

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, November 18, 1975

[Leave granted; Bill 63 introduced and read a first time]

[The House met at 2:30 p.m.]

## Bill 65

The Optometry Amendment Act, 1975

## PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Optometry Amendment Act, 1975. This bill updates the act and provides a better relationship between the optometry members and the association in the province.

[Leave granted; Bill 65 introduced and read a first time]

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

## Bill 62

The Agricultural Development  
Amendment Act, 1975

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 62, The Agricultural Development Amendment Act, 1975. This being a money bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of this bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

The bill, Mr. Speaker, is designed to increase the level of direct funding by the Ag. Development Corporation from \$100 million to \$150 million. As well, it's designed to provide certain administrative changes that will ensure that agreements for sale and mortgages cannot be assumed by persons who might not otherwise be eligible under the Ag. Development Corporation regulations.

[Leave granted; Bill 62 introduced and read a first time]

## Bill 49

The Attorney General Statutes  
Amendment Act, 1975

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being Bill No. 49, The Attorney General Statutes Amendment Act, 1975.

[Leave granted; Bill 49 introduced and read a first time]

## Bill 63

The Farm Implement  
Amendment Act, 1975

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 63, The Farm Implement Amendment Act, 1975. Mr. Speaker, the bill is designed to change from a system of bonding farm implement dealers to a system of a dealer security fund. In addition, the new legislation will provide for the use of a single conditional sales contract.

## Bill 70

The Alberta Heritage  
Amendment Act, 1975

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, The Alberta Heritage Amendment Act, 1975. This bill will change the name of the act, the constitutional amendments and also allow an MLA to serve on the advisory board. As well it will increase the fine for any contravention of the act.

[Leave granted; Bill 70 introduced and read a first time]

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure today to introduce 23 honor students from Hardisty Junior High School in the constituency of Edmonton Gold Bar. They are here with their teacher, Mr. N. Jacques, and they have toured the Legislature. They are in the public gallery, and I would ask them to rise and be recognized by the House.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce three distinguished visitors to you, and through you to the hon. members of the Legislature. The three visitors are from the municipal district of Starland. The head office is located in Morrin, Alberta. First of all, Mr. Albert Aaserud who is the Reeve of the M.D. of Starland. He has been a councillor for 18 years, has been reeve during the last 10 years; Mr. Skip Hampton, a councillor of the M.D. of Starland; and Mr. Jim Simpson, the assistant secretary-treasurer. I'm sure if these men will rise, the House will give them a hearty welcome to the Legislature.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to introduce to you two visitors with us this afternoon, Mrs. Perry Cowan, who is the national board member of the NFU, and James Mayne from Kensington, Prince Edward Island, who is the junior president of the NFU of that

province. For your information, Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Cowan is from my constituency, and is also my neighbor. They are seated in our gallery. I would ask the two to rise and be recognized.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce to you, and through you to the hon. members of the House, 52 visitors to the Legislature this afternoon. They are Grade 4 and 5 students from John Barnett school in the constituency of Edmonton Belmont, 50 students attended by their teachers, Mrs. T. Rimney and Mrs. L. Goldring. They are in the members gallery. I should like to ask them to rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

##### Cattle Industry

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Agriculture. It relates to the present situation many farmers find themselves involved in as far as the price of cattle is concerned. My question is: has the federal government made any proposal to Alberta wherein it would pick up half of a \$100 grant, if in fact the province would pick up the other half, if the province made that available to farmers in Alberta? In other words, has the federal government indicated to the province that if the province would go halfway, the feds will go the other half in making a \$100 grant available to farmers on a basis of calves?

MR. MOORE: No, they haven't, Mr. Speaker. Indeed the situation has been probably the reverse, in that Ottawa has insisted that any province which implements a stabilization program of its own would not be eligible under the federal stabilization that might occur under Bill C-50. As a matter of fact, one of the principal points of that federal legislation outlines that the stabilization programs which might be developed cannot be of a nature that might shift production from one region or one province of Canada to another.

It therefore seemed quite clear to us, early this year, that if Alberta were to implement a cow-calf stabilization program, we would probably not be eligible to receive the benefits of any program that might be implemented federally. Indeed, it's my information that the federal Minister of Agriculture has said one of the difficulties in implementing the program is the number of programs which have been developed in other provinces. I particularly refer to all the provinces west of Quebec, including Quebec, with the exception of Saskatchewan and Alberta, which have implemented some form of program.

