plants and structures and things, and would refer, for example, to an electrostatic separation device in a stack. Also, in the future, as our cities grow, populations grow, a particular problem area could arise where it may be necessary to enforce the regulation in that specific area.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons I raise it is, it is my understanding that there are mechanics who are removing all pollution [control] equipment for a fee. My understanding also is that they are perfectly within their legal right to do so under The Clean Air Act. It prescribes the maximum permissible concentration of any air contaminant.

I'm visualizing that within the city we could very well have a situation that would be bad simply because of the pollutants created by cars, and yet I'm not aware of anything that would bind me to keep my pollution [control] equipment on my car within the province of Alberta. And if somebody were to come along and tell me that I was adding to it, I would simply say that John Doe, the citizen who is driving beside me, is the one who is causing it. There is really no way of controlling it as I see it. Yet under that particular section, the maximum gross could, in fact, be a problem. I'm just wondering if the hon. member would have some explanation as to how the government proposes to handle a situation such as this.

MR. CHAMBERS:

I think, Mr. Chairman, that I attended the same subcommittee meeting where this came up, that there is certainly nothing to stop anyone from removing the device at this point in time. But the regulation, of course, is here so this regulation could be enforced in the future.

I guess I'm not really quite sure what the hon. member is asking. In other words, as I understand it, there is nothing to stop anyone from removing one of these devices. However, if and when the need should arise in the future, then this regulation could, in effect, be enforced.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, if I might, just by further explanation, say this. I may have missed something in the bill, but it does not say what particular industry or what particular area is going to be controlled if it reaches the maximum or is over the maximum allowable.

I'm suggesting to the hon. member that cars within the city of Edmonton could, on a very foggy day, for example, create the very situation that is mentioned in this particular section. Then what is going to happen? Is it there simply to permit some controls that may come later by regulations? Is that really what it is saying?

MR. CHAMBERS:

I think that is correct in part. In other words, I think an act of this type - and again this item does cover plants, structures and things, and I think at this point in time it's definitely required for plants for example to have particle control in smokestacks. But I think to have a complete item, it should contain reference not only to "plant, structure or thing", but also to motor vehicles. As our population grows in this

province there may well be a case where a situation in a given city might get serious enough that it may become desirable to enforce this particular regulation with regard to motor vehicles.

Furthermore, there is progress being made in this field. We've heard quite a bit of discussion recently by the motor companies with regard to improved catalytic converters. So the type of device that may be available in the near future for motor vehicles may well be much improved over what has been available so far. Like the hon. member, I have some doubts about the gain to date with the existing devices which may reduce the number of emissions on a measurement basis. Nevertheless, if 50 per cent more fuel is consumed, then maybe there really isn't any gain being achieved at all.

Perhaps there is a good reason to hope that these devices will receive significant improvement in the fairly short-term future, in which case it might then be desirable, depending upon the pollution levels in certain of our probably major centres, to actually enforce this particular regulation.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to pursue it much farther. I think the hon. member has covered in part my concern, but I want to simply say this, I'm a little concerned in the area of future regulation. The section that I am looking at certainly becomes an all-inclusive one which will permit the government to take just about any action that it wants to as it relates to any "plant, structure or thing." What is really bothering me is that I recognize that particular definition section is so broad that overnight, as it were, we could find ourselves faced with a new regulation that could be rather bothersome. I feel that the automobile is a very well-known polluter. I would hope that the province is giving very serious consideration to how it wants to handle it, that it will not come in with something, shall I say, drastic and hasty, that would create problems for us later on.

I think the hon. member will recall that in the committee we were also asking the Minister of the Environment what law we would be under. Is my understanding correct that he did state that we would be under a federal law that would be applicable to us within the province? I'm wondering if the hon. member has some information in that particular area?

MR. CHAMBERS:

I don't recall that. I do recall some discussion as to whether or not, for example, if one removed such a device from an automobile here and then drove into the jurisdiction of, say, Ontario or California, the question was then asked, how does the driver stand. I'm not so sure that point was clarified at the subcommittee and I don't really know the answer to it.

MR. DRAIN:

Following along on the ...

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Drain, I believe Mr. Miller wanted ...

MR. D. MILLER:

I'd like to pursue this thought Mr. Strom carried, a "structure or thing." Could a "thing" be a person?

MR. CHAMBERS:

Well not being a lawyer - and perhaps one of our legal friends might have a better definition - I would personally think that a person would never be described as a thing.

As to what is a thing - I'm sure the hon. member is wondering what a thing is and that's a good question - but surely there are plants and structures. I don't know, maybe a dirigible filled with gas flying over Alberta. What would that be? Would that be a thing?

MR. DRAIN:

Following along on this subsection (e)(iv), Mr. Chairman. I feel that in reality the powers are too vague. If there were sense and logic applied to the interpretations of laws, which there are not, because those who enforce them - it is theirs not to reason why, it's theirs to do what it says in the book.

Now I have an interesting situation where we have a small sawmill operating which produces about 4,000 feet of lumber per day. It has got an emission control order by which it must cease and desist to smoke. So then evaluating the amount of residual waste that comes from this particular operation and relating it to the population in this particular village, if the villagers decided to burn firewood for fuel, they would in effect create more pollution than this particular burner.

This situation, where there would be air contaminants of quite a measurable proportion, would also occur in a situation where people had to return to burning coal, for instance. Therefore, in all frankness, I feel that this particular offending section which is so ambiguous should be struck out or amended in a manner which clearly defines what the intent is.

I could also refer to - what about feedlots? Certainly there is a definite air contaminant and in reality there is nothing here which precludes the utilization of this power, except one person's particular viewpoint, which would be [that of] the person who is, in fact, enforcing these regulations.

So I am very concerned about this particular bill and feel that amendments should be made.

MR. BENOIT:

This is still on the same section, Mr. Chairman. Are there regulations now existing under this section? This Act came in in 1971 and I was wondering if we have regulations now, or if we are still anticipating regulations under this section?

MR. CHAMBERS:

No, there are regulations now, Mr. Chairman. This amendment act is providing for amendments.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I want to get back to the section I was discussing previously. The hon. member indicated that Section 2(a) includes air within buildings, and I appreciate his answer. But I believe in legislation of this type it isn't enough that there is an opinion that it does. I would like to recommend that we be more specific and include it in the section - include perhaps air in buildings in which individuals are employed or to which the public is invited or generally expected to attend. I am just making this as a random recommendation, but I would like to recommend this section be held. The hon. member has indicated that that is the intent.

I am recommending that it would be much better if the intent was really spelled out in the legislation. I believe this is the difference between good legislation and legislation which could lead to a serious dispute. I commend the hon. member on this bill. It is certainly a tremendous bill. But when we deal with the bill clause by clause, if problems or matters of this nature arise, we should move in and plug any doubts or amend any areas where there may be a doubt as to the entire meaning of the section.

I would like to ask that this section be held. Unless the hon. member brings in an amendment himself, I would like to bring in an amendment to that section and it would take some time to get the proper wording which would be acceptable to a bill of this nature, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAMBERS:

I don't really see the need for that, Mr. Chairman. Section 2(a) says "prescribing the maximum permissible concentration of any air contaminant for all and any part of Alberta." I think that is fairly straightforward.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member says that, and I feel you can interpret it that way. But, for instance, if there were some building in which individuals were employed - and I don't believe the pollution level in buildings and public buildings is being monitored at the present time, will regulations provide that this be done? I am talking about all buildings. I am talking about a restaurant where they may have gas fumes escaping from the kitchen or from a stove, or any building - say, a government building - in which the ventilation is so poor that the air may well fall in the category of being contaminated through not having a sufficient amount of oxygen.

