

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, May 14, 1974

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege this afternoon to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly, some 12 students from the Social 30 class of Central High School in Hughenden. They are accompanied by Mr. Anderson and Mr. Manning. I would ask them to rise at this time and be recognized.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, once again I'm most pleased to introduce to you and through you to this Assembly 75 students from the constituency of Edmonton Belmont which I'm proud to represent in this Legislature. They are Grade 5 students from the Kildare Elementary School and are sitting in the members gallery accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Joan Budd. I should like to ask all of them to stand and be recognized by this Assembly.

MR. McCRAE:

Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you today a group of 30 students from the Senator Patrick Burns School in Calgary. They are accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Szulczyk and have enjoyed a tour of the museum this morning and are looking forward to observing the Legislature in action this afternoon. Mr. Speaker, they are seated in the public gallery and I would ask them to stand and be acknowledged by the Assembly.

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure this afternoon of introducing to you and to other hon. members of the Assembly, a group of 37 Grade 8 and 9 students from the Dapp School in the Athabasca constituency. This afternoon they are accompanied by Mr. Frank Gurak their principal, teacher Mr. John Muzyka and their bus driver John Forbes. They are in the public gallery and I would ask them to stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in introducing to you and through you to the hon. members of the Legislature three fine young men from St. Mark's School. They are Ken Bowman, a Grade 9 student, Andre Doucet and Mike Bowman, Grade 8 students. These students have been looking over the Legislature, have political ambitions and have actually tried out the hon. Premier's chair for size - and it fits very well. I'm sure we all welcome these young men to the Legislature.

TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I made reference to a report that existed in regard to a major study on bank stability in the Edmonton area. Today I would like to file with the Legislature the Whitemud Banks Stability Study done by R. M. Hardy and Associates.

MR. LUDWIG:

What year?

MR. YURKO:

This year - two weeks old.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to test the strength of one of the male pages by tabling Return No. 151 on the motion by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table reply to Question No. 120 on the Order Paper.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Department of Mines and Minerals

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the cabinet today approved a recommendation of the Energy Resources Conservation Board that pending final disposition of the application by Canadian-Montana Pipe Line Company under The Gas Resources Preservation Act and covered under the Energy Resources Conservation Board March 1973 report 73-A-OG, that existing Permit No. CM 54-1 authorizing Canadian-Montana to remove natural gas from Alberta be extended one year from May 14, 1974 until May 14, 1975.

The cabinet also decided the extension be subject to the condition that Canadian-Montana Pipe Line meet the government parameters as specified from time to time with respect to the field pricing of natural gas.

The cabinet, in reaching its decision, noted that:

(1) Canadian-Montana Pipe Line Company has advised the Energy Resources Conservation Board and the government that it is prepared to meet the government parameters respecting field pricing of natural gas;

(2) Canadian-Montana has been producing and removing natural gas from the province of Alberta since 1952;

(3) A majority percentage of the total Montana power system load is residential and commercial and not industrial;

(4) Natural gas from Alberta is comingled with Montana-produced gas in northern Montana and is used throughout the Montana power system which services the town of Coutts;

(5) Three per cent of the total natural gas being removed from the province goes to the State of Montana;

(6) The extension of one year changes the existing permit from a 20-year permit to a 21-year permit but does not change the combined volume of natural gas which has previously been authorized for removal under the two existing Canadian-Montana permits;

(7) A further extension or extensions for a similar period may be granted from time to time.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Commonwealth Games Levy

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs but I see he is not here, so I'll direct the question to the Premier. Has the government been asked to introduce amendments at this particular session of the Legislature dealing with The Municipal Government Act to make legal the intended levy of 1.2 mills by the City of Edmonton for the purpose of the Commonwealth Games?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would just have to take that as notice and refer it to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. He may be in his seat before the conclusion of the question period. If he is, perhaps the hon. Leader of the Opposition might want to redirect the question then.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question - I would be perfectly agreeable to the Premier passing this on to the man.

[Mr. Russell entered the House.]

In fact, if I might just speak until the hon. minister gets in his place, Mr. Speaker, then I'll ask the question directly of him.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs - the Premier was going to pass it over. Has the minister been asked by the City of Edmonton to make amendments to The Municipal Government Act to make legal the intended levy of 1.2 mills by the City of Edmonton for the purpose of the Commonwealth Games?

MR. RUSSELL:

No, we've had no such request yet, Mr. Speaker, that I'm aware of, unless it's come into the department within the last few minutes.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the Department of Municipal Affairs given a decision to the City of Edmonton regarding the 1.2 mills and its intended use for the Commonwealth Games?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe we've been asked for that advice as yet.

Land Speculation Legislation

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a second question, to the Provincial Treasurer. Is the Provincial Treasurer or the government intending to bring forward legislation at this spring session dealing with land speculation?

MR. MINIELY:

No, Mr. Speaker. I think all hon. members are aware of the fact that there is considerable work being done on taxation matters through an advisory committee under Alberta's corporate tax system. We will be looking at a wide variety of matters. Most of them, as hon. members know, are on the incentive side. Certainly they are intended on the incentive side, but along with our study we are looking at questions such as that.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question to the Provincial Treasurer. Is the government going to be introducing legislation at this session dealing with the taxation on undeveloped land held for speculation in the two large urban centres? Are there any thoughts of legislation in that area?

MR. MINIELY:

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, not in this session, and at the present time I wouldn't want to put any time frame on it.

Commonwealth Games Levy (Cont.)

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to add to the previous answer that I gave to the hon. Leader of the Opposition with respect to discussions on the current mill rate for the City of Edmonton.

I know that there have been discussions going on this morning with respect to setting a by-law dealing with a split mill rate because this is the first year they are doing it. We have assured the city that if they want to proceed before the amendments are through this year, they will have the necessary legislation and I've given that as a commitment to the city. Now whether or not within that context they've discussed the 1.2 mills for the Games, I don't know.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question back to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister undertake to check with the officials in the department and then report back to the House?

MR. RUSSELL:

Yes, certainly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Natural Gas Export - Montana

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Premier. Through you I'd like to ask the hon. Premier if the extension of the permit mentioned by the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals will satisfy the needs of Montana as discussed with the governor yesterday?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I understand that it will. Certainly I would presume from the governor's remarks that he would have preferred more than merely a one-year extension, but he understood the situation the Government of Alberta was in, in terms of establishing any sort of separate relationship for Montana. On the other hand, it was our feeling that since they had been supplied with natural gas since 1952, since they did involve the community of Coutts, since they certainly have been in all respects cooperating with the government and are prepared to accept our price parameters, we felt the least we could do was assure them of the continuity of supply for the one year.

I would interpret the reaction of the governor as feeling that his trip was worth while. He added to it, of course, aside from the natural gas question, desirable discussions between the State of Montana and the Government of Alberta relating to tourism and agriculture in particular.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wainwright followed by the hon. Member for Taber-Warner.

Seed Grain Supply

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. It relates to the late spring we are having now. I'd like to ask the minister if there have been any recent developments in the availability of some of the seeds that the farmer is looking for at this time?

DR. HORNER:

Pardon?

MR. RUSTE:

The availability of the early-maturing types of seeds. I'm thinking of the rapeseed and barleys.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge the availability of seed grain has not been a particular problem except perhaps with the question of oats. But I will check with the departmental officials to make sure that that's still the situation, as it was a few days ago.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Alcoholism - Compulsory Treatment

MR. D. MILLER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Is it the intention of the minister to introduce legislation at this session to make a treatment program compulsory for alcoholics who would otherwise refuse rehabilitation?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was kind enough to send me notice of his intention to ask that question and to point out that such legislation is currently before another legislature in Canada. He's wondering about our intentions of proceeding in the same way.

The answer to the question is that last year I did receive a full briefing on that type of legislation from the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission and it's a type of legislation that is in use in some parts of New England. New Brunswick has seen fit to follow that lead.

The essence of it, in a few words, is that treatment may be done on a compulsory basis rather than on a voluntary basis if a judge so orders.

We still have that under review. There is no intention certainly to introduce any legislation of that type in this session. Whether or not it would become a priority within the next several months is still an open question.

MR. D. MILLER:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Would it be under consideration that a member of the addicted person's family could request that he have compulsory treatment?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think in that type of legislation, if the judge is making a determination on whether or not an order should be made in respect to a person, he would hear from various witnesses and no doubt that would include those who would know him best - the members of his family.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

CSA - Statutes

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Premier. Can the Premier advise the Assembly whether or not the government is prepared to appoint a commission at this time as recommended by the president of the Alberta Civil Service Association to examine the conditions and the statutes under which Alberta public servants work?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, we haven't had an opportunity to consider that as yet. I believe the public servants of Alberta of course are well aware and have present in their minds the very important step forward this government made, in moving from a position where a unilateral decision could be made to a position of independent arbitration. But as for that specific one, we haven't considered it. I would think it is probably unlikely.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is the government investigating current claims of inconsistency of treatment of government employees between the various arms of government?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Those are matters, Mr. Speaker, of constant consideration and we welcome any suggestions from the other side as to where they would like to specifically identify the inconsistencies.

MR. NOTLEY:

Further supplementary question, if I may, to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Has the government reviewed the recent royal commission reports of the provinces of New Brunswick, Ontario and I believe British Columbia as well? Has the government monitored any changes that have been made in their legislation as a result of these royal commission reports?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, there has been a constant monitoring of those reports by the government. But there is a general, growing feeling, I believe, not just in Alberta but throughout Canada that there surely are better ways to deal with the matter of arrangements regarding salary structures with the public service involved in essential services such as they are, than a matter of strikes. We have already stated unequivocally in this House in 1972 the position of the government on that particular point which I believe at that time was supported by the official Opposition.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. the Premier. Does the government have any suggested alternatives at this time to either the strike or binding arbitration?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I think the view the government holds is the matter of binding arbitration is a very good one and certainly a distinct improvement over the situation that existed at the time we took office, when unilateral decisions were made by the government. If the hon. member has any additional ideas - this has been pursued by experts throughout the world - we welcome them at any time.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Is the government prepared to entertain the proposition of the Alberta Civil Service Association that public servants should come under The Alberta Labour Act and have the option of either the right to strike or binding arbitration?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, would the hon. the Premier assure us that in their studies that they would take into consideration the consistency of treatment of employees within the government service or agencies or boards?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is certainly yes.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Premier give further assurance that the relevant regulations of the three acts under which government employees work would be investigated and updated as well?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, we would be pleased to do so. I'm sure the hon. member in his capacity as a member of the Legislature would point out and identify the specific matters of inconsistency to which he is alluding.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question, if I may, to the hon. Premier. Can the hon. Premier advise whether the government has assessed yet what particular acts the new agencies such as the oil sands research agency, under what particular acts these particular employees will be able to bargain?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, that is something that I couldn't answer right now. I'll take that matter as notice and respond in due course.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Alberta Opportunity Company Auction

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. Could the hon. minister advise what action has been taken as a result of the resolution which this Legislature passed last year regarding the disposal of advertised products from the Alberta Opportunity Company by auction rather than by public tender?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, we did have an experiment in which they had an auction rather than public tender. They analyzed the results of that particular approach and found that it wasn't quite as satisfactory as they had anticipated. They have gone back to ... [Inaudible] ...

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. minister advise if information is available as to who conducted the experiment, what the circumstances were and the products that were sold?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Order Paper.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would assume that the products that are sold and listed have to be made public because if people are going to buy them they'll have to know what it's all about, and the same with the price.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Further to the question, in line with the experiment, the one sale that was conducted, is that information available?

MR. PEACOCK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Calgary Youth - Aerosol Fatality

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is with relation to the reported death of a young lad in Calgary which was allegedly due to sniffing Pam, an aerosol vegetable oil. I wonder if the government has received any report?

I had actually intended to direct the question to the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs, but perhaps the acting minister would take the question. Has any member of the government received a report concerning the death of this young man in Calgary?

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, as acting Minister of Consumer Affairs, I'll be glad to check and enquire as to whether his department has had such a report. Speaking for my own department, Mr. Speaker, I would advise this House that I have not received such a report.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. minister ought to be advised that this was reported and televised ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sit down!

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Order please.

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

Ethylene Plant Construction

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question today to the hon. the Premier. It's regarding the federal government announcement of the past few days that they are going to make an announcement regarding future ethylene plants in Canada.