That's the reason, Mr. Speaker, that it has been our desire to move on the basis of the national stabilization program.

After that is in place, there are provisions within the federal legislation for provinces to get together jointly and provide some level of top-loading, providing all provinces agree on the level of top-loading, and that top-loading doesn't tend to artificially shift production from one region of Canada to another.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a supplementary question to the Attorney General, once again dealing with the problems of farmers in this particular area. Has the Attorney General's Department issued instructions in the Wandering River area that if farm implements are on the highway tomorrow, they'll be removed, or charges will be laid?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I have issued no such instructions.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. In light of the answer the minister gave the House yesterday, that it isn't possible for the Department of Agriculture to have as up-to-date figures as we'd like to have on what's happening to the slaughter of female animals, is the minister giving consideration, when he speaks to the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties, to asking for the assistance and perhaps local monitoring by the counties and M.D.s into the situation as they see it in their own particular areas? Then hopefully the government could take that information and perhaps reassess the situation.

MR. MOORE: Well, Mr. Speaker, we've been doing just that on a continuous basis, although not with the councils themselves, but rather with the local agricultural development committees, of which there are about 60 across the province, as well as the agriculture service boards which, the hon. member would know, Mr. Speaker, work quite closely with the county councils.

The only difficulty I mentioned yesterday with regard to up-to-date figures is that you would appreciate that the fall cattle run and the largest movement of cattle to the market has occurred only over the last, perhaps, four to five weeks. I don't have any figures that relate to what has happened, say, since October 1, although there are some indications that indeed considerable numbers of cows are moving to slaughter.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Are the proposed demonstrations largely directed against the federal government for lack of action on the stabilization program?

MR. MOORE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't really know. It would be my judgment, when you consider the number of programs this government has had in place for cow-calf and beef producers over the course of the last four years, at least, that we've provided a substantial amount of assistance in a variety of ways. I would just hope we can get some kind of action at the federal

level that would allow us to proceed with a national cow-calf stabilization program.

MR. TAYLOR: One further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. When the federal government brings in a cow-calf stabilization program, will it not largely solve the grievances of the farmers who are now demonstrating?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, that would depend entirely on what level it's brought in. I would have to say again, I was rather disappointed in the re-introduction of the fat cattle stabilization program for the period October 14 until the end of this calendar year, in that they actually lowered the total amount from \$45.44 to \$43.92. We don't believe there's been that kind of reduction in the costs of feeding a fat animal out to slaughter weight. On the other hand, we know how it happened. Rather than taking the cost of raising a calf or a feeder as it goes into the feedlot in their cost of production formulas, they calculated the cost the feeders were having to pay at the market for those calves and feeders. There's no question the price received by producers there is certainly not adequate.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture with respect to the fat cattle stabilization plan. Has the Government of Alberta made any protest or representation to Ottawa concerning the reduction in the program?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, initially I would have to say we provided figures from Alberta with respect to both the fat cattle program and the proposed cow-calf stabilization program that would indicate the cost of production. We have also made substantial recommendations to Ottawa with regard to the manner in which the pay-out is made.

Mr. Speaker, the past situation and the one existing is that prices are taken across Canada based on an average of Toronto, Winnipeg, and Calgary prices. We insisted to the federal government that it should take into consideration regional differences. Assuredly, when Calgary is the best market in Alberta, and when other markets in Winnipeg and Toronto, because of freight differentials, are better than that, it's an unfair advantage to producers, particularly in the northern part of the province, who are provided a level of stabilization based on that Toronto-Winnipeg-Calgary base.

There are a number of other areas where we made recommendations to the federal government, where we thought the plan could be improved. They accepted very few of them. In general, our suggestions were not accepted. It's my view they were not accepted because they wanted to try to save as many dollars in the plan as they possibly could.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have one additional supplementary question as a result of questions to me. I think theoretically it should go to the hon. Minister of

Energy, but in practice I would direct it to the Minister of Agriculture for an answer.