Although I feel you can conclude the meaning from this, I am recommending that it would be much better if it were spelled out more specifically that it does include that, because when the average layman who has [employment in] public places reads that, he'll say, well, that doesn't affect me. It should be spelled out clearly to him: you have been

alerted. You have been forewarned that this affects you. You can't allow air in the building to reach above a certain level of pollution.

I am not just talking in generalities. For instance, I know a lot of service stations have precautions: they have devices to determine how much carbon monoxide they have. But how about an employee who says, I am working in a garage and they are careless. He has no legislation to resort to. The boss can say, well, if you are a troublemaker I'll fire you.

I am of the opinion that this is a proper issue to be spelled out more specifically. I don't believe it would hold anything up too much if this section were held to give an opportunity for anyone who is interested to perhaps bring in amendment. I am saying "held" because I am not ready to draft one right now.

It is a fairly good act, but there is no point in bringing in an act and bringing in 25 amendments before it is really implemented. I am raising this point, and I believe it is a valid point, that either the hon. member should go to the Legislative Counsel and bring in a properly worded amendment, or permit the members in this committee to bring in an amendment. It is customary to hold a section if any member requests it, in order to give that opportunity to deal with the section.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. DRAIN:

I certainly have to support the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View. There are times when I am a little bit dubious about that, but at this particular time I am prepared to support him whole-heartedly and strongly urge the hon. members to give very serious consideration to the revision of clause (iii) - with three dots on top - and (iv), in order not to have so much ambiguity and inability to interpret it in this particular bill. This is very serious. It is a major responsibility, I think, of all people in this Legislature to come out with legislation that is clear-cut and meaningful, and which will cover the situation for which it is intended.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this particular piece of legislation does not fill these criteria in any dimension and therefore, I urge that it be redrafted in a more meaningful way and presented later on. I fully realize that it is essential to have some of the powers, but the definition should be included in any type of legislation that is brought before this Legislature. To move in any other direction would be irresponsible, inconsiderate and an abrogation of the responsibilities for which we have been elected, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAMBERS:

Despite the chastisement from my honourable friend from Pincher Creek, I don't really agree with him. I think the bill is well written and practical the way it is, and unless the hon. members have an amendment ready to present, I would recommend that we proceed with it.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, we have many sections in this bill yet. I'm really at a loss to know why there is such reluctance to yield to a reasonable request. Certainly the section could be interpreted in two different ways and there is nothing wrong with having more specific legislation. He says he doesn't agree. That is one man's opinion. I believe that if you leave it this way and somebody came up and stated that the air pollution in a certain building is above that which is acceptable, you could have yourself an interesting lawsuit about it. You could have an argument. Why leave it in doubt? It's agreed by the mover of the bill, the hon. member, that that is what it means. I'm saying, well, legislation ought to spell out what it means as clearly as possible. It isn't going to in any way detract or take away or create problems. It will solve the problem.

I'm of the opinion that under this legislation if I was in a building and I said that I could smell some fumes and we had it monitored and we found out that it was above the permissible level in the building, and I was obliged as an invitee or as an employee to be there, then where would I go? I'd have to go to the courts to get an interpretation of the section to see if I'm protected. It's a much better way. I believe a lot of legislation is designed to avoid people having to go and find out whether you have a common law right or whether you can stretch the meaning of this to cover it. Now that is a reasonable request.

The reason I want the section held in committee is that I'm not ready. I want to give some thought to the kind of amendment that I'm prepared to propose. I might want to clear with the Legislative Counsel whether this thing might be covered elsewhere. I think it's

a reasonable request and we shouldn't take that much time. This one section can take more time, if we debate this thing, than the rest of the bill. It does not impede the progress of the House if this is permitted.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move that we hold the bill in committee until the government can either tell us specifically what these sections mean, or until they are prepared to make some changes so we will know specifically what they mean. It's the lack of definiteness that causes us to question the bill in its present form.

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Chairman, since the Member for Calgary Mountain View has given a definite commitment to draft an amendment, I think that's fair enough. I think we should hold that item.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

We then have agreement that the bill be held in committee?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to proceed with any other section so that would be left to the final conclusion so that there would be no other holdup on it, if the House would like to so do.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Does that mean the members of the Assembly would like to go section by section on this bill?

MR. STROM:

I have just a couple of questions, one question anyway, that I'd like to ask if I may.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I wonder, Mr. Strom, the Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff has asked leave of the committee to introduce some guests in the gallery. May he have leave?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

#### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS (CONT.)

MR. WYSE:

Mr. Chairman and members, I'd like to introduce to the members of the Legislature this morning some 75 members of the Dr. Knox School Band and Singers from Kelowna, British Columbia. They are accompanied by Mr. Don Richie and some other members. They will be performing in Edmonton this afternoon, I think, at the Balwin High School and tomorrow morning at the Londonderry Shopping Centre. They are in the public gallery and I'd ask them all to stand and be recognized by the Assembly at this time.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (CONT.)Bill No. 18 The Clean Air Amendment Act, 1974

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I want to say right now that I recognize this as a very important bill. We're moving in a very difficult area, and yet we cannot afford to stand still. I just want to be on record as saying that even though I am questioning some points in it, in no way do I want to be interpreted as being against The Clean Air Amendment Act.

But I also want to say, Mr. Chairman, I recognize that it was an engineer who was responsible for the department when this original bill was drawn up, and I noticed in the bill, and it was in the original bill, that it talks about "... prescribing the method or type of method, or instrument for measuring ..." or determining and then in Subclause (v), "... the visible emissions from any plant, structure or thing." I'm wondering, is there an instrument that is available for measuring the visible emissions from a plant?

MR. CHAMBERS:

There is a chart, and I'm trying to recall the name of it - I think it's something like Ringleman - but anyway, there is a chart which shows different - there are black spots on the chart and there is a series of these which one can hold up and compare with the emission from a stack and therefore determine, qualitatively at least, within a certain range the degree of contamination on a visual scale.

MR. STROM:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate that. It adds to my knowledge. Also, I would like to ask the hon. member, we have a very interesting situation in the city of Edmonton, the Edmonton power plant just below us here. The emission in the wintertime creates a very beautiful situation. Is that monitored at all times, and is it a problem as far as pollution is concerned?

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Chairman, I have also wondered about that in the past. I've checked with people on that and I've been assured that, depending upon the ice crystals in the air and the temperature, while it looks like a lot of pollution it really isn't. It's primarily steam and the pollutants emitted from those stacks are very minimal.

MR. RUSTE:

Back to Section 9.1, in the footnotes it refers to it as being a new section dealing with:

A prosecution under this act or the regulations may be commenced within two years of the commission of the alleged offence but not afterwards.

My question to the hon. member is that we'll get a case where we'll have something that may poison an individual who may be working in a plant and it may not be apparent until after two years. Has he any recourse in this case?

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Chairman, we felt that the two years was a fair period of time in there. Obviously if liability is extended for an indefinite period the costs to the operator just have to go up. It seemed, after consideration, that two years was a reasonable time limit with regard to this act.

MR. RUSTE:

Further to that, I'm thinking about the individual who may be involved. It's true enough that industry would look at it, but certainly I understand that there are cases in medical science today where there are slow-acting effects on individuals from various concentrations of chemicals and so on that may not even show up in that period of time. I think for the protection of the individual workman or worklady, whatever it might be, this is a bit limiting in that case.