I was wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the government has been in touch with Ottawa - or has Ottawa been in touch with the government - prior to the proposed Thursday announcement regarding the Dome application?

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, maybe I could ask the hon. Premier, has the federal government indicated to the province that the Petrosar Plant at Sarnia - they wish that to go ahead, regardless of our objection that we may not be able to supply all the feedstock they require?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, that's a very extensive and complicated subject. It's the intention of the government, in the next few days probably, to make a statement on the matter subject to certain other events. I would prefer to defer my response on the specific questions the hon. member raises [until] that point, except to point out to him that Alberta Gas Trunk Line made a very significant announcement today confirming their intention with regard to an ethylene plant to be constructed in Alberta in which there would be no pipeline and a total upgrading of derivatives in this province - a very important announcement for the province.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. Premier for his advanced information. I was wondering if he could enlarge on the fact that there are no pipelines involved, and where is the location of the new, proposed plant?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the advice that I have is that in terms of the actual plant itself - the ethylene plant - it can either be in Calgary, in Edmonton, at Fort Saskatchewan or at other locations. But with regard to the derivative plants, the intention of the consortium that involves Alberta Gas Trunk Line, Canadian Industries Limited and other companies, would be to have the derivative plants, as far as possible, on the basis of the provincial government's industrial strategy, on a balanced basis through the smaller centres of the province, to the extent that it's economically feasible.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say without elaborating further, pending a statement by the government, that there have been communications as recently as the last hour with the federal government on the matter of petrochemical plant locations.

MR. DIXON:

One final supplementary question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. With the announcement by Alberta Gas Trunk today, will that effectively eliminate one of the competitors that has been asking for a plant in Alberta? Is this ...

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is clearly asking for information which is in the nature of an opinion.

MR. DIXON:

No, Mr. Speaker, my question, if they wish me to reword it - my question is, with the Alberta Gas Trunk announcement does that mean that there are not going to be the same number of people applying for new plants because Alberta Gas Trunk will probably take in more than their own? In other words, you mentioned CIL - does that mean this will do away with CIL?

MR. SPEAKER:

With great respect, the hon. member is still asking for an expression of opinion coupled with a prediction.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Perhaps I could just elaborate on my answer and say that the matters dealt with in this whole situation will be encompassed in a fairly extensive statement by the government, hopefully within the next few days.

MR. SPFAKER:

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

Consumer Education - Alberta Schools

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Education. Will the hon. minister be encouraging, in the near future, a comprehensive program of consumer education in Alberta schools? And that would be at all levels.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, a good deal of work has been done with the Ministry of Consumer Affairs on that subject and I've had a number of discussions with school trustees in the province.

Certainly the degree of interest in consumer education - and some of it has been going on for many years - varies a good deal, depending on what area of the province and what school board is being talked to. But I would see increasing interest and increasing dollars going towards the subject of consumer education, remembering that the extent and the rate at which it's moved into in various school systems will depend on the local boards.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question to the Minister of Education. Has the Department of Education given consideration to some form of special funding to assist school boards which choose to become actively involved in consumer education?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, that's one of a number of alternatives that we are exploring at the moment, Mr. Speaker.

I should also add, while I'm on my feet, that we are not looking at encouraging a specific course in consumer education, such as Consumer Education 10, 20 or 30, but rather assessing the extent to which that subject is present and can be usefully studied in a number of courses, a broad range of courses, already on the curriculum.

MR. CLARK:

A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Have the Audio-Visual Services branch of the department and the Alberta communications people been given any instructions by the government to look at this whole field of consumer education? Not just in the 1 to 12 system but also in the whole concept of continuing education?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well, insofar as the basic education system is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I haven't personally given any direction of that kind. Certainly they will be consulted and involved in ongoing developments.

MR. GRUENWALD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister still have an advisory board on curriculum and instruction that could advise the minister on the types of things we're talking about now?

MR. HYNDMAN:

That board which was in operation for some years is not functioning and has been disbanded for the moment, Mr. Speaker. We did that for the reason that a number of members of even that committee indicated that a more decentralized and localized kind of curriculum committee, or committees, which would deal with the different subject areas in a more manageable way, might be the better way to go.

We're exploring various alternatives which could involve a very substantial restructuring of the advisory committee in the curriculum area over the course of the months ahead.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Just one further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What method is being used now by minister to get feedback on different types of curriculum that might be of interest to educational systems?

DR. BUCK:

Task forces.

MR. HYNDMAN:

At the moment, Mr. Speaker, a good deal of information has been coming back from school boards. And in consultation with the Minister of Consumer Affairs we're getting very useful and contemporary information in that regard as well.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Coal Sales - Montana

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Premier. Was there an opportunity to discuss the possible sale of domestic coal to Montana, when the hon. Premier discussed other matters with the Governor of Montana yesterday?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure I heard the hon. member. Did he say domestic coal? We had a discussion, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the coal situation. As the hon. member is well aware, there are some very interesting and important coal deposits within Montana, but

they are under the federal jurisdiction because of the United States law. They have some serious environmental concerns in their province relative to their limitations regarding water.

It was more a matter of discussing a common industrial position that we're in, whereby we have the natural resources and we're trying to use the leverage of the natural resources to create, in Montana and in Alberta, a higher degree of job opportunity, rather than ship the unprocessed resources to other areas and buy them back on a value-added basis, which I think is a matter of growing concern both to our province and to that state.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Does the hon. Premier have any statistics as to what percentage of the power produced in Montana is produced as a result of natural gas?

MR. SPEAKER:

It would clearly not be within the obligation of government to serve as a research tool in this direction.

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Black Bears

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Has any directive or permit been given by his department to increase the number of black bears which may be taken by hunters this spring and this year?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, the answer is no, inasmuch as that's not how it's done in any case.

The matter of black bears has been discussed several times in the Legislature and I think all of the concerns were answered fully. With respect to hunting however, the game regulations each year do provide an opportunity for the hunting of this particular animal and I would anticipate that in 1974, this possibility might exist as well.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the responsibilities of the hon. minister who is in charge of lands and forests, is one of his undertakings the matter of beating around the bush?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

Civil Servants - Political Rights

MR. NOTLEY:

May I pose an additional question to the hon. Premier? Could I ask the Premier whether or not the government is giving any consideration to a change in policy with respect to public servants in Alberta exercising full political rights including the right to participate in politics and seek public office?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I don't know that that's a matter to which we've given any recent consideration. So I think I would rather take the matter as notice and consider it.

MR. NOTLEY:

If I may just ask one supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, of the hon. Premier. Can the Premier advise whether or not this is a subject which will be reviewed along with the other questions as to the difference in the three acts that cover the bargaining rights of public servants in Alberta?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that I see the connection. I would have thought that when the hon. member started to ask his question, he was relating it more to the question of conflict of interest that may be involved. We will certainly be considering the subject, but not in relationship to the question of collective bargaining.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. CLARK:

I wonder if I could ask the hon. Government House Leader if he would be in a position to check out the various motions for a return and give us some indication as to any that might be held up for a long delay? We would like to have some of them prior to the study of the Estimates.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I think if the hon. Opposition Leader would give an indication of the specific ones he's interested in, then I could perhaps get information as to how long it might be before the answers are provided. Some of them are quite detailed.

MR. CLARK:

Could I ask then for Sessional Papers 107, 111, 115, 126, 128, 124, 130, 137, 153 and 150?

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

176. Mr. Barton asked the government the following question:

Which of all towns, municipalities, counties, and improvement districts, has the provincial government assisted in writing off all or a portion of the municipal debt, and what was the amount in each case and the remaining debt in each instance for the years 1972/73 and 1973/74?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, we're happy to accept that question.

177. Mr. Ludwig asked the government the following question:

How many convictions were there for impaired driving and what were the total fines paid for said convictions, during the period of time between December 31, 1964 and May 1, 1974, in,
(a) The City of Calgary, Alberta,
(b) The City of Edmonton, Alberta?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Attorney General, could that matter stand until Thursday?

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it agreed by the Assembly that this may stand until Thursday?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

178. Mr. Notley asked the government the following question:

1. (a) How many days during each of the months from November, 1973 to March 1974, inclusive did the air pollution index at the central Edmonton monitoring station show readings in the following ranges: (i) moderate, (ii) heavy, (iii) severe?
(b) What were the comparable statistics for the monitoring station located in east Edmonton?
2. What was the average daily level of sulphur dioxide air pollution for each of the above months as recorded by the central Edmonton and east Edmonton station respectively?
3. How many days during the six month period from October 1973 to March 1974 did the sulphur dioxide readings exceed .035 parts per million at the air monitoring station located in (i) central Edmonton, (ii) east Edmonton?
4. When, if at all, does the Department of the Environment plan to issue regular public reports on the air pollution index readings from the east Edmonton monitoring station?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I'm happy, on behalf of the Minister of the Environment, to accept Question No. 178.

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. Mr. Chambers proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

Be it resolved that the Legislature support the recommendations with regard to land use and resource development in the eastern slopes as contained in Interim Report No. 1 of the Environment Conservation Authority.

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Speaker, to begin with and perhaps to refresh our minds on the subject, the Environment Conservation Authority defines the eastern slopes as the total mountain and foothills area in the province, from its western and northwestern boundaries with British Columbia, and its southern border with Montana, to the eastern limit of the foothills. It doesn't, of course, include the national parks or Indian reservations.

This definition was presented in Information Bulletin No. 1, which invited submissions with regard to land use and resource development in the eastern slopes.

This bulletin reminds us that land is now used in the eastern slopes, or proposed for use, for tourism, summer and winter recreation, urban development, forest utilization, mineral resource industries - and that would include, of course, oil and gas development - surface mining for coal, underground coal mining, agriculture, watershed conservation, domestic water supplies, hydro-electric power developments, wildlife and fishery management, wilderness and natural areas, and institutional use by charitable and religious organizations, archaeological sites, and for research and other areas.

The report also recognized that the different present and potential uses of resources in the eastern slopes area could either have no effect on each other or they could actually complement each other; they could be conflicting or they could relate to each other in other sequential ways.

The authority then invited submissions from all sectors of the public, including developers, industry, regional planning commissions, cities, municipalities, towns, I.D.s, Indian bands, universities and other agencies, associations, groups and individuals. Submissions were invited on all aspects of land use and resource development, including proposals for specific recreational and tourist development projects within the area.

For the purposes of the hearings, the slopes were divided into five separate districts, corresponding to the five major watershed basins, and outlined by the statutory boundaries of the four regional planning areas and Improvement District No. 14. These areas are the Oldman River Basin, under the Oldman River Regional Planning Commission; the Bow River Basin under the Calgary Regional Planning Commission; the North Saskatchewan River Basin under the Red Deer Regional Planning Commission, the Athabasca River Basin under the Provincial Planning Authority, and the Smoky River Basin under the Peace River Regional Planning Commission.

In order to provide the public with solid background information with regard to these specific areas, each of the planning authorities prepared an information bulletin, which I'm sure members have seen, which detailed the geographic nature of the area, including the typography, drainage, climate, soils, vegetation, fish and other wildlife, existing resource development and also an evaluation of the resource potential. I found these bulletins quite informative. They are attractive; they contain some very useful maps and are very interesting reading.

In order to make this background material readily available to the citizens of Alberta, information centres containing all available source material were established in a number of centres throughout Alberta. These were itemized in Information Bulletin No. 3.

As part of the background information supplied to the general public, the authority presented a report, being Information Bulletin No. 12, on this subject. It was prepared by an ad hoc committee being the Science Advisory Committee of the Environment Conservation Authority. I found this report to be highly interesting and to contain, at least in my view, some very worth-while observations and recommendations.

For example, many people look upon the eastern slopes as a rather homogeneous entity, whereas in actual fact, the region is varied and complex, both environmentally and in terms of its use by people. Of course, in addition to the five major basins referred to, there are numerous other watercourses which cut through the landscape.

The lower foothills section of the zone represents an area of transition between boreal and subalpine regions. Foothills elevations are considered to vary normally between 3,000 and 4,000 feet, whereas the so-called montane forest region is generally an elevated area between 4,000 and 6,000 feet. The subalpine and alpine area is normally considered to be that lying above 5,000 feet altitude.