Is the government giving any consideration, especially in northern areas, to deferring lease payments on public land where grazing leases are in effect?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, once again it probably is in the area of the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, but I would have to say I've taken the time over the years to survey and study the amount of money paid by beef producers in this province for leased land, both in southern Alberta and the northern part of the province. I've been aware of the variety of reports outlining the formulas and [how] they should be adjusted over the years. One of the things, Mr. Speaker, I think all hon. members know is that there is a variation in lease payments based on the price of cattle. Indeed, in addition to that, I think the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources would be able to tell you that we have substantially protected the rights of individuals to use Crown grazing land, and that over the years we have tried to, and certainly in the last two or three years we have resisted efforts to have those lease payments increased over and above what they've been. Substantially, I think it can be said they are very close, if not right on what they were a number of years back.

So one really can't consider that the costs to cattle producers of grazing Crown land has increased anywhere near to the extent that other costs to the producer have increased. Indeed, it was my view, on considering it a short time ago, that it might be unfair to substantially lower those lease payments on Crown land when you have a number of producers -- and probably the ones who are in the most trouble today -- who don't have access to Crown grazing land and are forced to utilize their own deeded land, both for pasture and for feed.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Has the government reconsidered its decision not to make some of these loans, grants -- even a portion of them -- based on need?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the question of loans from the Ag. Development Corporation or the cow-calf advance loan of 1974, which was directly from the Department of Agriculture, has been under consideration for considerable weeks. I would have to say we have not altered the decision not to make them grants. One of the difficulties we've had is trying to figure out a way to apply that. We've had suggestions that we might provide some assistance by way of grants to those individuals who need it.

I think hon. members, Mr. Speaker, should appreciate that it is very, very difficult, with the wide variety of conditions across this province and the number of producers, to get into any kind of means test system. Frankly, if it were possible to do that, we might consider it. But I've had a very difficult time figuring out how.

With all the producers there are in Alberta, we would get into a means sort of thing so that we might provide grants.

On the other hand, the Ag. Development Corporation, I would say again, has been very lenient in regard to continuing to guarantee for another year loans which were due this fall. I've talked with the major chartered banks, the heads of the chartered banks in Calgary, not too long ago, and I got from them an indication that where possible, if it looked at all feasible that the loan might be repaid and that that enterprise would recover with better prices next year, they would extend those loans, and we would correspondingly extend our guarantee.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, a number of other programs are available from the Ag. Development Corporation, which I think I circulated to all MLAs last week, with regard to a direct lending program, a specific guarantee program, and other helpful things. That, Mr. Speaker, is in addition to some of the ongoing programs like feed freight assistance, which is available once again this year in a couple of areas in the province where they've had a difficult time in putting up hay and providing feed for their animals.

There are a number of other programs that, whatever difficulties producers might find themselves in, are of some benefit to them.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Does the government at this time possess any contingency plans for unilateral provincial cash assistance to cow-calf operators in the event that Ottawa doesn't move -- we all hope Ottawa moves, but in the event Ottawa doesn't move?

Further, while I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister as well. Are any discussions taking place, or has there been any consideration as to a possible timetable for unilateral provincial action if no action is forthcoming from the federal government?

MR. MOORE: Well, Mr. Speaker, on the first question, I think hon. members should be aware that, at least in statements I made to farm organizations and groups and through the news media some weeks ago, I said we were not moving on a provincial basis to extend the cow-calf advance program for this year. We would not be moving with respect to the extension of guarantees and loans from the Ag. Development Corporation until we had something from Ottawa by way of a cow-calf stabilization program. We expected that to come in late August or early September of 1975. When it didn't come, and when the heavy run of cattle started coming to market and producers were in a position of having to make decisions whether to keep their calves or their feeders or sell them, or what to do, I felt it was necessary that we make some moves in this regard. That resulted in the introduction once again this year of the cow-calf advance program at a 7 per cent interest charge.

That program, Mr. Speaker, was re-introduced because some \$47 million of credit was out to cow-calf producers in this province. Taken in total, I and this government were concerned about the withdrawal from the industry of that amount of funds over a period of two months. Although we require some interest to be paid on that amount, you must appreciate that many of those dollars could not be secured without the government guarantee. The government guarantee on those loans this year is probably more important than the interest factor. So we've provided in total, Mr. Speaker, just by that one program, at least an additional \$40 million of credit to the industry at what I think is a very acceptable credit rate.