MR. CHAMBERS:

Well, I think there is protection, of course, for workers in other areas. This specifically refers to prosecution with regard to offences under this act.



MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well. Does the Chair receive agreement that the bill be reported on progress only?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

Bill No. 19 The Clean Water Amendment Act, 1974

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Questions? Comments? Title and preamble?

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, there is one question I wanted to raise. Again, it's in regard to the city's practice of dumping snow above the city. I don't know whether it was done this past winter, but it has been done other winters. Is that a kind of problem that will be regulated by this act?

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Chairman, I presume that it could be, although it was interesting to learn that this river is actually quite clean. The measurements taken show that it's quite suitable for swimming, for example. So it appears that the effects of dumping snow aren't actually that detrimental.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the taste of water in the Edmonton system during - well, not so bad this last week or ten days maybe - what was the reason that it seemed to have a different taste about two weeks ago from what it had, say, several months ago? Is that from the snow and things that are dumped in the river bed?

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Chairman, apparently yes and also from water carried down by the storm drains, I presume. Apparently, from the report I read by the city, it's not harmful. Perhaps for a brief period it had an unpleasant taste, but no potential harm could be derived from drinking it.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Chairman, where did the oily taste come from? Is that from used motor oil or ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Drayton Valley.

MR. FRENCH:

Drayton Valley, was it?

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Chairman, I don't know. As I recall [from] reading the article, I don't think it was oil. I think it was other chemicals that really caused the appearance and taste, not oil.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Chairman, for the last six years I have asked the same question: when is the City of Edmonton going to quit dumping salt, sand and gravel, et cetera into the river? And every year I get the same answer, that it's not having any effect. But, Mr. Chairman, I think if we keep dumping it long enough we can save the \$5 million, or whatever we need, to put the weir in down there and we will be able to walk across the river in this area if it keeps on going.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, with a project such as this, the practice of dumping sand, salt, water and gravel into the river in at least two or three areas in this park will certainly be done away with. With all due respect to the so-called specialists in the Department of the Environment, I think that we have to find a better process of getting rid of the

debris from our city streets than dumping it into the river, number one for aesthetic considerations and secondly for environmental considerations.

Nobody in the government or the Department of the Environment can convince me that there aren't harmful effects going into that river from this unaesthetic and, to me, unenvironmental aspect of dumping this 'crud' into the river. The government can sit over there and tell me that this river is in such fine shape. Well, Mr. Chairman, I used to live 130 miles down that river and we used to catch fish in there and practically drink out of that river at one time. And I defy or I challenge any of the members on that side to do that very thing now without taking typhoid or diphtheria shots. And I even challenge them to eat the fish. I challenge the Minister of Lands and Forests to catch fish 130 miles down river and eat them.

AN HON. MEMBER:

And shoot the bears.

DR. BUCK:

I realize maybe that this is the government's program of trying to get rid of the fish in the river as they get rid of the beaver and the bears. But, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see a commitment from the Conservative MLAs on that side of the House who are supposed to be representing the people of the City of Edmonton, but at the same time representing all the people of the province, to stop dumping sand, salt and 'crud' into that river. Mr. Chairman, I hope they take notice of that.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Used car batteries ...

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Chairman, my question to the hon. member is similar to the questions and concerns just raised. This is in regard to the contamination of snow dumping as well as other contamination.

Has there been a measurement of fish population taken upstream and downstream and how does it compare, not only as to the edibility of the fish, but to the population of the fish upstream and downstream? Have you any information on that, please?

MR. CHAMBERS:

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests might wish to comment on that.

DR. WARRACK:

I'm happy to do that, Mr. Chairman. I was very interested in the hon. Member for Clover Bar's self-criticism of the previous government in this regard ...

DR. BUCK:

When are these guys going to realize they are the government? Let's let them do something about what happened. We get that song and dance all the time ...

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order. Mr. Minister.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Chairman, the last thing I would want to do is hurt the member's feelings. Seriously though, certainly through the course of history it's got to be the case that the fishery capability of the North Saskatchewan River has been reduced. We have been conducting some studies in more recent years with respect particularly to the migration and spawning of the goldeye that takes place in the North Saskatchewan River historically and to a lesser extent now. It is primarily, as I understand from the preliminary results of the study, the goldeye that holds some real possibility for rehabilitation of the stream. But that's very preliminary and also subject to the possible incompleteness of my memory in that answer.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Chairman, could the hon. minister possibly investigate the possibility that the goldeye may be proliferating just the same way as the salmon plant in the Great Lakes because they love sewage. Would he look at that possibility?

MR. D. MILLER:

Mr. Chairman, I'm concerned about this bill because of the fact there is a study going on now to try to sweeten Tyrell Lake with fresh water from the ridge reservoir, and also go around to the east end of the lake with a fresh stream, mixing the two together and discharging it into Etzikom coulee for the ranchers who are pleading for water for sprinkler irrigation along the banks of Etzikom coulee for grass and hay.

Now the history of Tyrell Lake - despite the attempt of the Department of Lands and Forests to maintain freshwater fish in there, the salt content is too high. The thought has come from engineers in the south that our water resources - I don't know who came up with the idea that we could mix the water - put a steady stream through Tyrell Lake, bring it up to a level, discharge it and join it with fresh water again, and in five years we would clean up Tyrell Lake. Now we don't know the result downstream if the water that we discharge from Tyrell Lake, with the fresh water joining with it - even if it's double the discharge from Tyrell Lake - if that will be sufficient for growth. I'd like to hear the member comment on that if he has any knowledge of it.

MR. CHAMBERS:

Well, I have no specific knowledge of that specific water body, Mr. Chairman. However, I am confident that the Minister of the Environment would be most happy to sit down with the hon. member and discuss that particular problem.

[All sections, the title and preamble were agreed to.]

MR. CHAMBERS:

I move that Bill No. 19 be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 24 - The Social Development Amendment Act, 1974

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions on this bill ...

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Barton, first of all, there is an amendment that has been circulated.

MR. BARTON:

In establishing the different rates in family allowance, is this rate conclusive to all the provinces, or does the province establish its own rate for the different categories like 15, 19 and 25?

MR. ASHTON:

The hon. member, Mr. Chairman, has raised one of the key aspects of this bill. It is that the provinces, for the first time, negotiated with the federal government the right to set the rates within the provinces, subject to it turning out to be an average of \$20 per child throughout the province. So I'm not sure how these particular rates compare with all the other provinces, but it's possible they could be different from some of them. I understand that they are definitely different from some of the provinces.

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Chairman, then I take it that the current rates as of January 1 are established by the provincial government?

MR. ASHTON:

Correct, although of course they have to meet the federal guideline of \$20 average.

MR. BARTON:

So in other words, you get a lump sum of money and you split it up according to the age group.

MR. ASHTON:

You average it out.

MR. BARTON:

All right then, when you get this money from the federal government, Mr. Chairman, are there any specific criteria or regulations as to how this money is to be spent?

MR. ASHTON:

There are a couple. One comes to mind, there is a minimum of \$12. For example, you couldn't say that children under six years of age would receive nothing. The minimum payment must be \$12.

MR. BARTON:

Then I take it that the criterion as far as the one-year tuition period, or whatever you want to call it, for foster children is a provincial regulation.

MR. ASHTON:

I can't answer that specific question. I can say there is a ...

MR. CRAWFORD:

No. No it isn't.

MR. BARTON:

Would the minister explain it? I missed it. I was trying to concentrate on the member.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say to the hon. member, the answer to his question is no. That regulation is federal.