The climate, as we know, varies significantly not only as a result of latitude as we go from the Oldman River Basin in the south through the Smoky River Basin in the north, but also as a result of altitude and as a result of chinook winds which, of course, significantly affect the winter standing snow levels in certain areas, as well as the hydrologic cycle as a whole.

Vegetation, of course, varies from heavy mature timber, which is a valuable renewable resource, to the scant and fragile alpine tundra which, amazingly enough, despite the harsh conditions under which it often has to thrive, supports quite a variety of animals and birds.

Although the permanent human population of the foothills area is small, much of the area is used in one way or another, and very often in competing ways. For example, there is competition in the grazing areas - and I was interested to learn that there are over 100,000 acres in the area we are looking at which are leased for grazing purposes. But there is competition certainly, in certain areas, between domestic animals and ungulates and in certain areas even with the wild horses. I suppose, depending on whether one is a wild horse connoisseur or a cattle rancher or a hunter or perhaps one who just likes to see wild animals or even to know that they are out there, he might have an entirely different view from the next fellow as to how that particular portion of the eastern slopes should be used.

In fact, when you get into the question of wilderness areas, there is also a fairly wide spectrum of opinion as to what a wilderness area comprises and how it should be used. I think there are those who look upon the wilderness area as being an area of totally undisturbed ecological preserve such as it was in the days before man ever arrived on the scene, while there are also those who look upon a wilderness area as only a relatively protected area which they could nevertheless have access to, whether by horse or canoe or perhaps in the view of some, even by machine.

In fact, if you really look closely at the situation, it appears that all the resources in the foothills, all renewable resources, water, timber, wildlife, fish, agriculture, et cetera, are interrelated in one way or another.

The removal of a block of timber, whether during forestry operations or even along seismic cut lines can have positive benefits, for example, easier access by people who want to perhaps travel into the area to hunt or fish. Again, this depends upon one's point of view. Also the cleared areas usually provide improved grazing for wildlife. On the other hand, the timber removal results in increased spring run-off and increased siltation in streams and therefore, possible damage to fish populations. Furthermore, as areas are opened up and more access to people and machines is provided, more damage can undoubtedly occur.

Similar conflicts exist with regard to the non-renewable industries such as the petroleum industry as the result of seismic trails, well sites and, of course, the risk of pollution from either an oil spill or sulphur emissions. Fortunately, most foothills

hydrocarbon fields contain gas and therefore the risk of spillage is somewhat lessened. Also, as the result of sophisticated technology developed principally by the operating companies, and because of the close supervision by the Department of the Environment, sulphur emissions are contained within acceptable limits.

Coal development provides a much greater problem since large masses of material are removed, particularly from surface strip mines. Not only is the landscape disfigured, and perhaps in the mountains this disfigurement is in some cases permanent, but dust and noise pollution is common and there is conflict with both wildlife management and recreation.

Forest clearing and mineral working on sloping ground can lead to erosion and increased siltation of streams. Furthermore, it has been noted that there is no record yet of successful reclamation in the fragile subalpine zones. The seepage from coal and tunnels is - I guess in mining terms I should refer to drifts or adits rather than tunnels - but anyway, seepage from these and the spoil heaps may also contain harmful chemical pollutants.

In some areas of the U.S.A. the chemical content of streams appears to have been permanently altered as the result of coal mining operations. There are many other examples of detrimental results of coal mining operations. Yet in our mountain and foothills region there is contained essentially all of our high grade metallurgical coal, estimated to be as much as 30 billion tons probable. Of course, we are mining metallurgical coal now for export. There is no doubt that we'll mine more for our own growing steel industry at such time as we develop our own iron ore deposits. As the demand for steel and energy grows, there will be ever-increasing demands upon us to produce more and more coal.

Mr. Speaker, one could talk for some considerable time about the potential conflict which exists within our eastern slopes, and yet I think the point has been made, and members are aware of the significant problems and conflicts and alternatives which we have to deal with now and in the future.

Members have all received Interim Report No. 1 of the Environment Conservation Authority, and the Minister of the Environment tabled Report No. 2 with regard to the Oldman River basin yesterday. The reports on the other basins will follow as they are prepared.

Mr. Speaker, the preamble I have presented so far was intended to be by way of a brief overview of some of the background material and problems associated with land use and resource development in our eastern slopes. I felt it was necessary to review the overall situation although Interim Report No. 1 deals specifically with commercial, tourist development proposals presented at the public hearings which were held from June 11 to July 13 last year. However, I think members will agree that it is difficult to isolate such specific proposals from overall land use and resource development.

Mr. Speaker, to summarize the conclusions and recommendations contained in Interim Report No. 1 first, it is interesting to note that at the hearings there were numerous objections to all forms of tourist development and few expressions of support for specific proposals were heard. However, about half the people in attendance were willing to accept such developments within existing east-west corridors, or within existing communities.

The report recognizes that there is rising pressure on the national mountain parks, created by tourists who visit in increasing numbers each year, and that this pressure occurs mainly during the summer and mainly along the east-west transportation corridors. There is a shortage of tourist facilities now, probably a severe one in our national parks, and tourist needs are expected to rise in the future. The report recognizes that there are two possible alternatives to development, either the laissez-faire approach, that is, uncontrolled development; or the alternative where planning controls are worked out and then imposed.

The report recommends that assuming orderly development is desirable, then a land-use policy should be developed which recognizes the demand for additional facilities in the east-west corridor. It notes that such development could be confined to existing communities, especially those which have a low tax base from which to operate, since the problems of waste disposal, landscaping costs, and access road construction would be minimized.

However, the report also recognizes that there may be a need for the development of permanent tourist and recreational facilities in areas other than in the east-west corridors, and that these may have to be provided, even though many people would prefer to have limited development rather than intensive development.

The authority also recommends that since new towns create many problems, such developments should be selected by government only after a careful view of land-use priorities. They recommend that an overriding consideration at this time be that the planning options remain open until a general land-use plan can be developed and adapted,

and that, "The creation of such a plan can be properly carried out only after inter-departmental work on land use capabilities has been completed".

To look at the specific commercial proposals reviewed in the report, it was recommended that the Westcastle Resort be allowed to expand so as to fulfill the requirements for the 1975 Canada Winter Games, and that all developments and improvements, wherever possible, be in harmony with a master development plan for the total resource development.

It should be noted that these applications for commercial proposals varied widely in magnitude, cost, and in the amount of pre-planning or preliminary design considerations that had been carried out.

Some were merely presentations of concept without any in depth study, whereas others were sophisticated, innovative schemes that have already had appreciable input in terms of engineering and feasibility studies.

It was recommended in Report No. 1 that further development planning and studies, or review of site, proceed on a number of proposals, such as White Spruce, to be located adjacent to the Westcastle road and bordering the Crowsnest forest at Beaver Mines. Also on the Assiniboia project for the southeast shore of Spray Lakes; for the Banff recreational project adjacent to the park boundary in the Canmore corridor, and the Odyssey, a resort village proposed for the Clearwater forest reserve at the junction of the Cline River and Highway No. 11.

However in all these cases, while attractive aspects of the proposals were recognized and degrees of encouragement given, nevertheless, it was made clear that there should be no commitment to final approval until a general recommendation on land use and resource development in the eastern slopes is forthcoming.

Several developments which appeared to be either not sufficiently advanced in planning concept, or perhaps not even desirable in the opinion of the authority, were, in effect, discouraged.

The Alberta Wilderness Association proposed a wildlife recreation area, with no access for motorized vehicles in a 560 square mile area of the Bow River reserve. They also presented a series of submissions proposing the establishment of recreational wildlands with designated areas in each of the watershed basins. The authority noted that this subject is complex, involving "passionately opposed conflicting interests," and recommended that any recommendation with regard to these proposals be deferred until after the general recommendations on land use and resource development on the eastern slopes is forthcoming.

The Alberta Youth Hostels Council proposed that a chain of 31 youth hostels be built through the eastern slopes, beginning at Westcastle and ending at Grande Prairie. Fifteen of these, between Westcastle and Grande Cache, were proposed for immediate development. It was pointed out that each site requires only two acres, provides shelter for persons of any age or sex, and enjoys a good reputation for maintenance and supervision.

The sites are proposed at 40-mile intervals, within a reasonable one day's biking distance. I found it interesting to note that the authority felt that in due course there would be support for infill sites, located within hiking distances of each other, and they recommended that the youth hostel proposal be approved in principle.

Personally, I feel that the youth hostels provide a service of tremendous value to our young people, and indeed to all Albertans and Canadians. I would urge members to give this recommendation unanimous approval.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every member in this Assembly is concerned about the present and long-term development and use of our eastern slopes. Of course we have members here who represent the eastern slope areas - at least in part - in their constituencies and do have, therefore, special insight into some of the problems of eastern slope development. Since this area parallels our major population centres, there will be ever-increasing demand for additional recreational areas, and as our population grows, ever-increasing demand for development of more natural resources, both renewable and non-renewable.

Personally I have great faith in technology and I feel that within the framework of an overall plan we can achieve the proper balance between resource development and recreational objectives, while still preserving a beautiful, clean environment in this most attractive area of Alberta, and at the same time recognize that the population of Alberta will grow significantly in the years ahead.

I would also like to state emphatically that, in my view, our most valuable resource of all in the eastern slopes is our water. These slopes are the source of most of our rivers and streams and a plentiful supply of clean water is surely our most vital

commodity. So, whatever we do in the way of development, I feel that our first consideration surely must be to protect our watersheds.

Secondly, I think that everyone would agree that our eastern slopes represent a most valuable recreational area for all our citizens. I personally believe that most Albertans want expanded recreational facilities along our foothills. Therefore, I would recommend to the Minister of Lands and Forests that he consider a significant expansion of provincial park areas along the eastern slopes.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is absolutely essential that we develop an overall long-term plan and stick to it, regardless of conflicting pressures. The development of such a long-term plan is, of course, a monumental task, and a task that every member of this Assembly will give serious consideration to.

I am also confident, Mr. Speaker, that after reviewing the overall findings and recommendations of the Environment Conservation Authority with respect to land use and resource development in the eastern slopes, that this government will make a thorough assessment of legislation pertaining to this area.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Environment Conservation Authority for the excellent work that they have done and are doing. I think that the recommendations contained within Interim Report No. 1 are sound. Therefore, I would urge that members endorse this report and therefore support this resolution.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on this resolution and thank the hon. member for bringing it before the Legislature. When we talk about the eastern slopes of the Rockies we're talking about what I always considered as my backyard ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

A pretty big backyard.

MR. DRAIN:

... having spent most of my life in that particular area, starting out in the business of logging through the kindness of a credit account with a very friendly ranger. If anyone worries about it, all the dues and so on were eventually paid.

[Interjections]

This, of course, is something that you couldn't do in 1974 because I guess our efficiency has probably expanded beyond the point of any retrogressions in any direction or other.

Looking at the entire eastern slopes I would say that the method that has been used to coordinate the different uses over the prevailing years has been reasonably satisfactory. Assuredly there has been conflict in different areas; game versus cattle grazing, overuse of ranges as a result of trying to accelerate cattle production during the last war, depressed prices for lumber, inadequate facilities for fire-fighting in the early era of the province because of lack of access to the various areas - all these things have had some impact on the eastern slopes of the Rockies.

I did attend the hearings in Coleman and did make a presentation on this particular subject. Since the interim report specifically deals with recreation I could possibly go over this particular section I mentioned.

Recreation and all of its facets can be considered one of the most important present and future uses of the Old Man River Basin.

And, of course, this applies all along the eastern slopes. We talk about the land area. It is a comparatively small area and the interim report mentioned that there is going to be more and more demand for tourist utilization and more people demand. This is very, very true, and I think probably we're rapidly reaching the stage when we're going to have to assess how far we can go in the direction of tourism. The hon. member mentioned that it was a very fragile area and the higher areas do not respond very rapidly to any excessive use, which would result from a tremendous amount of tourism.

The Foothills and mountains will be needed to fulfill this desire [for more outdoor living]. More and more there is rejection of commercialism and a desire for the simple things of life. Urban dwellers are constantly being bombarded with crass commercialism. Their desires for the outdoors can be met in the Foothills of the eastern slope.

What direction should the development of the eastern slopes take? Primarily I would say that no land should be sold. It should remain in perpetuity the property of the Crown and the people of Alberta.