In addition to that, as I said a few minutes ago, I've asked the Ag. Development Corporation board of directors and management to be very lenient with respect to the repayment of direct loans and the collection of loans through the banks that are guaranteed by the corporation to those individuals in the beef cattle business who show some signs of good management, a desire to continue, and the ability to in fact repay those loans if the market conditions do improve.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the minister. Is the minister aware that the hay situation is a problem in some of the areas where there is demonstrating? Is there a plan to help farmers with the hay situation?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, yes, indeed, there is a plan to assist farmers who are having difficulty with regard to feed supplies. I believe it was some three years ago we introduced the feed freight assistance program in Alberta, and it's an ongoing program still in effect this year. The manner in which farmers receive assistance under this program is to apply to their local municipal district or county authorities. The Department of Agriculture staff then does a survey of the areas affected to determine how serious the feed shortage is in that particular area. Then on a recommendation from the county or municipality involved, we will implement a feed freight assistance program for that county, or part of that county as determined by the councillors.

One is presently in effect, at the request of the county of Grande Prairie, for the west side of the county. Two others are pending: one I know is in the Wandering River area north of Lac La Biche, where some concern was expressed with regard to feed supplies because of wet ground and very difficult harvest conditions.

I am certainly open, Mr. Speaker, to requests from any other counties or municipalities across the province which may think that their producers are in a such position that they would want to apply under the feed freight assistance program.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is to the Minister of Social

Services and Community Health. From my past experience, when there are difficult conditions or adverse weather conditions in some of the areas of the province, farmers have made application for public assistance to your department.

Has the present cow-calf situation caused an increase in public assistance requests to your department during the past two or three weeks?

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of the fact that there's been any dramatic increase in requests for assistance, but I'll be glad to check with the department, determine whether there is, and advise this House.

#### Foothills Hospital Dismissal

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my second question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. In light of the recent events at the Foothills Hospital in Calgary concerning Dr. George Abouna, is the minister considering introducing legislation at this session which would create an independent board of appeal where such cases could be heard, outside the hospital?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I think I indicated in the first session of this Legislature that it was my intention to spend the first several months to a year assessing the overall organizational and decision-making problems that may exist in the hospital field. I don't anticipate I will be ready to make suggestions or recommendations of that nature, outside the context of other organizational questions I'm addressing myself to and examining throughout various tours throughout the Province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I think at this time we've met with about 45 individual hospital boards throughout the province on 4 or 5 tours, and I'm assessing all the overall problems. I think the one the hon. leader questions is one that would be within the context of my overall assessment.

MR. CLARK: Perhaps a supplementary, to rephrase the question. Is it the intention of the minister to introduce any legislation at this session which would make it possible for Dr. Abouna and the Foothills Hospital board problem to be heard before an independent group, either appointed by the government or by this Assembly?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I guess I was trying to explain to the hon. leader that I think he's oversimplifying the particular situation. I think it's important for all hon. members to realize that when we have hospital boards in Alberta which are charged with the public responsibility to administer the day-to-day affairs of a hospital -- I think it's important before I, as the minister, or we, as MLAs, interfere with that decision-making process, we have hard evidence that there was, in fact,

negligence or impropriety on the part of the board in making its decision. I have no such hard evidence of that nature to this point.

MR. CLARK: A further supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister plan to take any action to further satisfy himself that everything is okay, shipshape, at the Foothills Hospital as far as the Dr. Abouna situation is concerned?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I think I've indicated that I have no hard evidence to this point which would give me cause to interfere in the board's decision on the matter. But I emphasize, if the hon. leader has any hard evidence which has not been brought to my attention, I ask him to provide me with it and I'll be glad to assess it.

#### Dodds-Round Hill Project

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the Minister of Utilities and Telephones can assure my constituents, who will be affected by the proposed Dodds-Round Hill thermal power plant, and also concerned groups such as Unifarm, ag. committee groups, chamber of commerce, that the Energy Resources Conservation Board will hold public hearings on the Calgary Power and CanPac applications presently before the board.

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, I am in a position today to confirm that those applications have been filed. More directly to the question, I have been advised by the Energy Resources Conservation Board that it would be its intent to hold public hearings on that important project.