MR. BARTON:

Federal regulation?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Right.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development enlarge upon that? Is he saying that the holdback of a year to foster children is a federal regulation, or am I misinterpreting that?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Yes. It's a result of federal legislation. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure how closely this relates to this particular bill but I think it has some bearing on it. It's a result of federal legislation or regulation that for the first year of placement of a foster child in any home, no federal allowance under the Family Allowances Act is made.

MR. BARTON:

What happens to that first year's holdback then? Does the province hold it or have we lost that first year even though the child is in our province?

MR. CRAWFORD:

It is not paid at all to anyone, and that is new as of January. I think what hon. members have in mind is that under the rules that were in existence up until December of last year, there was a special trust account set up for the first year. After that it went to the foster parents. That trust account system no longer exists, and the reason is that in the first year no payment is made.

MR. BARTON:

Following that, Mr. Chairman, was that trust account held by the provincial government in previous years or the federal government? Was that a specific federal government regulation, that this one-year period would not be covered?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Yes. Once again explaining the previous system, Mr. Chairman, the moneys in the first year were not paid directly to the foster parents because, in the view of the federal government, the administrative difficulties of following people who stayed for relatively short periods of time in different places would be too great. So, in respect to a child who had not been with a foster parent for a year, they simply paid it in the name of the child to the provincial department.

The provincial department kept separate trust accounts for each child in respect of whom such payments were made and the parent could apply for the use of those funds for special purposes for the child.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Chairman, has the hon. minister made any representation to the federal government that the moneys follow the child - if a child is in a home for say three months - that the cheque follow the child rather than be held in a trust fund? Because, Mr. Chairman, there are some real problems that develop in the older teen-agers. Under the present situation they just don't have adequate spending money in this age group. I would like to know if the minister has made any recommendations that that money follow the child even if the child is in a foster home for only three months or so, that the money go with the child rather than be held?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I indicated that that system ceased as of December 31, 1973. What happens now is that the payment is made - and in this respect it's similar to the previous practice - after 12 months. The difference is that in the first 12 months there is no trust account because the federal government makes no payment.

My hon. friend asks me if we have made representations asking them to make sure that the funds follow the child. I think it is obvious that if the child has been there over a year they do just that. They do follow the child. But in the cases where the first year is still the situation and no payment is being received at all, the provincial government directly pays an additional \$20.

MR. BARTON:

Following that up, this is a standard practice in all the provinces of Canada that they have disallowed this one-year period?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Yes. I am giving the information as best I know [it] of the federal jurisdiction, Mr. Chairman. My understanding of it has at all times been that under the new federal program they simply stopped giving payments during the first year.

MR. BARTON:

The hon. minister wouldn't be prepared at this stage to make an announcement that the family allowance would be retroactive to January 1 and passed on to the foster parents or wards?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my choice of an occasion on which to make that particular announcement hadn't been made for 11:55 this morning as the hon. member is asking.

I want to just take the opportunity though to say one more thing that I hope hasn't left a misunderstanding. I realized, as I thought about it, that it could have in respect to an answer I gave to the hon. Member for Clover Bar. It relates in part to the differences that some members of the Foster Parents' Association have had with the Department of Health and Social Development with respect to family allowances.

It's simply this. I indicated that during the first year the province makes up the difference. That really is the source of dispute. What we do in the first year is, whatever amount is provided by provincial rates is paid. At one point I used the term an extra \$20, which is not entirely accurate. It's the amount as set by the province that is paid during that first year.

It's in the years after when the federal payment comes in that we took the policy decision that the amount that had been set on the provincial rates was still the right amount. If the person was receiving a non-taxable [family allowance] - it's not like yours or my family allowance which is taxable - a person who receives it on behalf of a foster child is still receiving a non-taxable one. The person who receives that additional non-taxable \$20 up to the present time and up until the program is declared to be any different, it has been that we do charge back, in respect to the fact that the federal payment is received. In other words, the person doesn't get the bonanza of another \$240 non-taxable each year.

MR. BARTON:

Following that up, it makes it pretty difficult under - well maybe this question would be ruled out of order.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Go ahead.

AN HON. MEMBER:

This is an open government.

MR. BARTON:

I appreciate the fact that one of the platforms was an 'open' government and I appreciate he will probably answer the question. One of the questions, Mr. Chairman, that bothers me is - and I can't blame the government and I can't blame the social development personnel - the fact that they have to produce bills for haircuts, and in some cases personal necessities for girls in other areas.

[Laughter]

I was wondering if the hon. minister would make one of the recommendations of an extra \$20 to cover the personal inconveniences that ...

[Interjections]

They can laugh, but it's not very funny. It's embarrassing when a child has to ask for a receipt for certain things. We're all adults and flush, but these are wards. Sometimes they have had 12 or 13 homes, and I think it's serious and I leave it for your fine judgment.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, it was a representation rather than a question. I just wanted to respond to the hon. member by saying that I agree with him. That is a source of difficulty to young people, if the situation is that for something like a haircut a receipt has to be asked for. We have assured the Foster Parents' Association, in the representations they made to us, that we were giving very, very strong consideration to changing that particular aspect of it. Anything that is done in that respect would be done at the same time as the long-ago promised statement by myself resolving the entire issue.

On the timing of this statement, I want to just say to the hon. members that it has only been a very practical matter that has resulted in it not having been resolved. I do have my views on it and we have had the meeting of the cabinet committee, but the cabinet itself hasn't been able to get this particular item on the agenda yet. That's the whole explanation.

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the hon. minister's sincerity.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, with with the advent of long hair the last three or four years the department must have saved about \$10,000 in haircuts alone.

[Laughter]

The point I really rose to ask about though is, does the department have a limit on the number of homes in which a foster child may be placed? I've come across some youngsters who have been in four or five. I read the other day where the girl in Ontario who committed suicide had been in something like 15 or 16 foster homes. This must have a terrific emotional effect on the life of a boy or girl.

I am wondering, has the department any guidelines as to the number of foster homes? Is there a place where you say, we'd better give up on foster homes and put this lad into an institution, or do we diagnose the thing to find out why it is that this lad can't fit into a foster home? Are the wrong foster homes being picked? Is there something we don't understand about the child?

I rather lean to the thinking of the late Father Flannagan of Boys Town in the States, who said there are no bad boys, only bad parents. Perhaps that's going too far, but I lean towards that thinking. I don't know whether the hon. members ever knew Dr. Coffin, who was once the head of the normal school in Calgary, who taught the graduates of that school that if a child wasn't making progress not to blame the child but to blame yourself as the teacher because you don't know enough psychology to handle that child. I think there's a lot in the psychology of understanding a boy or girl in order to get them to fit into the environment.

I am wondering what study is made of these boys and girls who have difficulty fitting into foster homes?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I'd very much like to respond to that, and I wanted to recall to the hon. member the lines of Lincoln Stephens, I think, when he said there's no such thing as a bad boy but sometimes good boys do bad things. I always liked that line very much and I've even used it in my own defence on occasion.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the hon. member if maybe in the departmental estimates where we're dealing with foster care that we have much wider discussion on this subject than maybe should be today. I would just note that under the Family Allowance Act which my hon. colleague from Edmonton Ottewell is presenting, the only reason I interjected at all was because of the specific application to the foster issue.

MR. TAYLOR:

That's quite satisfactory.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Has any assessment been made of what is returned to the province or to the federal government under taxation now that the family allowances are taxable?