Now when anyone tries to make a case for the utilization of this area and the development of commercial developments therein, they do not recognize the accessibility of the area. Two hours from Calgary, one hour from Lethbridge can take you right back to the main range.

Basically, the report, the interim report, deals with two things in two specific recommendations. One is the Westcastle development. I think if we looked at the Westcastle development and what occurred there with the virtue of hindsight, we could conclude that in reality it was, to some degree, a mistake to go in the direction of setting up an area of Crown land for private development.

Now, the guidelines were laid down by the former government; these people would go there, do their own thing, not come crying back to the government for financial assistance, look after their roads and all their maintenance. But it just doesn't go that way because when you start a development like this, you involve an area, you involve groups of people, you involve the public, you start a cycle of demands and these demands have to be met. Once you have created a situation like this, there is no alternative except to go along with it. So we talk about the 80 acres in Westcastle and we say, well, that's insignificant in the overall area of the eastern slopes of the Rockies. And in reality, it is, in the total mass. But remember this pretty well corrals the whole west Castle valley.

To the people who have travelled into that area and hunted and fished there for many years, to look the area over and now see no-trespassing signs, no-shooting signs, they say, this is our land and here we've been and this is where we hunted grizzlies in the past and now it belongs to someone else. The right of proprietorship has been established. However, now that this is done, I see no direction that it can go except to accept this particular recommendation in report No. 1 and go along with it. It's there. It is something that cannot be avoided any more.

When looking at the particular area, it is quite amazing to rationalize why it was picked as a ski area to begin with, for anyone who really has any concept of skiing. It's on the north slope where the sun hits it, where you have this problem with icing and lumping of snow, where the snow melts off fast. This was picked by a Swiss who was supposed to have all the groundwork and background and understanding of this. So, the only way you can go in that particular area, is having regard for the chinook belt and the variations in snow cover which you do have.

Now, I recall in 1942, I had a camp operating right across from Gravenstafel Creek, across from where this ski tow is operating. I had a crew in there and it was February and there had been no snowploughing done whatsoever in that particular area that winter. So I did go out there on a matter of checking timber and one thing and another. I drove my car in 1942 in February right up to where the ski site was. The road had never been ploughed and there was simply no snow. And I said, boy, this is really the place to work. Now, where I'm working, there is a lot of snow, over on the other side of the mountain, so we'll set her up. We'll move the centre of operations for next winter for timber supply into this particular area. And that's where I got into real trouble. Because that winter, there was 12 feet of snow on the level, bulldozers weren't all that efficient and there weren't that many in the country. I did have a very important responsibility because coal had a high priority. It was fueling the ships and operating the railroads and without the supplies that I was supposed to furnish, it was impossible for them to keep going. We bucked that snow, and we pushed it up 25 feet. So there's a contrast.

What I am saying is you have an inconsistent snow supply. Very obviously, before the Winter Games, you will have to - or someone will have to - set up snow nozzles, artificial snow machines and so on and hope that a chinook won't come. Because that is the situation you have. In reality, if you want consistent ski-type weather, you have to move further east in the province where you get beyond the influence of the heavy chinook.

I'm just pointing out some of these as problems that face Westcastle. These are problems they'll have to live with. The road is not that bad in there, but what occurs is the lack of sophistication of the drivers who come from the big flats, go into the mountains and proceed as though they were coming down No. 2 south on the four-lane.

Of course, you have the hydrological cycle which the hon. member referred to, where you have snow, sleet and all the variations in weather. These create tremendous problems. For every thousand feet of elevation in the mountains, you gain 20 feet of moisture. The end result is that where it's sunshine and blue sky 20 miles east, you get up in the mountains - storm clouds, ice, snow and all the other conditions. Now this is why - I just illustrate the reason I say you should tread very, very carefully in the matter of any development.

The policy also up to now, as enforced by the Alberta Forest Service, has been that any cabins, logging camps or human habitations that had been utilized and were no longer required were burned to the ground. This area was kept so there was really no permanent location. In my view the desirable manner in which this particular area could be utilized would be keeping it for simple recreation, hiking, cross-country skiing, camping, fishing, all of these things. There is a surfeit of commercialization, a surfeit of places where you can go if you want that sort of thing. But to get back to real nature - this is probably the last block of land that there is in western Canada that can be utilized in this direction.

So any policy that is developed should be developed on the basis of non-permanency, non-permanency of towns, non-permanency of buildings, non-permanency of anything.

This brings me now to the youth hostels. I certainly commend the youth hostels movement. It is something that started in Canada in 1930 as a spin-off of a German development. The reason it was so important in Germany and in European countries was because, in truth, there was no available free land where one could go and camp. So these hostels had to be developed.

I suggest that any hostel development should take place outside this particular area, along the edges or fringes, because in reality it's a very, very narrow area. In one day you can walk across any particular part of the eastern slope of the Rockies right to the main range and across to British Columbia, so it's not all that big an area. But it's a unique area.

So what you do with the youth hostels system - if you set it up, you set up permanent or semi-permanent buildings. And we talk about two acres, we talk about 31 hostels that stretch from the Waterton boundary to Grande Prairie. We say, well this is 62 acres and it's of no significance. But really, this is the beginning of the breakdown of what will occur as a result. Where you bring in youth hostels, you have to bring in supply depots, you have to have permanent residences. You concentrate people in certain areas which is not desirable. Without any physical developments whatsoever there is a tendency for people to find their own areas, to move around into the different parts of the region thereby eliminating any concentration. This is one of the plusses.

There is no question that once you have set up the youth hostels movement as such - it is, in fact, not a public organization, it is a private organization although it is funded to a great degree by government grants. Therefore, if you say that you are going to give one particular spectrum of society the privilege of moving in there and having these things, how can you then deny to someone else the same privileges? Because people are all equal. Therefore, I would say this is one objection I have.

Another objection I can voice is that the ability is there to bicycle, to camp in the times when it is suitable for camping. It's no problem - the types of sleeping bags they have today, you can camp anyplace. Now the only objection to that is that the hostel system would, in fact, give you a certain amount of control.

Nevertheless the permanence of any particular building equates to the necessity of use. Now there are certain times on the eastern slopes of the Rockies, because of the extremely dry conditions, when it is very desirable that no people be there. This has been enforced at times by the Alberta Forest Service in the true interests of conservation. Because remember, the most important use of this very vital area is water production. Nothing you do to the eastern slopes of the Rockies in a detrimental way will destroy the amount of water produced - they are not related - but it will certainly destroy the type of run-off. Excessive logging would create more water because the evaporation factor in timber is just beyond the realms of fantasy when it's figured out. Just millions of gallons are taken out of the ground by trees and evaporate into the air.

Some experiments have been conducted with a view to increasing the water supply by simply totally logging all brush and so on. This gives a considerable extra output of water. So this, of course, is the ultimate which I don't expect will be pursued.

But as the population of southern Alberta grows and limitations are placed on the water supply, and the government as such has now said they will not consider anything other than the management of the river basins, many things will have to be done. For instance, snow will have to be trapped and conserved in the Rockies. This is one example of what can be done.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would say that as far as the eastern Rockies are concerned, the use the area has been put to thus far has been reasonable, although thought should be given possibly to extending the area further east in the interests of better game management.

Finally, this should continue to be the domain of the people of Alberta and their interests should be placed above that of any fast buck or of those persons with extreme viewpoints. The thousands of people who now use the eastern Rockies basin for hunting, fishing, camping, et cetera, find no difficulty in enjoying themselves without the

benefits of commercialization or developed facilities. The fact that this region is without these artificial means enhances the recreational value. This will become more and more evident as time goes on. Multi-use of the resources of the region has proven practical in the past, and with the proper controls that now exist in legislation, [this area will] continue to be the playground and supply the livelihood of thousands of Albertans in the future.

So that is my position, that this should be maintained for the people. I do not believe in a fast buck and I can see that by commercial development along that eastern slope of the Rockies, in the interim basis there would certainly be a lot of things to gain in the matter of commercial development and so on. But I do not feel that's the direction to go.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LEF:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few brief comments in speaking in support of the resolution and, initially, to congratulate the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder for bringing forth what is a very crucial and timely issue to this Legislature. I would hope that members on both sides would participate and make known their views to assist not only the Environment Conservation Authority, but this Assembly and the government itself in the development of policies related to the eastern slopes.

I would also like to echo those congratulations, expressed by the honourable mover of this motion, to the Environment Conservation Authority for the manner in which they have undertaken this particular study. I know all of us received a number of information bulletins which not only kept us up-to-date on what was proceeding as the hearings were held, but also gave us some excellent background information from which to develop our own positions, and especially assisted those members of the public who participated directly in the hearings themselves.

I recall during the last couple of years - and will perhaps make referral in my comments to a couple of resolutions which have preceded this particular one in the Assembly - I recall two sessions ago when the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo brought forth a resolution which was to the effect that we encourage development within the national parks of recreational kinds of facilities and potentials for our citizens. That particular resolution, although it did centre on the national, the federal kinds of jurisdictions - certainly I remember that in the comments made by hon. members there was a great deal of discussion of those lands under provincial jurisdiction. And of course when we are talking about those lands, we are talking really about the eastern slopes, as they range parallel to the national parks.

I also recollect a resolution which I brought forth last year relating to one particular part of the eastern slopes, and that was the Kananaskis valley. Although that particular resolution related mainly to highway construction, I also remember that the range of discussion at that time went beyond just the highway itself, and I recollect once again the comments of the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest. I always enjoy his interventions in debate, especially as they relate to this particular topic, because of his background and, of course, his own "backyard" in the eastern slopes.

I want to restrict my comments largely, as the interim report has done, to those matters which relate to recreation and its potential development or lack of development within the eastern slopes, recognizing that there are a number of other forms of development which will be dealt with in the final report of the conservation authority and which were touched upon to a certain extent by the mover of the motion.

There are a couple of questions which are raised when we look at any report on the eastern slopes or any consideration of the disposition of those lands. The first of these is, to what extent are we, on the one hand, going to encourage development of those lands in a number of ways and, on the other hand, to what extent do we encourage policies of preservation, preservation of those lands as they now exist, and perhaps discouragement of both visitation and development?

I want to say at the outset that when we talk about encouraging or discouraging visitation to this part of our province, I feel we would be taking an ostrich-like approach if we were to take a completely preservative kind of approach. I think we just have to recognize that running parallel to the eastern slopes are something like 8,000 square miles of national park and the preservative policies which flow with that kind of park. But on the other side of the eastern slopes we have a range of population which is somewhere in the area of 450,000 in the Calgary region, something like 500,000 in the Edmonton region and then, of course, Red Deer and those areas in between with an increasing kind of urbanization.

As I say, I think it would be a myopic approach if we were not to recognize that these demands of population do require some kind of recreational outlet. Despite the fact that

we are now embarking on an urban park policy, there are still those other areas of escape from the city, of outdoor recreation which citizens in our urban areas and surrounding populations do require.

So, having said that, I want to perhaps just expand a little bit on some of the reasons I feel we should encourage some kind of developmental policy. I am with the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest when he says we don't want a commercial kind of approach to the development of these lands. I would rather say that we should have a development which encourages outdoor recreation - and I would like to talk a little bit more about what I mean by outdoor recreation a little later on - but encouraging outdoor education, not the development of dance halls, casinos or all the other things we can put in our cities, but only those activities which directly relate to our enjoyment of outdoor recreation within those areas.

Along with the increasing population, the increasing urbanization, there is no doubt that we do need some accessibility from our urban areas to this recreational outlet. We keep hearing over and over again that within our society there is an increase in leisure time. There is just no doubt that with the emphasis now on flexible work patterns, the extended holidays, extended weekends which are available to people, people are going to demand an escape from their cities to these recreational areas. There is going to be a swing, I would suggest, to the outdoor kinds of enjoyment rather than just sitting in front of the tube and watching non-stop football, basketball and so on, on the weekends. I think it is the demands we have within our own families, within our own relationships, which will carry us from the cities to the recreation we can find in places like the eastern slopes.

Along with this, I think we are going to find, and already have, improved accessibility which we have to the eastern slopes through our highways program - we discussed in great extent the Kananaskis highway program last year. With the extended highway program there is no doubt people will find increased accessibility to the eastern slopes. As I said, we just can't ignore that on the other side of the eastern slopes are something like 8,000 square miles of basically virgin territory which will probably remain in that state because of the policies of the federal government, which I encourage.