MR. STROMBERG: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister give consideration and support to holding the EPCB hearings in Camrose?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, the procedure is that the Energy Resources Conservation Board first checks the completeness of an application, then decides on matters such as that. However, they have indicated to me it has been a matter of their general policy for some long time, in major projects that have particular pertinence to a region, to try to hold those public hearings in the region involved. I would be very hopeful, in my answer to the hon. Member for Camrose, that the hearing would, in fact, be at Camrose.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question on this matter to the hon. Premier. Will the government give consideration to having hearings by the Standing Committee on Public Affairs concerning this project, in the same way that hearings were conducted, I believe in 1969 if my memory serves me right, concerning the Bighorn Dam?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't have thought at the moment they were comparable situations. We'd take it under advisement.

DR. BUCK: Supplementary to the hon. Premier, Mr. Speaker. Would he consider providing funds for the people in the Round Hill-Dodds area to present a case before the Energy Conservation Board?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I believe arrangements are being made in various ways for these hearings. Certainly we've considered that from time to time. There are some limitations. Perhaps the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs may wish to expand upon the answer.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, we are looking at the whole problem of funding interventions. Hopefully, we can come up with some definite policy before too long.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs indicate to us when he will have the decision if these funds will be available to the group in the Round Hill-Dodds area?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that under consideration.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Utilities and Telephones. Is he in a position, as a result of his discussions with both the company applying and the ERCB, to give the Assembly some timetable as to when public hearings may, in fact, be held?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, the timetable on that would largely depend on whether the applications as filed are complete. As I mentioned in response to the question from the hon. Member for Camrose, the first step is to evaluate the completeness of the application. If it is complete, the rest of the procedure can then begin. If it is not complete, a supplementary volume and quality of information will have to be provided to complete the application.

Assuming the application would be complete, then in the coming few months, as I understand it in early 1976, public hearings would be held.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary by the hon. member, followed by a further one by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

We are running out of time. A number of members have indicated they wish to ask questions. We have gone at some length into some of the important topics that have been covered thus far, and perhaps we should now make the answers and the questions somewhat shorter.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question, for clarification, to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Given the answer of the Minister of Utilities and Telephones, can the minister give assurance that the government

program of assistance, whatever it is, for groups wishing to make submissions will be announced sufficiently well ahead of the hearings that in fact that money will allow those groups to make proper submissions?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I will check the policy in that regard to see whether it is broad enough to cover that type of hearing.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier and the Deputy Premier. In light of the fact that an application is now before the board, have the Premier and the Deputy Premier changed their views on the development of the coal mine in the Dodds-Round Hill area?

To refresh the Premier's memory, it was on record that the Deputy Premier and Premier were opposed to a strip mine in that area. I'd like to know . . .

MR. NOTLEY: Especially the Deputy.

DR. BUCK: Especially the Deputy Premier. I wonder if his philosophy has changed now.

DR. HORNER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is aware what I did say at the time was that we shouldn't be wasting valuable agricultural land if we weren't very sure of the reclamation procedures that would be put into effect if the mine went ahead. [interjections]

DR. BUCK: Waffle, Hughey.

#### Farmers' Demonstrations

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture, relative to the bulletin the National Farmers Union put out, and their statement of highway ccw-calf demonstrations. In it they report that the minister had said he "had no respect for farmers who had nothing better to do than run up and down the highways on their tractors."

I wonder if I could get an explanation on that point.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I did make that comment Friday afternoon in discussions with the leaders of the National Farmers Union demonstration. I made it in relation to a discussion we were having wherein I advised them that I had been in the Wandering River area on Wednesday evening, October 22, to meet with a number of producers. In addition to that, I asked the leaders of that particular demonstration if they would send representatives to a meeting scheduled in my office for Friday afternoon last at 3:30 o'clock. The individuals involved declined the invitation to meet with me that afternoon.

It was in that context, Mr. Speaker, that I said I didn't have that much respect for people who had nothing better to do than move up and down the highways on tractors, after they had declined an invitation to sit down and discuss their problems with the Minister of Agriculture.

## Frank Slide

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Government Services responsible for culture. Would he be able to indicate to the House what progress has been made to have the Frank Slide designated a classified site under The Alberta Heritage Act?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, every effort has been made to speed up this declaration, and we are now in the process of declaring the Frank Slide a classified heritage site.