MR. ASHTON:

Yes, they've calculated that the province will be receiving something in excess of \$11 million by virtue of the income tax provisions on the family allowances.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, then in light of that are we not playing right into the hands of the income tax department, while it's true enough that we get it back partly as a province, when we increase the amounts to the older children under what is proposed in this bill, I would submit Mr. Chairman, that we look pretty carefully at this.

I know there are circumstances where getting the larger amounts of money for the older children in families is really appreciated. But by and large, and I would take a 15 year spread from where a young couple is married, have their first children and receive a smaller amount, but also their taxable income is considerably less. What is happening here, as I see it, is that 15 years later they get the maximum amount payable under this bill in one hand, and it is taken out of the other in income tax.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it would be better to give larger amounts to the younger parents with younger children who are in the lower taxation brackets than to increase the amounts progressively as they get older to have more of it taken off by taxation.

MR. ASHTON:

Of course, one of the exciting features about the whole concept of the present bill is that the benefit is given to those families where the greatest need is. Those families with the higher incomes don't have the same need, and to me it's quite proper that it's income taxable.

Now the point you make has some merit, but it certainly wouldn't have much merit if you were making that argument to a low-income family that had several teen-agers. If you were suggesting that [with] their expenses, which are very high for teen-age children, the benefit they were going to get was to be lessened, to give more to the families with younger children, I think you'd receive a substantial amount of objection.

So, taking the whole picture into account, this seemed to be the fair way of doing it, in that there is some relationship between the cost of raising a child and the amount that is received under the family income. This applies to all families and it will have a particular impact on the low-income families because they, of course, won't be paying income tax or [will be paying] low rates of income tax on the amounts they receive under this bill.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, further to that, certainly I concur. There are instances, and I preface my remarks by saying that there are instances where it would be different. Certainly, I think by and large too, that many of those low-income families do have forms of assistance available to them.

But I was thinking of the impact that it has as far as Alberta goes. In the move made here in the amount of money that is removed from Alberta in additional income tax, it wouldn't necessarily have to be if it was left at the lower rates for the older children and the greater rates for the younger ones.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to add a few comments further to those made by the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake in his appeal to the minister to change the present circumstances as quickly as possible.

I've had representation from foster parents regarding the problems that the current situation is causing wherein this receipt business is required, wherein foster parents not only open their homes to foster children but are put to financial expense under the present system. For example, envision Mr. Chairman, if you can, a young lad playing hockey who needs a new hockey stick because it's broken. The foster parent has to pay for it, and then has to wait four to six weeks until someone in the bureaucracy decides whether or not Johnnie really needed that new stick.

And then we find other situations where he's invited to the final banquet and the kids decide to take up a collection for the coach and put the bee on each child or student for \$2 say, for a gift for the coach. How does he get a receipt for such a situation as that?

All these circumstances the child faces on a day-to-day basis definitely brand him as being different from the other kids, or the kids with natural parents. Pretty soon he begins to develop some hostilities in some cases, Mr. Chairman. Then he goes to his foster home and becomes more difficult for them to handle, in some instances, and he may even take his hostility out on the property of the foster parents. They don't have reimbursement for any damage done by a child who may go into a temper tantrum and break some property or wreck a car or things of this nature. They don't have protection against that sort of thing.

So it's an escalating problem of hostility. The present situation does not lend itself at all to making these foster children feel that they are part and parcel of normal society. They are being branded as something different. They are being put in a position where they are subject to ridicule from other kids of the same age. It just does not seem right that an economic reason, and a relatively small economic reason, should be allowed to exist which undoes or has a negative effect on all the good aspects that the government is trying to do in regard to helping and aiding foster children.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I would certainly echo the sentiments of the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake and his cause in this regard, and would urge the minister to get the situation rectified as soon as possible, because the damage that is being created in the interim may very well be more than is evident at first blush. We'd urge the minister to eliminate this system of receipts that are presently required.

Thank you.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, just to back up what the last member mentioned, I had the occasion not long ago to meet with some foster parents and certainly the concerns they expressed to me were along those lines. Certainly the matters the member, Mr. Barton, raised too are concerns that were expressed.

One further one I would like to refer to is the matter of the amounts of money collected by the income tax department off the family allowances. I believe the member mentioned it was some \$11 million. I would submit that it would be better for us to keep as much of that as we could in Alberta and then the province supplement some of those cases that were in need, as he referred to and as I acknowledged, rather than to use the basis we are for paying it and parting with that money.



MR. ASHTON:

I'm sorry. The \$11 million is the province's share of the income tax.

MR. RUSTE:

That makes it all the more important then.

MR. ASHTON:

I wish to commend the Member for Calgary Bow for his comments. I've had the same concerns and of course these have been expressed to the minister and the department on previous occasions. I'm sure by many members, certainly by members of this House. As the members are aware, there are some rather dramatic changes that took place in the foster care allowances and benefits several months ago. I'm sure the minister would be glad to repeat those benefits if it were called for at this time. I would suggest that perhaps the foster care topic would be more appropriately dealt with during the estimates later on if that's the wish of the House. I thought there was general agreement earlier this morning that that would be the case.

[All sections, the title and preamble were agreed to.]

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 24, The Social Development Amendment Act, 1974 be reported as amended.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 30 The Wildlife Amendment Act, 1974

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Chairman, there are two or three things here. The first one that I would like to draw to the attention of the committee is this amendment on page 2, Clause 9. It's amending Section 25 and it's new. It says:

(5.1) No person shall

(a) discharge a firearm from, or

(b) cause a projectile from a firearm to pass along or across,

a developed road allowance in any county or municipal district unless he is hunting game birds with a shotgun under the authority of a game bird licence issued pursuant to this Act or the regulations.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

Mr. Chairman and committee members, there is a question with regard to two matters. Number one is a developed road allowance. Now an ordinary road allowance is on the grid system and it goes at the edge of a section of land. That is what is considered as a road allowance. Now, there are some areas in our municipalities where well-developed roads travel not along road allowances, but diagonally across the piece of property or something of that nature. The people are concerned that something be put into the Act, in the definition section probably, to clearly distinguish what is meant in this particular section by "a developed road allowance". If it's only going to take the roads that are developed on the actual road allowances, then it doesn't cover the areas where the roads don't follow the road allowance.

The second part the people are concerned about particularly in our area, in the west country, is that it only covers the developed road allowances in the counties or municipal districts. But west of us and north of us are some heavily populated sections of IDs, and particularly in these IDs in the foothill areas, the roads are developed not on the road allowances but in a winding fashion wherever they happen to fit the best. They are well-developed roads and very highly travelled roads. The concern of the people is that we should have those two matters looked into and adjusted so that it wouldn't be limited just to municipal districts and counties, but would also cover those more highly populated areas of the IDs; and also this matter of a clear-cut meaning of what is meant by developed road allowance.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Chairman, on both of those matters, as a matter of fact, the hon. member will recall my having taken really quite a bit of the House's time to address both of those points during the course of my remarks on second reading. They are both very important questions especially the first question, the question of what really is a developed road allowance and how to best handle that.

I'd refer to the comments I made on second reading to emphasize that the three part firearms package of amendments that's in The Wildlife Act - of which this is one - was developed on a basis of considerable discussion and you might say, even negotiation, relative to the sportsman and relative to the landowners and the municipal districts and counties association people who, in a sense, represent them; also with input from agricultural groups, and sort of mediated by the Department of Lands and Forests.

On that very question, on that very word "developed", a considerable amount of discussion took place and a number of alternatives were searched for. It was decided during the consensus that emerged to stay with the word "developed" road allowance. When you think of some of the alternatives, for example on the one hand, if you were to leave that as a definition that would be made by the local municipality or county, what you would really do is endanger having public access choked off completely by the way they defined road allowance. They could say, for example, that if they mowed the grass on them that means it's developed and they'll close it off to public access. Of course the sportsmen would, I think quite rightly, object to that.