Having expressed my feeling that we do have to have a development of an outdoor recreation kind of capacity in the eastern slopes, I want to talk about the emphasis that we perhaps should have in this development. It brings us to the second question. What is the nature of the development we shall allow in our eastern slopes? I am one of those who looks forward to the final report and the guidance this can provide, but I do want to give some of my own feelings about this.

The interim report expressed one feeling I would like to support. But before I get to the interim report, I would like just to relate one quotation from Information Bulletin No. 12. I think they came up with what I think has to be our approach. And I quote:

It is by no means too soon to implement a comprehensive, integrated management plan for the WHOLE region and ALL its resources.

This particular statement was followed up in the final report on page 4(a) of the interim report of the authority when they said as follows:

The overriding consideration at this time is that planning options remain open until a general land use plan can be developed and adopted. The creation of such a plan can be properly carried out only after inter-departmental work on land use capabilities has been completed.

These are the kinds of emphases I recollect in the previous resolutions too, that it's crucial that we develop some kind of integrated plan, a zoning perhaps, but a total plan for the eastern slopes so that we don't, by accident, have the kinds of commercialism creeping in to the eastern slopes which we will no doubt later regret. We need this plan to reconcile the very kinds of demands, the extremes we have on the one side for development and the extremes on the other side for complete preservation of the area. And only an integrated, well thought-out plan can provide that kind of emphasis.

I want to make a couple of comments in regard to one aspect of development and this is regarding tourism, because this is probably the crucial question when we talk about the extent of the development that we are going to allow within the eastern slopes.

I'm one of those who feels that we should encourage tourism within our eastern slopes, within the parameters that I've mentioned before, but that it be restricted to encouragement of an outdoor recreation kind of tourism. There is no doubt that tourism can bring some real bonuses to this province and I just want to mention a couple of these.

In addition to the increased domestic demand that we will have for the outdoor recreation facilities we will need in the eastern slopes, I think we owe it to those other parts of Canada, especially other parts of our prairie region, to make available those

kinds of beauty, those kinds of facilities that we can provide in the eastern slopes. The domestic demand is going to be there and there will be the visitation; there is no doubt about it. All we have to do is look at the visitation to our national parks and we observe the kinds of spillover effects that are already occurring within the eastern slopes.

But there are some real economic benefits, too, to be gained from an encouragement of tourism in this area. When we talk about the development of a new energy resource, when we talk about the processing of our oil resources, our natural gas resources, the question that always comes to my mind is just how many of these kinds of engineering technology jobs can we provide? But when we're looking at tourism, we're looking at a different kind of job. We're looking at a job that is not a technology kind of thing nor an engineering kind of capacity.

I recollect from those years that I spent in vocational counselling that there are just so many people who are not going into the engineering technology kind of jobs. Tourism, on the other hand, provides just that balance of jobs that we need within our society. So there is an economic benefit to be provided just in there. It's a non-depleting kind of job which we can utilize throughout the eastern slopes.

Along with tourism though, I think we should remember that once we look at the development of an area like the eastern slopes, it's not as if we're going to completely desecrate the area just by allowing so many people in. Along with the encouragement of tourism, there are also conscious efforts, conscious kinds of jobs devoted to the restoration and preservation of the locale within the eastern slopes. I think comment was made when we were looking at the Village Lake Louise kind of project a couple of years ago, concerning the real effects that can occur when we allow a facility to run down. If we encourage and bring about a planned approach to the eastern slopes, this kind of restoration, the preservation that we will have to bring along, will assure the continued beauty of that area.

Along with an encouragement of tourism though, one of the side benefits which we can get, and I think we've all seen this, is where we have wanted to visit the eastern slopes or some part of the mountains but we've found that there just aren't the facilities there. There aren't the outdoor recreation facilities. There is no doubt that a province can't subsidize the development of these recreation facilities. When we look at things like downhill skiing, boating, sailing, mountain climbing, hostelling, sightseeing and the visitor capacities that we need, there is no doubt that those are going to cost money and there will have to be a certain visitation to the area just to allow for that kind of development of visitor centre facilities. We may develop these visitor centres for the purpose of tourism, but there is no doubt that the spillover effect to our domestic population is the development of these sorts of developments.

So those are just a few things I wanted to say, Mr. Speaker, about tourism. I'm one of those who feels we should encourage tourism, but definitely within the parameters of outdoor recreation. To talk about outdoor recreation, I made up a shopping list of some of the things I see as outdoor recreation. The first one I'd like to leave out is snowmobiling because I just don't think that we need that kind of motorized treatment of our eastern slopes. But here are some of the summer activities which aren't just going to occur accidentally. They are summer activities that we are going to have to develop, such as the jumping-off spots. That's why I, at this point, would like to endorse, as have the two previous speakers, the interim report for the youth hostel development.

I'm really encouraged by this one and I endorse strongly the development of the youth hostels, those 31 projects throughout the eastern slopes. They can provide the kinds of jumping-off places, the kinds of one-night, two-night visitations that we need for the activities I'm going to mention now, activities like cycling, hiking, back-packing, hunting, fishing, boating, sailing, mountain climbing, hostelling, sightseeing, camping, trailering, picnicking, horseback riding, canoeing and swimming. These are just some of the things that we might encourage in the summer activities.

One of the problems we have now, though, is that there is a seasonal kind of restriction. So I think that in the winter we have to look at activities like skiing, both downhill and cross-country style, ice fishing, snowshoeing, hiking, tobogganing, sightseeing - snowmobiling I've left out already - and iceboating. These are just a few that we would all put on an outdoor recreation shopping list that we'd like to see within the eastern slopes.

Those are the kinds of activities I would encourage for the development within our eastern slopes, recognizing that we need the jumping-off places within the eastern slopes, not only hostels, but also some commercial one-night, two-night facilities to provide a wide range of opportunity for our population.

Thank you.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate, at the outset I'd like to congratulate the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder for what I think is an excellent resolution on the Order Paper because it provides the kind of scope that allows a number of members to become involved in this question of really what kind of future do we see as far as the whole area of the eastern slopes is concerned.

I can't really go back like the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest and talk about my experiences in the eastern slopes. I suppose the only comment I can make in that area is that the west side of my constituency takes in that area of the eastern slopes basically from west of Cremona up to west of the James River Bridge. Having had the opportunity to spend a few years of my life in the town of Sundre, I know very well how important the eastern slopes are to that particular portion of my constituency. I'd be less than fair if I didn't say that there is a deep realization and appreciation by the people in that part of the province of the role that the eastern slopes especially have to play in the future of that particular part of Alberta.

So what I'd like to do this afternoon for a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, is to make some comments with regard to some of the problems that I see us as having in the eastern slopes. I'd like to make one or two comments as far as some of the interim recommendations that the Environment Conservation Authority has made, and then perhaps make one or two suggestions as to what, hopefully, might be in the next series of recommendations from the Environment Conservation Authority.

However, before doing that, I'd be remiss if I didn't associate myself with the comments made by all the previous speakers when they talked about the excellent job the Environment Conservation Authority did, not only in holding the hearings across the province last summer, but also through the information that was made available to members prior to those hearings. I think it's fair to say that that may well have been the first time that such a tremendous amount of information available from a wide variety of sources was pulled together in such a manner and then made available to the many people who are interested in the future of the eastern slopes in this province.

I suspect that those people who initially set out the hearings were indeed very surprised at the broad response which those hearings received. I had the opportunity to sit in at the hearings on the second day at Red Deer, and I know very well that the hearings of the Authority started in Red Deer early the following morning and went on until something like 11:00 or 11:30 that particular evening. Talking to some of the people involved in the Authority, they indicated to me that that wasn't any particular exception, that there was this kind of interest all across the province when they held the hearings. So I certainly want to say, congratulations on a job well done.

There have been comments made by a number of the members regarding the competing uses of the eastern slopes. It is an understatement to say that there is a wide variety of competing interests. The hon. member who just finished, talked about outdoor education. Then there is the role that forestry and lumbering have to play in the eastern slopes. There is an increasing emphasis as far as recreation is concerned.

Once again, relating to my own particular constituency, if one has a Sunday afternoon that you want to spend very interestingly, park in Sundre and watch the stream of traffic that comes through that particular centre late Sunday afternoon. The number of people who make the trek from Calgary up the trunk road and come back through Sundre is just amazing. The same thing can be said as far as Friday evenings are concerned - people come up from Calgary, then go out there, and then go back down to Calgary at the conclusion of the weekend. This growth in recreational use, just within that particular portion of the eastern slopes itself, has been truly amazing in the last few years.

Then there is the point which was mentioned by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, the competing use as far as wildlife and cattle are concerned. I recognize that that is not an easy one to resolve. Nevertheless in the course of the Environment Conservation Authority coming to grips with competing uses, one of the really difficult decisions it is going to have to make, and a decision this Legislature will hopefully have to make before long, is the question of the competing use of wildlife and the cattle industry in the eastern slopes.

Then there is the question of natural resource development; coal, oil and gas, and therein lies a large number of problems. Tourist use, already mentioned, fits in, certainly in some respects, to the use of recreation.

I would just like to make four or five general comments that I would hope we would keep in mind in arriving at some priorities as far as these competing uses are concerned.

First of all, I think that a very important portion in the interim report is the concept of keeping our options open at this particular time. I believe it is important that we keep our options open at least until such time as we get the final report from the

Environment Conservation Authority. I would have to commend the government for really, not freezing, but not allowing any long-term development to go ahead at this particular time. Unaccustomed as I am to congratulating the government, I think that is one of the areas in which the government has acted wisely.

I would hope that in the course of keeping these options open, and then once we have the final report moving from there, that we would continue to keep uppermost in our minds that the eastern slopes area is one in which Albertans can seek recreational and outdoor opportunities and continue to keep that area available to what I would refer to as the average man.

Some of the proposals which have been made to the government, the present government and the former government, dealt with propositions that were a bit grandiose to say the least. I would hope that the overriding theme that would be kept in mind by all members, and certainly by the government, in arriving at future development plans in the eastern slopes area would be the tremendous need to keep this part of Alberta available to Mr. and Mrs. Average Albertan, in fact, to make it part of their heritage and the heritage of their children to come. That won't really be possible if in the number of years that lie ahead we permit some of the very, very expensive and extensive recreational developments to go ahead. That, in my judgment, would simply not be part of, or in keeping with, that type of concept.

The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest talked about the need to resist the temptation to make a fast buck. Certainly that is very appropriate. I'm sure that there will be a number of proposals - if they haven't come forward, they will come forward in the future - simply making it possible for the province to, in fact, make that fast buck. I would hope we would resist that kind of operation. I have no indications at this time that we won't do that, but I would like to support a move in that particular area.

I was particularly pleased with the response of the Environment Conservation Authority, and also that of individuals who appeared at the hearing, regarding the Barrier Mountain proposal, a proposal that [involves] the area west and south of Sundre. It caused a great deal of consternation to people in that particular area. To be quite frank, there are people on both sides of the argument. Some, I would say a small group, would have liked to have seen it go ahead, but a very substantial number of people from that particular region of Alberta had some real concern about the Barrier Mountain proposal. I'm pleased to see that that project hasn't received the go-ahead - and [there is] little indication that it will receive the go-ahead.

Now moving on, Mr. Speaker, to some of the concerns that I have, I would want to say at the outset that I think likely a fairly reasonable job of administration of the slopes has been done over the past number of years. I'm sure all of us, regardless of where we sit in this Assembly, can point to things that, given our circumstances today, we wouldn't have done. If we had had that information of today, we wouldn't have made that decision five or ten years ago.

But generally, overall, I think a fairly reasonable job has been done as far as the management of the eastern slopes is concerned. Let no one be under any illusion [that] the job of management of the eastern slopes in the future is going to be increasingly difficult, with the increasing pressures in the particular area. I hope that there will be a genuine recognition of the multitude of government departments which are presently involved in authority as far as the eastern slopes is concerned. I tried to lay this before the Environment Conservation Authority when they had their hearing in Red Deer. I would like to take just a moment or two again - if my recollection is correct, there are something like seven, eight, or nine government departments which have a rather major influence on a variety of aspects of the eastern slopes.

There is a tremendous need for coordination in future development. There is a tremendous need for coordination as far as preservation for the future is concerned, and obviously a real need for coordination as far as regulations are concerned.