## Skilled Manpower

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. I understand from the latest unemployment statistics that our unemployment rate is less than 3 per cent in this province. However, we have a problem of shortage of skilled manpower or 'perscnpower'. I was wondering if the hon. minister could indicate just how serious this shortage is at present, and what steps are being taken in order to get more skilled people into the job market.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, the provincial unemployment figures are extremely favorable in comparison with the federal ones, and we regret the national figures. As the hon. member points out, it has the other side to it, a shortage in certain specified trades and certain industries, indeed certain professions. This is contingent on several kinds of things like seasonal employment and unemployment, the return of students to institutions of learning, the movement of females in and out of the labor force, and several other factors including the weather, particularly with respect to the construction industry.

The capability of the province, along with industry in the private sector, to respond to this is reflected in the figure of 5.8 per cent unemployment back in 1971 to 2.6 at the present time and 3.4 in terms of an adjustment for seasonal unemployment. The institutions and on-the-job training, working with industry, including management and labor, have done a significant job in opening up job opportunities for the people of Alberta.

DR. WEBBER: A supplementary to the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure the hon. minister is aware of the problems of enticing tradesmen into the industrial education teaching program at the University of Alberta. Out of 25 annual bursaries provided by the Department of Education, each worth \$5,000, last year 20 were given and this year the number has dropped to 6. I was wondering what steps the Department of Education is considering in order to improve the supply of industrial education teachers in the province.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, the subject in question is a consideration and a responsibility of the Students Finance Board in my department. The matter of the number of absolute dollars that government should, in fairness, set up to induce tradespeople to move into another occupation is that kind of thing, a value judgment. Probably, and it's a guess on my part, the absolute number of dollars in terms of the incentive for qualified tradespeople to leave highly paid jobs, to lose a year's income to go to the university with a \$5,000 bursary, is the answer to the question. The matter of supply and demand in the trades, and in the teaching of the trades, is a problem we're working at the best way we can. This is one of them.

## Native Land Claim

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Premier. Can he advise the Assembly what the official position of the Province of Alberta is at this point in time with respect to the legal action undertaken by the Indian Association of Alberta concerning its oil sands claim?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'd refer that question to the hon. Attorney General.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, as the member appreciates, a caveat was lodged with the Registrar of the Northern Alberta Land Registration District, and the registrar has been seeking our legal advice as to the manner in which this caveat should be handled.

There are, I think, three alternatives. One is to suggest that the caveat not be accepted at all, and be totally rejected. Another is to register the document. A third is to refer the matter by way of reference under The Land Titles Act to a Supreme Court judge. We have been considering a recent decision of the Court of Appeal in the Paulette case, and now we're in the course of finalizing our legal advice to the registrar. I expect, in the course of the next day or two, we'll be in a position to indicate to the registrar our view on what he should be doing.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the Attorney General in a position to tell the House when in fact he can report specifically to the Legislature on what the legal case is, as far as the government is concerned?

MR. FOSTER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I thought I had done so. I would be in a position to indicate to the House our view in the matter probably by Friday of this week.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. Attorney General, or to the Premier. Have there been any discussions on this matter between Mr. Cardinal and executive officers of the

association, and members of Executive Council?

MR. POSTER: Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak for other members of the front bench, although I don't believe meetings have been held on this issue. I have had a meeting with the solicitor for the Indian Association, and will no doubt continue to have such meetings. The subject of those meetings, however, I think is a matter of confidence between their solicitor and my office, and I wouldn't be at liberty at this stage to divulge the contents of those discussions.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question then. Perhaps I could direct it to the hon. Premier and ask him whether, to his knowledge, there have been any discussions between members of Executive Council and officers of the Alberta Indian Association concerning this matter.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, not that I'm aware of, subject to checking. Although I was out of the country at the time, I'm advised that there was no warning given to the government of the proposed course of action taken by the Indian Association of Alberta.

#### Native Unemployment

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. Have any specific steps been taken to remedy the very serious unemployment situation in the oil sands area among native Albertans?

MR. SPEAKER: I have grave doubt as to whether this is a supplementary. The ordinary function of a supplementary is to get further clarification or amplification of an answer. It really shouldn't be used to introduce another topic when there are other members waiting and we're running out of time.