On the other hand, in terms of the full access to any kind of road allowance, developed or not, it was a clear area of objection by the landowners and the municipal district and counties people that there had to be some additional regulation regarding the use of firearms in these areas. They ended up with developed road allowance as basically something that was a saw-off, that both sides agreed they could live with.

In the instance of an initial prosecution, it would have to be a judgment factor on the part of the enforcement officer as to whether this was or was not a developed road allowance. In the instance that he judged that it was and proceeded with the prosecution, then the person who was charged would, of course, be able to make the case before the judge that this was not a developed road allowance and we would really have a kind of judicial consensus developing there that might very possibly in the future allow us to specify it more clearly than it is.

In short, on the question of developed road allowance, we were in the position that we did not want inadvertently to create unlivable problems by being so specific about it that it was impractical. Yet at the same time we didn't want to water it down so much that there would not be the increment of firearms protection that is clearly necessary in these areas.

The search for alternatives among the many people who have been involved in these discussions over most of a year really ended up with this particular terminology. It may not prove to be completely adequate. Some experience may help us to determine what would be more adequate. I would certainly say to you now that in the event that it develops that there is a better way to handle that, to be more clear and yet still have the impact that's necessary, I would certainly be open to making whatever change might then be practical and necessary.

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair]

On the second matter, the matter that the firearms restrictions pertaining to road allowances applies only to counties and municipalities, and as you rightfully point out does not apply to improvement districts and special areas, I think it is fair to say and fair to admit that there will be some fairly heavily settled areas that will not see any change or relief as a result of this amendment.

The thing is, of course, that in the counties and municipalities being, generally speaking, the most settled and heavily populated areas, we are applying protection there where it was clearly needed the most and where some clear protection is needed now, and evaluating whether that is enough protection in dispersing the hunting and trespass pressure that evolves at certain seasons of the year. Whether or not it would have to be expanded to include areas other than improvement districts and/or special areas, I don't know. But to go that far at this time was clearly going further than not only the sportsmen, but the other people of the general public who want to assure themselves of access to particularly Crown land areas which intend to be in the improvement district areas. They were just not prepared to go for that much of a restriction at this time, and I'm inclined to think that I agree with their position on that.

So the matter of including counties and municipalities, but not improvement districts and not special areas, was certainly a negotiation. It was a compromise and one that both sides of the question felt they could live with. We would go with the concept that could

give us some restriction as needed and yet try to leave as much public access as possible, and proceed with the amendment on the basis that was put forward and put forward now to you.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I'm not rising just to change pace although the hon. minister's speech has a soporific effect on the House ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

What's that?

MR. LUDWIG:

Now that we're dealing with road allowances, has he had any representations from any organization, the Fish and Game people, to perhaps provide alternate access to rivers where too many consecutive road allowances - I mean parallel consecutive road allowances - are leased out? Has the minister had any requests or any representations, say, from the Fish and Game or the Wildlife people to take a look at this kind of idea? We are very park-oriented now and there are areas in Alberta, I'm sure, within the minister's knowledge where we have recreation areas along rivers where the people can't get in. Has the minister had any representation or given any thought to perhaps taking a look at this to see if anything can be done?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Chairman, as you know this is not, of course, in the Act. But nevertheless it's not to minimize the fact that the question of public access to river courses, for example, is an important matter. It's had some considerable discussion from time to time in the House and I think all members are aware that the question of the access of these road allowances is really under the joint jurisdiction of the local government and the Department of Highways and Transport, at least in the instances of a county and municipality.

To be specific in my response to the hon. member's question, I've not had the representation of alternate access provision, but I certainly have had representation from those who feel that there should be more public access allowed on an existing road allowance. The answer to that is yes.

With respect to the possible alternative of devising alternate routes of access instead, that one has not.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, the reason I raise the question of alternate routes of access is that in some cases the road allowance, even if it were open, is not the best way to get to the river. Sometimes it's a question of convenience where we hit a sort of brick wall in trying to get access. Perhaps legislation could be enacted which would require the government, where consecutive parallel road allowances are leased or closed to the public for whatever reason, to perhaps arrange alternate access at a very reasonable price in negotiating with the landowner. As time goes by this has become a serious problem.

The pressure for access to rivers and to recreational areas is growing and it's common knowledge. So I'm just raising this because I feel that the hon. minister, being concerned about these matters, perhaps it's his department's place to take the initiative and see whether we couldn't work out something to do away with a rather annoying situation which exists at the present time, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Chairman, I'm particularly interested in Section 22 where this act amends The Municipal Government Act. As you know, The Municipal Government Act and the municipal police were previously authorized under the Act to police the by-laws of the municipality or the county concerned.

My concern has been expressed by the rural municipalities and the counties that since this section has now been amended it will be enforced by the game officers of the province. There is a concern in my area and also in the area just west of the city of Edmonton where these by-laws were in effect and properly so. Now, of course, they will be taken out of their hands. Many of the people in the area know the numbers of their local councillor and of the municipal police, but it is sometimes hard to find a game officer who you will be able to send out there.

So I'm wondering, Mr. Minister, through the Chairman, if this section remains as it is, then could we not possibly, to overcome the difficulties that lie in the area,

authorize or have authorization given to the municipal police or the county police to enforce this section of the Act, the same as they were under the municipal by-laws act?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Chairman, I, too, have talked to representatives of the Association of Municipal Districts and Counties. On a regional basis, at least, that is one of the representations that has been made. The Solicitor General and I are looking at the suggestion that was made, and indeed at the whole matter of not only a thorough but a fair enforcement of these kinds of provisions. Hon. members will, I think, recall that the argument in favour of facing up to this problem was really that the circumstance right now is chaotic and inequitable in its enforcement situation.

But in any case, yes, we have received that representation on a regional basis and the hon. Solicitor General and I are assessing that and will be coming to terms with the necessary enforcement provisions once we proceed with the desires of the Legislature.

MR. ZANDER:

One more question to the minister. Before the passage of this bill, could we get some assurance from you and the Solicitor General that this has been resolved? Certainly this amendment to The Municipal Government Act is just going to create chaos in the rural areas as far as the enforcement of game regulations if they are not to be enforced by the municipal police. I can sympathize, because we have not had adequate access to wildlife officers. We are many miles removed from them and to get a wildlife officer out there - you can get a mounted policeman but you can't get him to go out there - so consequently you have to get a wildlife officer. And my experience this past winter has been that I couldn't get one. But I could get hold of the municipal police.

I would certainly urge the hon. minister to consider giving some commitment to the Assembly here that this will be actually enforced, whether or not it can be done. But I certainly think at this time there has to be some commitment given to the rural municipalities that they can enforce some of the game laws through their municipal police.

DR. WARRACK:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I note the representation as the member has repeated it. I will say this too, though, I'm not about to inadvertently get into a position that I am making a representation for a change in the concept of The Police Act, and I think the hon. member well knows what I am talking about in that regard.

In terms of the word chaos, that for sure is what we have right now. I can give the member the assurance that we will be able to have a more enforceable and fairer situation by far after facing up to this problem, particularly on an agreement basis within the consensus of all concerned as compared with the current very unfair and really untenable situation in much of Alberta.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to finish what I started a while ago with regard to Clause 9 dealing with Section 25. I appreciate very much what the ...

DR. WARRACK:

What section? No. 9?