In my own mind I'm still not convinced as to the best way to get that kind of coordination. On one hand, you could take the approach of perhaps setting up some sort of a 'superministry' to be responsible for the eastern slopes. I'm not so sure in the long run that that is the best approach - perhaps set up some sort of coordinating mechanism, but those kinds of coordinating mechanisms generally work [only] as well as the people you have involved. I recognize this question of coordination for development in the eastern slopes is indeed very difficult.

What I would like to suggest is that, after we have the presentation from the Environment Conservation Authority - the final report which I understand is going to come down this summer sometime - I would hope that not too long after that, the government would be in a position to bring to the Legislature some guidelines they see being used for development in the eastern slopes. I think it is essential we recognize it. There is going to be a need for different guidelines in different areas of the eastern slopes. Let's face it, quite frankly the kind of guidelines you have for the

Canmore corridor are going to be tremendously different from the kind of guidelines you have for activities and development in the area west of Sundre, for example.

What I'm really proposing, Mr. Speaker, is that the government will be in a position, hopefully not before too long, to bring to this Legislature some legislation which would establish the guidelines for development and guidelines for activities in the eastern slopes. I think that if we had these kinds of guidelines laid down from a legislative standpoint, admittedly they would have to be general, but with the House meeting twice a year as we do now, there would be the opportunity to amend these guidelines or this legislation if, in fact, it were concluded that it would be in the public good to do that.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, in addition to having the guidelines for future activities and developments spelled right out in legislation, I would hope that as far as future tourist facilities are concerned in the eastern slopes, we would build upon the existing centres on the fringe of the eastern slopes. I am thinking in terms of Rocky Mountain House, in terms of Sundre, Canmore and going down south; those would be the jumping-off points. To a very great degree, those would be the areas where overnight facilities would be. I think it is certainly in the best interests of long-term development as far as the eastern slopes are concerned. I think also that it would be a tremendous economic shot in the arm to those particular communities which are on the fringe.

I recognize, Mr. Speaker, also that there will have to be different kinds of legislative guidelines for development. We have heard several discussions in this Assembly previously when the Minister of Mines and Minerals and others, some on this side of the House too, have talked about the tremendous kind of gas potential there is in the eastern slopes. Before very long we have, as a province, as legislators, to come to some sort of conclusion in our own minds as to whether we are going to be involved in zoning certain areas of the eastern slopes and where the corridors are going to be. Is this where the oil and gas development is going to take place? Are there going to be other areas where coal development will take place?

At this particular time I am rather inclined to think that that is the best approach. I can see that approach hasn't been used on all occasions or perhaps on many occasions in the past. But look into the future. It's this kind of zoning that I think is going to be very, very essential.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Calder, in concluding his remarks, talked about what he considered to be the most important resource in the eastern slopes. I believe that he said if we have to make a choice as to what is the most important resource, there is no question, water is that resource. I couldn't agree with him more. If we have to make a choice between water and some other resources we must opt in favour of water. That's going to throw some very heavy responsibilities on the Department of Lands and Forests as increasing pressure comes from a variety of government agencies and agencies outside government, for development in the eastern slopes area and directly outside.

The last comment I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the future of this eastern slopes area, I would hope very much that we would preserve the opportunity for all Albertans, as far as hunting and fishing are concerned, to resist any move in the direction of private hunting. I say that because there has been no indication by the government at this time that they are thinking of moving in that direction but if I recall the presentations that were made at Red Deer, there were some aimed in that particular direction. It seems to me that when we are having a discussion of this type in the Legislature, it's rather appropriate that I would put on record, as far as I, as an individual member, am concerned - and I am sure I speak on behalf of the people of my constituency, especially the west end of that constituency, when I say that they would see a move in the direction of private hunting as a very retrograde step and a step that I would hope all members of this Assembly would oppose.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I hope before too long we will have before this Legislature some sort of, perhaps, legislative guidelines that will apply, in general terms, to development in the eastern slopes. I recognize that there have to be some differences within the eastern slopes area. We have to wrestle with the problem of the kind of approach we are going to use as far as natural resource development is concerned. We have to wrestle with the problem also of providing a heritage for the future - not just for the present but certainly looking to future generations. I would hope that we are going to see the [same] kind of recreational growth in these areas in the future as we have seen in the last short period of time. I would hope that those towns along the fringe of the eastern slopes would really be seen as jumping-off points or staging areas where overnight accommodation and opportunities are available to Albertans.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments with regard to this resolution, a motion which I approve and want to speak in favour of. If I had any criticism offhand it

might be that the resolution is too short, but probably the number of speakers on the resolution will lengthen it and make up for its brevity.

I do want to say, probably, a word of commendation to those who have spoken so far. I hope that all our conversations on this particular subject, which is so timely, will remain on a positive note. In talking about the eastern slopes - the backyard of some of the members - I try to contend that the portion of the eastern slopes in my backyard is the most beautiful part of the Rockies in all of Alberta, from the Kananaskis Lakes south where the Highwood River begins close to the boundary, goes through the whole constituency of Highwood and ends up in the Bow River in the Highwood constituency. There is good fishing up and down the whole length of the land. It's like the land flowing with milk and honey and fishes.

With regard to the ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

You're kidding.

MR. BENOIT:

Not really. Mr. Speaker, because some people can't catch fish doesn't mean that the fish are not there.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. BENOIT:

I have no problem supporting this resolution on Interim Report No. 1. Out of the 23 hearings that are reported in this particular report, I believe there are only two upon which there is a definite recommendation. The others have a recommendation that suggests you do nothing until the general land use guidelines or legislation has been produced. So, for those of us who are not in a hurry to develop the eastern slopes in an adverse way, this is an easy recommendation to agree to. In some respects it is tantamount to a land freeze until legislation is forthcoming. It might be interpreted as a delaying tactic. If so, it could be justly delayed because there are times when it is a good thing to delay action until more information is forthcoming and until we are able to make final decisions.

However, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't want this kind of tactic to be continuously used just as an excuse for delaying action or delaying a decision that needs to be made in the very near future with regard to the importance of developing the eastern slopes. It leaves the whole matter yet in the air. For those people who want to make some development in the eastern slopes and who are keen and have plans, it is rather frustrating to be told month after month and finally, year after year, that we are still awaiting the final reports. So, I hope that before too long we will be able to come to some decisions and make some first steps in putting forth some definite guidelines and plans for the eastern slopes development as the hon. Leader of the Opposition suggested a few moments ago.

Land use legislation about private land, particularly as it is going to be dealt with by the land use forum, is something that still requires a great deal of study. The land use development in the public lands and Crown lands has been studied to a very great extent in the last ten years, one way or another, not only in Alberta and in conjunction with the eastern slopes, but all over the North American continent. So we have a great deal of input into the use of Crown land. Most of the land in the eastern slopes is Crown land. There is some privately owned land but most of it is Crown land. I feel we have enough information available now to make some decisions with regard to at least the first steps in developing land use on the eastern slopes. We have dozens of reports and we have hundreds of hearings with regard to this matter. Granted, they are pro and con and will take a lot of sorting out. In the end not everyone can possibly be satisfied with whatever decision is made. Therefore, some decision should be made for the sake of the development of this area when the time is right to do it - and the time is now.

Alberta has millions of acres of undisposed Crown land. Over half of the province consists of undisposed Crown land that is available, to a certain degree, for the type of recreation we are talking about in the report that is here. True, large areas of it are not easily accessible, and large areas may consist of swamp or things of that sort. But if you want to get back to nature, and you want to see things in the raw, and you want to see things as they are where man hasn't yet put his foot - or where if he put his foot it would sink down so far that you couldn't see his tracks - then there is lots of that kind of land in the province of Alberta. Probably the most beautiful, and the most accessible, is in the eastern slopes. That is what makes the development of the eastern slopes so imperative.

As I said, the eastern slopes have in them some private land. Whatever decisions are made will have to be made primarily with regard to disposal of Crown land. But they will also have to include some kind of disposition for the privately owned land in the area.

The whole secret, I believe, Mr. Speaker, is to zone the entire area and develop multiple uses for the widest possible development of the entire area. Multiple use will be the greatest value so far as getting use out of it and it will also provide the greatest satisfaction for the largest number of people. So somehow we have to zone it in such a way that we will be able to get the greatest advantage available. Probably a lot of people have expressed their feelings on this but I think that probably one area we need to consider is whether or not we will sell any more Crown land in Alberta. That question has been raised and tested and I think that up to this point the general consensus of opinion has been very definitely in opposition to the sale of Crown land in the province; that is except in the arable areas in the northern portion of the province, but certainly not in the eastern slopes.

I believe the government should determine and control all use on public lands and it is the responsibility of this Legislature to provide legislation and, where necessary, some regulations in order that that may be done so the people of the province and even the visitors to the province will get the greatest advantage, the best use of this type of land. I believe we should use only the transportation corridors to provide tourist accommodation and facilities, and that we ought to keep in fairly narrow confines any type of development, particularly permanent development. The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest was quite emphatic in suggesting that there be no permanent development, but only temporary development. This is not always practical, Mr. Speaker, when one considers the large outlays of capital that are required for certain types of development. However, in the national parks, if you consider the method used of leasing land, one has to say that in one respect only temporary development is permitted. I guess the type of temporary development there is permanent enough to justify the outlay of considerable amounts of capital.

Delayed action on The Planning Act has given me some concern, Mr. Speaker, but I could live with that. I could also definitely live and feel it's necessary to delay action on the land use forum. But I feel very strongly that now is the time for some action to begin so far as the eastern slopes are concerned. We have a planning act now in existence, therefore, we may be able to justify a delay in implementing a new planning act.

We've never had extensive land-use regulations for privately owned land in the province of Alberta and, therefore, we need to continue study until we have more information. But when it comes to the eastern slopes, we've been studying this for a long time; we've had many hearings; we've had over a dozen reports, and we are informed that it won't be too long before the final reports and recommendations are available. For that reason I think we need to give serious consideration to going into action here. There are three areas of land-use control. One is in the eastern slopes, one is through The Planning Act and one is through the land use forum. One of these has to get off the ground and take the first step. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the eastern slopes facet is the one that needs our attention at this particular time.

Therefore, with all due respect to the resolution before us, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a slight amendment which doesn't change the resolution itself one iota, but simply makes an addition to that resolution, and in so doing I would like to get Mr. Speaker's ruling as to whether we might be able to continue the discussion by considering both the resolution and the amendment when we discuss these matters.

I move, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution by Mr. Chambers be amended by placing a comma following the words, "Environment Conservation Authority" and by adding immediately thereafter the following words:

and the Legislature further requests the government bring forth legislation in the spring portion of the 1975 session of the Alberta Legislature enacting land use and resource development policies for the eastern slopes.

That, Mr. Speaker, is simply an addition to the existing resolution requesting some action on the matter by the government in the spring portion of the 1975 Legislature. Is that one acceptable, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

As far as I'm aware, the proposed amendment is in order procedurally but I would rather doubt that it would permit debate simultaneously on both the amendment and the resolution unless the House wishes to agree unanimously that that be done. The reason is that according to my present understanding, debate on a motion and an amendment simultaneously is appropriate only where the amendment is a substitute motion, and as I read this amendment, it is not a substitute motion; it does, in fact, add to the main

motion. However, if there is unanimous consent by the House that both the motion and amendment be debated at the same time there is no reason why that can't be done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no.

MR. SPEAKER:

In view of there not being unanimous consent, I would suggest that henceforth the debate, until the amendment has been disposed of, must be confined to the terms of the amendment and as to whether or not the amendment improves or does not improve the main motion.

MR. BENOIT:

Thank you.

MR. LUDWIG:

For the purpose of clarification, it is difficult in my opinion to determine how anything that is relevant to the amendment could be something that was not dealt with in the motion. The two deal with the same subject matter, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion.

MR. SPEAKER:

I don't wish at all to be unduly restrictive. The wishes of the House have to be paramount. As I see it, the gist of the motion is that the Legislature support the recommendations in the Interim Report of the Environment Conservation Authority and the gist of the amendment is that there be legislation enacted to give effect perhaps to those recommendations, and the two ideas are not identical at all. But as hon. members well know, the mover of the amendment has the right to debate both the main motion and the amendment in one speech.