#### Firearms Regulation

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Solicitor General. Would the minister indicate whether the provincial government plans to make any changes with regard to licencing or regulation of the use of guns in Alberta?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, the law in regard to firearms is a federal one under the Criminal Code. We understand that the Solicitor General of Canada and the federal Minister of Justice are presently studying some changes to the Criminal Code in this regard.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to table in the Assembly a copy of the recent

policy paper that's gone out to all gun registers across the province?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, the position insofar as the province is concerned is that it appoints local registrars who operate under the provisions of the federal Criminal Code. Guidelines on how they operate are internal documents which are not available for scrutiny in the same way legislation or regulations would be, inasmuch as they are analogous to instructions to the police.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. In relation to gun usage in crime, has any formal study been carried out or contemplated in Alberta, such as the Quebec Police Commission inquiry into organized crime?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I understand the commission on crime in Quebec, interesting though it is, has doubtful constitutional validity and is presently being questioned by the federal minister responsible. We have not, at the present time, considered a similar commission in Alberta.

#### Irrigation

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Environment. Could he indicate whether a feasibility study on irrigation expansion will be undertaken for the Bow River basin?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, we intend to do a considerable amount of work with respect to irrigation generally, not only in the Bow River basin but throughout southern Alberta. As you know, there is a commitment of substantial capital funds between the Department of Environment and the Department of Agriculture over the next 10 years. Exploratory meetings have been held with directors of all the boards, and we expect those to continue after they have had a chance to respond with their priorities later this year.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate whether priority will be placed on the repairs to the Bassano dam or the construction of the proposed Eyremore dam?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, again that matter would be considered in the broad context of the overall picture, once we get the requests or submissions in from all the boards and have a chance to compare one against the other.

#### Anti-inflation Guidelines

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Will the federal guidelines on prices be applicable to increases in insurance premiums?



MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, there was a direct reference in the anti-inflation white paper to insurance premiums.

MR. TAYLOR: A further supplementary. Would they also be applicable to proposed increases in power and gas rates?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, there is some reference to the regulated utilities under the Public Utilities Board. Perhaps the minister responsible, the Minister of Utilities and Telephones, might wish to supplement that answer.

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, even though I'm not responsible for the Public Utilities Board, I would add this point to supplement the answer of my colleague. There is specific reference in the federal policy position to both energy and farm products as to exemption under the anti-inflation program they were putting forward. Moreover, part of the announcement by this government has been that those exemptions need to continue to be respected in order to sustain our agreement to go forward.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, or perhaps the hon. Minister of Utilities and Telephones. In the light of your answer concerning the federal guidelines, has there been any discussion with officials of the Public Utilities Board concerning possible changes in their method of computing rate of return as a result of the per-unit profit factor which the federal Parliament is using in controlling prices?

DR. WARRACK: With respect to any discussions that have been held with the Alberta Public Utilities Board, I would refer that question to my colleague the Attorney General, who is responsible.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Attorney General. Could he advise us whether there has been any discussion concerning the method of computing profits in using the new federal formula, which is, as I understand it, the per-unit profit, to determine whether prices would rise? Has there been any discussion with officials of the Public Utilities Board to review the whole procedure for assessing the rate structure in the Province of Alberta, bearing in mind the federal guidelines?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, the Public Utilities Board obviously has been provided with copies of the federal legislation and guidelines, and asked to review the possible implications of the same for the PUB. I look forward to a discussion of this very complicated and difficult area with the chairman of the board and perhaps other members. I have not at this time specifically discussed the point the hon. member refers to, however.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs

or the Minister of Utilities and Telephones. Does the exemption for energy matters mentioned by the hon. Premier apply to the retail prices proposed by Calgary Power?

MR. NOTLEY: No, most certainly not.

DR. WARRACK: Well, certainly, Mr. Speaker, in addition to pointing out that it was not only energy, but also farm prices, that was a very important part of the position and evaluation the Alberta government put forward, certainly the place from which any other part of the price spectrum would arise would be from the retail point of these power costs. So I think the answer is quite clearly, yes.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, do I gather from the minister's last answer then that, when the city of Calgary purchases power from Calgary Power, they in effect will be controlled, they will not be allowed to make a 20 per cent increase? They're retailing electric power.

DR. WARRACK: My understanding of the question I just answered was whether these costs would be exempt because they are energy costs, and I answered yes. In that case I don't think the situation you bring forward would be a problem.