MR. BENOIT:

Yes, the same one we were dealing with, Mr. Minister.

I appreciate very much what the minister said, and his condescension and concern that if this doesn't work there may be some changes made. I would hope that would be the case. But I want to further enforce my plea now for more specific definition in the bill as it is now, from the standpoint of one thing the minister spoke about, and that is the matter of law enforcement of this thing.

In all fairness to our law enforcement officers who have to take these cases to the courts, if they do not have something specific by way of guidance on which to take them to court, the very example the hon. minister drew to our attention is exactly what transpires. A law enforcement officer, believing or understanding that he is charging someone who is on a developed road allowance, takes him to court on a charge. Then the court decides it isn't a developed road allowance, because the court doesn't understand it in the same way the law enforcement officer does. So the court dismisses the case, and the law enforcement officer is left holding the bag once again.

So often, in charges laid by law enforcement officers in conjunction with The Wildlife Act, again and again the cases have been thrown out of court and it just makes for a relaxing of vigilance on the part of the law enforcement officers. It is very discouraging and humiliating, and sometimes embarrassing, the way courts deal with these cases the law enforcement officers take in. And so, for that very reason, I believe we have a good argument for a more specific definition with regard to what the road allowance is, so that both the courts and the law enforcement officers might have the same rule upon which to go. It is leaving it this way, in a sort of ambiguous situation, that creates the problems in court. It has become quite a burden, in my estimation, so far as the law enforcement officers are concerned.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to respond further on this matter. May I do so in this way: that in instances where there is a judgment made by the enforcement officer, particularly with the new provision of the law, and this is brought to court, I would prefer, if there is a difference, that we accept the view of the court as compared with the single individual view of the law enforcement officer. Over the course of a short period of time and experience, it's very clear to me that the kind of judgment of the court will become the kind of judgment of the enforcement officer. As a matter of fact, I am not at all concerned about the "left holding the bag" problem, as he put it, inasmuch as it seems to me that in a proper enforcement of anything, be it wildlife enforcement or whatever, there probably ought to be enough strength of effort towards enforcement that a certain percentage of the cases are not prosecuted successfully. I don't really agree that is necessarily at all a matter of the lessening of the vigilance of the law and the decency of society, if you like. In fact, if there is more fairness in it because of that, then that is a situation I am very much prepared to accept.

The subject and the point you make, nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, are very important.

MR. DRAIN:

Well this may not be quite appropriate to the amendments, but it appears to be a good time to broach this particular subject. This has to do with the accommodation of the some 70,000 hunters who buy licences in the province of Alberta and relates to some particular areas in the improvement district where there is no visible indication of any road allowances whatsoever. Certainly they could not be expected to run a traverse from a definable corner post in some particular area. I was wondering if it would be a reasonable thought to suggest that road allowances should be labelled as such? There are quite a number of areas where there is no way to define them. If they were labelled, then the person would know that he could legally walk along a particular area, and it would preclude the possibility of trespassing in many instances. There has been a large number of complaints in this area.

DR. WARRACK:

I would just say I think there is some real point to that suggestion. Perhaps combined with the suggestion made earlier relative to the possibility of alternate access where it was either closed for very good reason or simply physically impractical to follow a road allowance, this might be a possibility as a conscious program of public knowledge on what is public access area.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, there are one or two items I would like to touch on in Bill No. 30, but before I ask my one or two questions, I would like to congratulate the minister on his wisdom in stopping the issuing of wild horse hunting permits this year. I think it is of very historical significance, too, because this year is the hundredth anniversary of the RCMP, and the horse played such a great role in the early development of our western Canada. So I say to the minister publicly, my thanks to his department. As a matter of fact I am going to Vancouver tomorrow to speak to the Canadian Wild Horse Association and this is ...

[Interjections]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Dixon, is Mr. Drain going too?

MR. DIXON:

No, he'll go next year.

However, Mr. Minister, in a more serious vein, I do wish to thank the government and I hope that I can say in a year's time that the permits are still not to be issued. I do want to thank the government, and the minister in particular, because it has been a long,

hard fight but, anyway, at least one giant step has been reached. Thanks again, Mr. Minister.

While I am on the subject of Bill No. 30, I wonder if the minister could bring us up to date on the bear situation as far as the honey producers in the province are concerned? I understand some action is being taken to try to put up electric fences by assisting financially with the electric fences. What other things are we going to do this year to try to avoid the mass slaughter of many of our bears in Alberta? The fact is there has been a public outcry by many people about the situation and I am sure the government is just as anxious as anyone else to cut down on it. I would like to know from the minister just what the plans are this year and in the future regarding the situation of the bears and the honey producers in our province?

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I wonder too, if the minister would take this into consideration. In Alberta we are gradually moving into farming in a more intensified way. I have in mind the raising of strawberries commercially, saskatoons ...

MR. LUDWIG:

Raspberries.

MR. DIXON:

... and apparently there is particular interest in strawberries on this side of the House.

No, I'm thinking of the wildlife damage act. They have had quite a discussion in Nova Scotia where a lot of the songbirds have been destroyed because they were attacking this type of crop. I was wondering if the government in Alberta is taking a look at the situation? What protection does the songbird have in Alberta? Have they any protection? Can they be shot at any time? Just what is the situation?

DR. WARRACK:

Two items: first, on the bears and honey thing. For detailed reading, I would suggest members refer to Hansard of about the third week in March, and my response to the distortions which were presented at that time. With respect to this matter, we will do the same preventative work we undertook last year when we were successful in cutting in half the kill of bears that had been taking place under the old government. We have been doing this preventative work by using electric fences and scaring devices, and also monitoring the damage problem so that bears would not be killed indiscriminately. The only ones which might have to be killed, the final removal if you like, are the ones which are clearly the ones which have gotten into the honey. Once they are into the honey, they want to stay there. It's like the country boy who goes to 'Paree' for the first time. If he gets where the action is, he wants to go back.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What about the city boy?

DR. WARRACK:

The city boy has already been there, Henry.

So on a joint problem animal control basis, that is handled by both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Lands and Forests, we are planning to accentuate and strengthen this successful preventative program. I really am serious that the bear kill was cut in half, as compared with the situation where there was no preventative action at all and the only thing you could possibly do was sort of kill every bear on sight. That situation is no longer the case, and we've had considerable improvement on it.

In terms of public reaction, just so the hon. member might take this into account as well, I've received quite a bit of communication from people wanting to know who the MLA was who regarded the honey production of Alberta, the largest and most valued in Canada by far, as minimal and minor. I was very happy to let them know that it was you, sir, and I'd hate to be your candidate in that country in the next election.

MR. DIXON:

Oh. Ohhh.

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, sir. On the ...

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. In the next election, is the hon. minister going to have a teddy bear on his campaign posters if he is nominated again?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order. Mr. Minister, please continue.

DR. WARRACK:

On the second point that was made by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican regarding the question of wildlife damage, and particularly some of the wildlife, for example songbirds that we're not usually discussing in the context of wildlife, but we should more often. The way the Wildlife Damage Fund works is this: the basic funds for the wildlife damage compensation program come from wildlife certificates that are sold to sportsmen as they obtain hunting licences. So the funds in the wildlife damage program can only compensate for damage by species of wildlife that are hunted. In other words, as far as songbirds for example, a truly serious situation which they had in the Maritimes, unless they are a hunted species and they are not in Alberta at least, then this would not be part of the wildlife damage program that's basically paid for by the sportsmen of the province.