MR. BENOIT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Continuing then, Mr. Speaker, I would ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Order.

MR. APPLEBY:

I wonder if the hon. member would read the amendment very slowly to us so we could all get an idea of what it is about.

MR. BENOIT:

It is simply making an addition to the resolution as it now stands and is worded like this:

and the Legislature further requests the government bring forth legislation in the spring portion of the 1975 session of the Alberta Legislature enacting land use and resource development policies for the eastern slopes.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if I may. I have the impression that the amendment may not have been fully understood by all members of the House and that, therefore, the question put by you, Mr. Speaker, on the matter of unanimous consent to debate both the motion and the amendment may not have been appreciated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed, agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

At the wish of the House I will repeat the request for unanimous consent for the debate on both the motion and the amendment to proceed at the same time.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it then that there is unanimous consent.

MR. LUDWIG:

Always.

MR. BENOIT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Advanced Education. It's appreciated.

To proceed for a few moments more, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that governments can move, and even have sometimes been known to move when pressed hard enough. And when it comes to this matter, we have had some examples of where the existing government has already moved when the pressure was on. I am making reference now particularly to the letter that was written by this government to the federal government when we were dealing with the matter of Village Lake Louise, when the government was not making its wishes or policies known to this House, but then, when the pressure was on, came forth with the letter and a very clear-cut statement with regard to Village Lake Louise.

In that letter, Mr. Speaker, there were three outstanding points which are very applicable to this resolution and also to the amendment. The letter recommended that there should be non-development zones in the national parks areas which should involve the majority of the park area where no development should be allowed of any type. And then there should be partial development zones, involving most of the balance of the park, where development would be restricted to facilities such as roads and riding and hiking trails. The purpose of this zone would be to make it possible for the citizens to enjoy the parks in their natural state.

And the third point was that the development or recreation zones should be set up in a small percentage of the park which would allow recreation and accommodation facilities for Canadians and visitors so that these people could enjoy the mountain areas of Alberta which lie primarily within national parks.

This is in agreement with the suggestion that has been made by myself and others even today that it is very important that the whole of the eastern slopes be zoned - zoned carefully - and within each zone, certain multiple types of uses be indicated where that is possible. They might be used part of a season for one thing, and another part of a season for something else, or they might be used jointly at the same time by three or four various types of activities and developments, so that it is quite possible to proceed with the information that we have today in the development and particularly the zoning of the eastern slopes.

Mr. Speaker, among all of the reports that were put out by the Environment Conservation Authority, there was this one that was put out under the name of Lands and Forests, Resources of the Foothills, which was, I think, probably developed jointly between the two departments, Environment and Lands and Forests. Chapter No. 5 was entitled Example of Possible Strategies for Development of the Foothills, and in there five management strategies were put forth giving five alternatives to what might be done with this. Three of these required that the land be owned entirely by the Crown. Two of them made alternative suggestions where the land would be owned in part privately, and primarily by the Crown. This is an example - and I'm not going to take the time of the House to read it or detail it but to draw the attention of members to it because they all have copies of this particular document. It pointed out how the land management strategy could be developed and certain implications and policies that could be put into effect.

Therefore I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that with letters like this, with suggestions like this and all kinds of them similar, made by the Environment Conservation Authority, and all the hearings that we have had - the hearings are now all complete - we have adequate information upon which to begin making some definite legislation for land use and development in the eastern slopes. As I said before, we can expect within a fairly short time now the final report with its recommendations.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is a degree of urgency for action here on the eastern slopes because costly and exciting recreational developments and multiple-use developments are being suggested and proposed which would be permissible within these

areas. And because they would be permissible, we should have the policies put forth and these people should be given the opportunity now to get to work on these developments.

We may not always live in such an affluent time as we have now. People may not always be as keen as they are now to use their leisure time in recreation and to develop facilities and accommodation and things of this nature within the eastern slopes. And so we need to strike while the iron is hot. The people are pepped up, society is making certain demands, money is available, studies and hearings are fresh in our minds and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the motion, as amended, is applicable and that, as well as accept the recommendations that are made in this Report No. 1, we should also ask the government to act upon it. And the time is now.

[Two members rose.]

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair regrets having to intervene between neighbours.

[Laughter]

The hon. Member for Drayton Valley.

MR. ZANDER:

I told you he saw me before. Thanks, Mr. Speaker. He's a little bit smaller than I am.

Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the motion, and the motion as amended, on the resource development and the development of recreational areas in the eastern slopes of the Rockies, my constituency runs to the foothills of the province in the eastern slopes. Something that has probably not been mentioned today should have been mentioned and it's also not referred to in the report. I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that about two years ago, there was a report in a leading western agricultural journal - it was not done by the Department of Agriculture.

I can only visualize that in the eastern slopes of the Rockies today, we have what we call multiple-use where the grazing of cattle is in the very foothills or to the high lands of the eastern slopes. It was interesting to read that journal, Mr. Speaker. And if I recall the figures correctly, by 2006 the estimated population of the province would be somewhere in the neighbourhood of 3.5 million people. It also stated in that bulletin that the total requirement for consumption would be in the neighbourhood of 3 million pounds of pork, which would mean that we would be looking at 150 million pounds of beef per year. Breaking this down, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that we would consume almost one-half million head of cattle, some 1 million hogs and over 3.5 million pounds of poultry.

This brings me to the point that I felt was neglected in the report, although it was very valuable. Somewhere, in zoning the eastern slopes of the Rockies whether we want to believe it or not, we are going to have to extend the agriculture community further into the green zone. But where we are going to go should be planned some 20 years hence. I think simply to say the foothills of the mountains, the eastern slopes, is a very good place for recreation, fresh water supply, boating, canoeing and hunting - I think we have to consider that we could do without most of these, except water and food.

I think, in my particular area alone, Mr. Speaker, and I believe it's true down the eastern slopes of the mountains, that somewhere we'll have to stop the encroachment of agricultural development on Crown lands into the foothills. But we must bear in mind that such planning has to be directed at least 20 to 30 years in advance. True, it can be said that the Kootenay Plains - and I certainly agree, Mr. Speaker - is a most suitable place for agriculture. It was certainly a point that was well taken when some talked of taking grazing leases in the area.

However, we must remember that 20 years from now, perhaps 30 years from now, we'll be dealing with a population in Alberta, perhaps, in excess of 4 million people. This will be three times as many people as we have today. Then, of course, we will have to supply the recreational needs of the people at that time. But I can agree with the hon. member who said we have to zone, it's urgent, it's very urgent. Because today I believe we are disposing of Crown lands - this hasn't happened this year - but we have disposed of Crown land, many, many miles into the green area and this is evident in my area. It's very good land suitable for agriculture. We find isolated farmers in a green zone, 20, 30, 40 miles into a green zone. Now we're trying to move them out of there because we're trying to get them to a point where we can have orderly development of the green zones.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, we will have to - and the urgency I believe, as indicated by the mover of the amendment, is that we do it very, very shortly because in order to have orderly development of the eastern slopes of the Rockies we have to be very

concerned about the agricultural situation and the needs for agricultural products within the time frame of the next 30 years.

Of course, in this time frame we will also have to plan the recreational facilities we'll want. We'll also have to be very concerned about the upstream pollution of our fresh water supply. I think probably western Canada and parts of the northwestern United States depend entirely on the fresh water supply from the eastern shed of the Rockies.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think a lot has been said about the report and I concur that it is very good. But one thing is lacking in this report and that is, where does agriculture go from this point? I think we have to be concerned with the ever-increasing population of Alberta - and not only Alberta, we are going to have to supply meat to western Canada, eastern Canada and also to the Orient.

Those of us who have been fortunate enough to have visited the Orient, and I think in particular of the Asian countries where they have terraced the mountainsides and have carried fertile soil on their backs to provide food for their people - I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should forget where agriculture fits into the picture, in planning and zoning of the eastern slopes of the Rockies.

We can easily plan the recreational areas. We have numerous lakes, rivers, we can have all the hiking trails and skiing slopes that we wish. But I think we must remember that food and water will be of prime importance 30 years hence in this province. And I think we should be very concerned about just where we strike the balance between agriculture and the foothills.

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I've ever had the opportunity both to speak to a motion and the amendment. But there are a few things I'd just like to point out.

The mover of the motion mentioned that we have on our eastern slopes approximately 100,000 acres of land that are basically set aside for grazing whether it's on a permit or outright lease. Of course, [there are] concerns by a great number of Albertans - do cows belong in our green area? Do cows belong in our eastern slopes? I would like to point out that the western stockgrowers have made it quite clear they believe that good land use legislation or good land use - that cows and recreation can mix. They back up their points by what has taken place in the state of Montana as far back as 20 years, where all their forest reserves are owned by the federal government. They've worked in their grazing leases, their timber leases and their recreation very, very well.

As a matter of fact, some of the people in the Department of Lands and Forests have informed me that if it were not for the cattle population that is grazing there now, the poplar tree would very likely take over whole valleys in the eastern slopes. Of course, now we don't have the advent of forest fires sweeping these valleys clean.

Because of the concern of a number of people, I'd also like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the cattle that are in these valleys, say, along the Kananaskis to Coleman drive, are not in competition with the wildlife. During the summer the elk are up at quite a high altitude. By the first of September or the first of October when the snows come and the elk need this graze, the cattle have been long gone out of there.

I would like to point out that there will always be a problem of trespassing wherever there are cattle being grazed. I think the western stockgrowers very wisely said the two can work together providing that there isn't a horde of people coming in, on a given day, where there are cattle.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out a concern of mine - all the good fishermen are not on that side of the House. There was a time when I could go to the eastern slopes and fairly well be guaranteed that if I wanted to get far enough back I could get fish. But I find now that every stream has a gravel road and bridge to it. I realize a lot of these bridges and roads have been put in for fire protection. But we've changed our methods of fighting fire now, we no longer have to use the forest tower. Every morning and every afternoon the Department of Lands and Forests has planes patrolling the whole eastern slopes. When a fire is spotted, helicopters are used to get the crews in. There is not the need for these roads. I sometimes think that some of these roads perhaps could be closed for a while until the fish population came back.

Getting back to what is taking place this summer in the United States, I read with interest - and this was in a daily paper, The Christian Science Monitor, which is sent to all members' offices and is recognized as good reporting - they predict 38.5 million American citizens will be visiting Canada this year. Of course, I don't think they are all coming to Alberta, but a large majority of them certainly will come.

Then you hear the predictions of the federal parks people. They believe some of their parks in Ontario and especially Banff park - it's just around the corner where the

federal parks will have to be closed to foreigners. They have reached their maximum capacity. They predict that perhaps further down the road we will have to go on to a quota system to get into our national parks.

Thus I would think that perhaps we might be wise to hesitate, to cool it a little bit on the eastern slopes development. It concerns me to see a road through one of the most beautiful valleys in Alberta, the Kananaskis valley, with a 70 mile speed limit, cutting right down through the heart of that valley. Okay, we've opened up the Kananaskis. I'll guarantee that in five years the Kananaskis is going to be overflowing.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

MR. STROMBERG:

Then the pressure will go on to the Spray Lakes. And when we have the Spray Lakes filled, where are we going to go then?

Perhaps we should take a look at the northeast part of our province with hundreds of miles of lakes and forests. Or, a lot of Albertans still like to holiday in B.C., maybe we should encourage going over to B.C. and save our eastern slopes for another generation. After all, I would rather see B.C. polluted than Alberta.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

MR. DRAIN:

Well, speaking to the amendment I certainly have to talk now about game and agriculture and the effect of agriculture on the wildlife. I can agree with the hon. members that the beef industry is vital and that it should be encouraged and that there can be a compatible program achieved, which presently is underway. A point can also be made for the utilization of the lower valleys for cattle grazing. In reality we have no scarcity of grass as a result of utilization by cattle of the eastern slope of the Rockies.

The limitations on the amount of game are determined by the amount of winter range. If, for instance, cattle were banned completely from the eastern slopes of the Rockies you would have the replenishment of the native bunch grass and the accumulation of this grass, with a resulting fire hazard which would develop into fires and so on. I don't think that's a desirable state, so this is just one more plus for joint utilization of the area.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. DRAIN:

I have to take issue with the hon. member who referred to elk grazing in the high areas. Elk were basically plains animals. The reason elk have survived is because they are one of the most adaptable of the wild species. As man encroached on their domain, they followed the path of the grizzly bear up into the higher regions. Now a strange thing is occurring. The elk, in fact, are competing with the mountain sheep because they are up there at 7,000 or 8,000 feet which is something very unique and never did occur before.