The other thing, though, that I would mention is that all of these areas of possible crop damage and, for that matter, livestock damage are really agricultural production damage risks and it is possible to have insurance for this kind of risk. But at the same time I think it needs to be admitted that that insurance opportunity for agricultural producers does need to be more extensive and more thorough than it is now. This was part of the work that was done by the committee chaired by the Member for Camrose, Mr. Stromberg, that has led to a number of improvements, and this is one of the areas where future improvement, I think, is definitely necessary.

MR. SORENSON:

Section 37 and the regulation, Mr. Minister: "This amendment will extend the prohibition contained in the section to bird eggs, raptors, ...", which are robbers, but hawks and owls are very beneficial to my way of thinking. Yet we have children or kids coming out from the towns or even farms and they climb up to the hawks' nests or the owls' nests and rob the nests of the eggs. I'm wondering, are there any laws protecting birds' eggs from these hobby hunters and what's stopping us from going up to the whooping crane nesting grounds? I feel like cutting the limbs off some of the trees and greasing the poles so they can't climb the trees to get at these eggs.

DR. WARRACK:

I might really have responded in this regard to the Member for Calgary Millican's question, but you've emphasized it and I'm pleased to draw your attention to the amendment in Section 2(a), to be specific, which will add falcons, ospreys and owls to the group of birds defined as birds of prey. The important thing about that is that all birds of prey, raptors if you like, are endangered species, so they get that additional protection. You'll notice elsewhere in the act an amendment that allows the inclusion of eggs which, prior to now under The Wildlife Act, have not been protected; only the live species of the bird itself.

Finally, also with respect to the amendment regarding the new Clause 23.1, this provides that we can now make regulations regarding endangered species of wildlife, and the reason this is introduced is that there has been ongoing work by international conferences and also by national conferences within Canada on the problems of endangered species. Each province is adapting its wildlife acts in order to have regulations that can deal with this on an even and uniform basis across Canada. That's the reason for that particular new clause.

MR. BARTON:

Getting back to the Wildlife Damage Fund, as far as the fund is concerned, does it actually cover damage by wildlife in cases of hay and the farmers preserving their hay stock for the winter? What type of regulations, or is there any remuneration under the fund for actual wildlife damage to farmers' stocks of hay?

DR. WARRACK:

To haystacks for example? No, it's geared to a cereal crop damage situation. So as it stands now, the answer is no. This relates very much to problems that I think it would be fair to say - and I think if we described it during the review of estimates as the next order of business relative to problem wildlife difficulties in southwestern Alberta

with elk attacking haystacks. The kind of thing you are thinking of might very well fit into this as a future adaptation that might be necessary.

MR. BARTON:

Could I just follow that up a little bit, Mr. Chairman? Is the minister prepared to discuss this particular aspect and make specific regulation changes? Basically, what I'm getting at is that there are different modes of preserving crops of hay for the winter; in some cases it is bales, in some cases it is stacks, in some cases it's in those bins where they chop it up and put it in piles. It was brought to my attention that if, in any way, the farmer - whether it is a granary or just straight grain - was proved negligent in not providing a particular extra cost in, maybe, fencing the stack or fencing the granary, he wouldn't be, in essence, compensated for this particular damage.

I think there is a serious misconception amongst the people who buy these wildlife damage certificates. They think this is covered. I understand the administration of it and the actual assessment is through the crop assessment board and really hasn't anything to do with the Fish and Wildlife officers. They submit their report and then it goes to the crop. They come out and sometimes it's several weeks later. It's not really an effective way of getting to the problem the way it is legislated or regulated today. I was wondering if the minister has the department looking into this area to bring it up to date as to what we have as far as advanced technology? Because a farmer sure can't go out and fence 20 stacks in his field.

The other part I'd like to bring up is the fact that I think the shortage of animals this year is very critical. I think our game management programs, the number of Fish and Wildlife officers have to be looked at. It has to be expanded. I think that we're in a serious time element if we're going to preserve any of the animals. We definitely have to look at the regulations. I think maybe we should be going back to one animal, one licence, a higher licence, extending the actual female hunting season later on, rather than in the early part in specific areas, and upgrading the type of hunter, making it a true sports-oriented program. The way it is now where you can get five animals; I don't think any good hunter wants five animals. He wants a shot at one animal. I think that if it's a price problem, I think it should be a higher rate - if you need the revenue of \$20, I think \$20: but entitle him to one animal for a period of time. Our population this last winter has really taken a serious turnaround. I think the minister and his department ought to be very careful in setting up the regulations for this year.

I would like to commend the Fish and Wildlife office for the work they have done this year in that area.

DR. WARRACK:

Thank you very much, through the Chair, to the member. These are some of the things we have to be looking at about this time. Whenever the session is finished, I anticipate having some time to look at them myself which is necessary, going towards the coming year's regulations.

I might just point out aside from having carefully noted the points made by the hon. member that in this year's budget, by far the biggest increase, as far as the division of the Department of Lands and Forests is concerned, has been the Fish and Wildlife Division, including an increase in enforcement officers to a pretty substantial extent.

MR. D. MILLER:

Mr. Chairman, to the minister. The complaint that Fish and Wildlife have registered with me, their MLA, is there is a shortage of grass, overgrazing this side of the timberline, especially in the leased land. It isn't excusable that the elk or the wildlife come down and raid the ranchers' haystacks. And it doesn't seem they can build fences high enough to keep them out. But they maintain and suggest that I register this with you that it's because the leased land is so overgrazed there is nothing there for them to eat. This makes it possible and very attractive for them to come down to the field.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Chairman, this is a good example of how whoever sits in my chair is constantly whipsawed in a number of areas including this one. On the one hand we have the sportsmen basically, and some others as well at least removed from the immediate area, who make just the point the hon. member has made. Yet at the same time, the people in the area who are doing the grazing are very upset that we are not allowing them to do more. I suppose it is a balancing of unhappiness rather than a search for everyone being happy. That's basically the circumstance as it is. I'm sure the hon. Member for Wainwright will recall having heard many of these arguments both at the same time for the same place.



MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, to the minister, I realize there has been an increase in the amount paid under the Wildlife Damage Fund, from \$15 to \$25 an acre, but in view of the increase in the price of cereal grains which I think it is pretty safe to say is about three times what it was at the time the rate of \$15 was struck, I was wondering if the minister is looking at an increase in that rate?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Chairman, I think, having regard to the time, that we should move that the committee rise and report progress on this particular bill and report the other bills that have been approved.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is it agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Mr. Diachuk left the Chair.]

\* \* \* \* \*

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration the following bills; Bill No. 19 and begs to report same; Bill No. 24 and begs to report same with some amendments. The Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration Bills No. 18 and 30 and begs to report progress on same and asks leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Government House Leader, I would like to call upon the Acting Government House Leader, the Minister of Advanced Education, to report on business at the commencement of the week.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I won't comment on the additional prestige that goes with this office.

[Laughter]

It is self-evident, I am sure.

AN HON. MEMBER:

And the salary.

MR. FOSTER:

And the salary, Mr. Speaker, as referred to by my colleague.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Do you think you can handle it?

MR. CLARK:

It'll be nice to have some prestige, won't it?

MR. FOSTER:

On Monday afternoon we will proceed to second reading of government bills beginning with Bill No. 32, The Alberta Energy Company Act and then proceed to Committee of the Whole to study the remaining bills on the Order Paper.

On Monday evening Subcommittee A will proceed with consideration of health commissions, and Subcommittees B, C and D will be left to their own devices.

Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do now adjourn until Monday afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[The House rose at 1:00 p.m.]