I have to take issue also with the hon. Member for Highwood who presumably is a very sophisticated fisherman. But I will statistically prove that there must be a lot of fishermen who are poor fishermen. Because on the reel count, not creel count, they had on the mouth of Dutch Creek last year, the statistics went something like this: 2,100 fishermen went up the creek and altogether they garnered 1,700 fish. So each fisherman caught three-quarters or five-eighths of a fish. That in itself is quite an achievement and I'd ask the hon. Member for Highwood to match that one.

Looking at this particular amendment, I have to say in truth, Mr. Speaker, what's all the rush? This is a major decision. Of course they could say there have been a lot of studies, as the hon. member brought out in his debate on the particular area. But sometimes it is better to proceed carefully and do something well. The plus for making a decision early is in relation to the fact that, as time progresses, the amount of pressure which is going to be placed on the authorities who look after the eastern slopes is going to be enhanced by the growth of population and the desire for people to utilize these particular areas.

This is something that has to be considered. I think anyone who says we have fires and fire dangers controlled, is simply whistling Dixie ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

MR. DRAIN:

... because environmentally when fire conditions become suitable for a fire, a fire will occur as part of the natural forest cycle. There are great gaps at the present time as a result of logging and roads which are kept up which, to a great degree, sort of protect against fire. But as these areas rebrush themselves and timber returns, given a dry season, a lightning strike and a strong wind, you can burn anything. You can certainly burn it with vim and vigour. I have had that unpleasant experience. You can even burn green poplar trees in June if you get enough wind behind them. The heat is very, very fantastic.

So I would say probably it would be wise to bring out a set of regulations or legislation which would, in fact, enshrine in law the intentions which have been brought out in this debate. That is, to maintain this unique area as a playground for the people of Alberta, to recognize that it is not going to be a question, in the future, of seeking out tourists. It is going to be a question of how to accommodate them. Commercialization of the area will not be a solution because they will also be engulfed in a very short time and the contents of this particular area, and the unique features thereof, will be destroyed for evermore.

Having regard for that, I would certainly approve legislation, but I would not think the framework of crowding it into the spring session, if the preliminary assessment has not been done, would be an ideal situation.

MR. HARLE:

Mr. Speaker, the motion we have had before us, the main motion, is one I am sure all of us can accept. However, I do have some doubts about the wisdom of the amendment because of the undue haste, I submit, in forcing decisions to be taken by the spring session of 1975. It would appear to me that this is rushing things unduly. Something which must be ready by spring of 1975 should be well into the planning stage right now. We've only received an Interim Report No. 1, implying there may well be 2, 3 and 4 interim reports. I see a great many problems ahead of us if we don't get the advice and proper recommendations of the authority itself.

I'd like, before going further into that matter, to discuss one or two things. I was very interested in the interim report from the point of view of the area immediately west of my own constituency, that is, west of Red Deer and Rocky Mountain House. There were only three proposals discussed in the interim report, and I'm sure that there will be more as time goes on. This is a very undeveloped area, an area which, to me, has perhaps one of the greatest attractions of our eastern slopes from the point of view of a traveller or a tourist in the area.

I'd like to touch for a few moments on the tourist resource itself that exists on the eastern slopes. I notice particularly that the interim report deals with a lot of proposals which are basically hotels and motels and this type of development. I would submit that this just simply isn't enough if we're going to make use of the tourist potential which exists on the eastern slopes.

I believe that tourists are a breed apart. I think once you step out of your everyday work, go on a holiday, you become an individual with different needs, with different ideas. You want to relax, you want lots of opportunity to do a lot of things. All this means is that merely providing hotel and motel accommodation just simply isn't enough.

I think right now that as far as tourist demands are concerned, one of the biggest demands that tourists have is for organized tours. The ordinary individual who is working each day and gets out on a holiday simply just doesn't know what to see when he goes to visit an area. The only way he can get exposed to the area very quickly is by some method of a tour system which takes him to see and to do what is available in the area. After he has had that experience he can then go back, if he likes the area, do a little more travelling, do a few more things on his own, the things that he particularly wants to do. But certainly on his first and perhaps his second trip to an area the tourist appreciates and enjoys the fellowship, the fact that he's getting around to see an area on a conducted tour.

This, of course, implies a lot of things. It implies that you have to have tour guides who are well-trained, tour guides who know what the area has to offer, can talk to their groups informally, can arrange their travel time and look after their needs. It's not an easy thing to do. And in fact, I think your best tour guides are usually

university people, either students or graduates. This means that there is a tremendous industry and a tremendous amount of logistics associated with a tourist business.

There are always points of interest that tourists like to see and these have to be developed. That means you have to have a road to get to them. If you want to protect the environment it means that you have to keep vast numbers of people on the track. That means that they can't be allowed to wander all over creation tramping everything down. There must be roads and paths developed to the points of interest. And these points of interest have to be found because they are not always present in the area right now; they have to be looked for, found and developed.

Also, tourists are not necessarily interested in just wandering around and looking at nature. You have to provide some other alternatives, some things that they can do at other times of the day. I'm thinking in terms of developments of nightclub areas, shopping facilities and eating facilities. In other words, there has to be more than just looking at the scenery. The scenery is great when the sun is shining, and for certain hours of the day, but if the idea is to make it attractive to a vast number of people, then you have to find alternatives for them.

People like people, and by that I mean when people are on a holiday they like to get together. They're very gregarious. They love wandering down areas where there are shopping and eating places. They love to see and feel and sense the situation that we have on Jasper Avenue on Thursday night shopping. This is what they want. They want a few hours of this so that in the evening when they come back from having seen the scenery they can all get out and walk in the cool summer evening down an area to do this sort of thing; see friends, meet friends, go for refreshments, eat, do the usual type of shopping for momentos and all the things that people like to bring back home to make a particular trip a memorable occasion.

I'm sure every one of us who has ever taken any kind of trip or holiday knows that that's what people do. One of the things I don't see in the interim report is any mention of this type of facility. I see hardship along the way for various motel and hotel structures if that is all that is to be provided. Because it means then that you're restricted to the tourist who is there for only one or two nights, sees what he can, and moves on. If that's the type of facility, fine.

But my point is that we have to arrive at some form of idea or policy - shall we say - of what we're going to provide to tourists. Because a tourist merely going around looking at our great scenery, great as it is - especially on the eastern slopes - is just simply not enough. He does it in a day. The American tourist comes up and thinks nothing of going into Waterton, getting into his car and hitting Calgary by noon, and he's seen a good chunk of the eastern slopes. If they are to enjoy themselves and stay there then there must be a well-developed system so that they can enjoy themselves and spend the money which they have brought for their holiday.

This means, of course, that there must be airports available, there must be access by public transportation, not only from the aspect of public airlines but [also] bus systems. I'm sure that in the future we're going to see less of the private automobile travel and more of the public transportation. This will be good because it will keep out of delicate environments the vast flood of automobiles. What do you do? All you can do is keep driving them and you get a continuous stream of traffic on the small number of roads you're able to provide in an area like the eastern slopes.

There must be public transportation facilities developed which will get people from their hotel accommodation out to see the various things that can be seen in the eastern slopes of the Rockies. This is a great logistical problem and I hope that eventually the authority will make some comments in this area, because unless we have this type of development, then we will have a very restrictive form of tourist potential as far as this part of Alberta is concerned.

The tourist wants to do as much as possible in 24 hours. If there is some appreciation of nature that he can get, that's just great. Then you've got a hit. That's what people want to do. But they can't do it all the time.

There is also the need to develop things which have to do with the general area of the eastern slopes. Things that are connected with the enjoyment we all talk about that we, as individuals, like to do when we are in this area of the world. That means fishing facilities. It means the provision of boats and equipment. It means the provision of guides to take people to the spots where it is possible to do some fishing. It means overnight camps and trails which people can use, and guides so people will get there, stay on the track and not wander all over the mountainside, deliberately destroying it.

Nature walks have to be developed. There has to be some form of boat launching available on lakes which will take groups of people on a trip up the lake or up a river. A visit to a coal mine, a visit to a ghost town, a visit to a ranch. These are what tourists like to see. They like to do it for an hour or so and then go on and do

something else, because not everybody has the training, the knowledge, the skill to go out there in the wilderness and camp, even overnight, without assistance.

It is only, as I see it, if we have the potential of a tourist resource on the eastern slopes that we think of it in terms of logistics. What are we going to provide the tourist so that he, over the period of his holiday, can enjoy it and go back home refreshed? That's what it's all about. If that type of thing is not available on the eastern slopes, then I see very little hope for developing tourist potential other than merely providing overnight accommodation for people who come through and pass on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, getting back to the point that I was raising before, what I consider to be the undue haste in the amendment proposed, I would like to propose a subamendment. The wording of my motion would be as follows:

That the amendment be amended by striking out the words "request the government bring forth legislation in the spring portion of the 1975 session of the Alberta Legislature" and by substituting the following words therefor: "requests that after receipt of the final report the government give consideration to bringing in legislation".

AN HON. MEMBER:

Too many lawyers.

MR. HARLE:

This amendment, Mr. Speaker, will remove the undue haste in trying to get a government to come to decisions without getting the report of the Environment Conservation Authority, because the result will be that policies are established without the benefit of the advice and, as has been said here, the good work that that authority is doing. Thank you.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, noting the time and the extensive discussion that is necessary on such an important matter as the motion originally put, and in addition to that, the agreement in the House that the full motion as amended would qualify for discussion all at the same time if members so chose, and presumably the same relative to the subamendment, Mr. Speaker, then I would like to proceed to offer some brief remarks at this time. I recognize that I would not be able to engage in the full extent of the remarks that I intend before 5:30, but nonetheless, offer remarks on the motion as amended and subamended as it stands at this point.

MR. LUDWIG:

On a point of order, I would like to recommend that the minister continue as long as he wishes, but we're all leaving at 5:30.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I know I can proceed without your ruling because that frivolous comment was not a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

If there is any question about the subamendment, as I read it at the moment - I would like to consider it a little further - but as I read it at the moment, the subamendment appears to be, in effect, a substitute amendment.

Therefore, since the rules concerning motions and amendments apply also to amendments and subamendments, it would be my opinion, subject to further consideration and perhaps some observations by hon. members, that the subamendment might be debated at the same time as the amendment. We have already agreed that the main motion may be, so we may have a package of three to deal with henceforth.

DR. WARRACK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I must be learning the rules very well from sitting close to you, since I, in this instance at least, correctly anticipated both the fact that your ruling came as I had anticipated and also that the most recent effort at a point of order was frivolous and indeed not a point of order.

The remarks, as I mentioned before being interrupted, Mr. Speaker, that I plan on this motion are quite extensive. I had hoped that I might have the time to outline the nature of the Foothills Land Use Allocation Study as it was an input into the Environment Conservation Authority hearings themselves, and an input to those who made representations at the hearings, including putting forward proposals.

I believe I'll hold that, however, and say only, prior to adjourning debate on this motion, that I think the debate on this particular motion has probably been the best I have heard in the time I've been here. As a matter of fact, it could very well be described as superb.

DR. BUCK:

Up to now.

DR. WARRACK:

I extend that point to both sides of the House, including the fact that many affirmative and positive kinds of suggestions and opinions were offered, which will be very helpful for this Legislature as it proceeds with its important work of deciding on the fate of the eastern slopes of the Rockies.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. minister adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before going further, the hon. Member for Clover Bar would like to have the leave of the House to revert to introduction of visitors.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS (CONT.)

DR. BUCK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave, and I thank the members for the privilege of introducing four young people who are presidents of high school students' unions in my constituency. I would like them to rise as I call them; Barry Litwin from Lamont High School, Brian Schackleton from Fort Saskatchewan High School, Mary Ann Eckert from the New Sarepta High School, and David Schultz from Tofield.

I would like the House to welcome these young guests.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, tonight we proceed to Committee of the Whole study of bills on pages 2 and 3 of today's Order Paper, beginning with Bill No. 55, and then proceeding to Bill No. 18 and Bill No. 21.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 5:31 o'clock.]