MR. TAYLOR: A further supplementary. Would prices to commercial and residential people in towns and cities having nothing whatsoever to do with farmers also be exempt?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, I would understand that the answer is, yes. I didn't mean at all to confuse the picture as to farm costs relative to energy, but to re-emphasize and reinforce the point as a matter of Alberta policy decision that we recognized energy was exempt and, separately, that farm prices were exempt. In that recognition, the continued exemption of those two areas was a major aspect of our evaluation and the reasons for proceeding in the manner announced by the Premier on November 12.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier, to clarify the situation. If I may, just a brief word of explanation. I can understand where under the federal guidelines energy pass-through costs would not be subject, but surely there are other factors in the costs of utilities which would come under the federal guidelines. Would that not be the case?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, although it's difficult to assess the situation until we see the actual regulations under the federal act, I think the position of the Government of Alberta with regard to any regulated utility under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Board is simply this: we hold to the view that the Public Utilities Board is there to regulate and protect the consumer of this province. We hold to the view that the Public Utilities Board is

also there to assure the viability and economic strength of the important utilities in this province that provide us with essential utilities.

We feel, therefore, that the judgment decisions of the Public Utilities Board, subject to ascertaining the final regulations that come out of the federal act, are judgment decisions we expect the Public Utilities Board in this province to undertake, based, first of all, on the criterion of a pass-through of costs, such costs including whatever increases in energy feedstock or energy requirements there are; secondly, to assure, not so much in terms of profit but in terms of rate of return, that there is a rate of return on the base of the investment made that's sufficient to afford a continued viability of these utilities.

We think that, insofar as the federal guidelines are concerned, their application to regulated utilities or to those utilities appearing before the Public Utilities Board is of such a nature as not to warrant the application of the federal guidelines.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps we might come back to this topic. We've actually run overtime. I have recognized the hon. Leader of the Opposition. If the House agrees, we might extend the time to deal briefly with this further question, then come back to the other topic perhaps another day.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

#### Public Accounts

MR. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the Provincial Treasurer when we can expect the 1974-75 public accounts to be tabled in the Assembly.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I'll check on that and give the hon. Leader of the Opposition an answer in a day or two.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, if I might ask one more supplementary, begging the indulgence of the House. Could the Provincial Treasurer, when he is checking the date, also check to see what the reason is for the delay? It's my recollection they're generally available in September or October.

MR. LEITCH: I doubt the hon. leader's recollection is accurate, but I'll also check that.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps we might both check.

x x

Under Standing Order 29:

MR. NOTLEY: I rise, pursuant to Standing Order 29, to move this Assembly adjourn immediately to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely the widespread

demonstrations throughout the province demanding provincial government action to assist the financially distressed cow-calf industry.

I have copies, Mr. Speaker.

I have introduced this motion today because it seems to me we have a situation which has moved from one of serious concern and alarm, which can be discussed in the normal course of legislative business, to a situation where we now have some 17 demonstrations throughout the Province of Alberta.

I would cite, Mr. Speaker, in moving this motion, Standing Order 29 (7):

A motion under this Standing Order is subject to the following conditions:

- (a) the matter proposed for discussion must relate to a genuine emergency, calling for immediate and urgent consideration;

Mr. Speaker, there would not have been a case for an emergency debate had we not a set of conditions which are extraordinary and unusual. I submit, Mr. Speaker, for the House today, that when we have 17 communities in Alberta where tractor demonstrations are occurring, that is a rather unusual, and indeed, a very serious situation.

I cite the names of the communities for the information of the members: Grassland, High Prairie, Grande Prairie, Beaverlodge, Debolt, Valleyview, Rycroft, Athabasca, Evansburg, Westlock, Calmar, Vegreville. . .

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member said there were 17 of them. Perhaps we could go on to the rest of the argument.

MR. NOTLEY: All right, Mr. Speaker. I think it's straightforward that there are quite a number of communities where these demonstrations are taking place.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would refer members of the Assembly to page 431 of Hansard, June 4, 1975, your comments on a request in the spring for an emergency debate. I quote from it, if I may:

. . . There is no question at all that the housing situation has been what might be called one of chronic crisis. But there is always the possibility that a crisis which has been chronic may become acute.

Mr. Speaker, there's no question at all that we've had problems in the cow-calf industry, but now that there are 17 demonstrations occurring throughout the province, it seems to me we have a situation which, in fact, could become acute. Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it's my judgment, my view, that this Legislature should take the time to debate what is clearly an emergency situation.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, the sole decision before Your Honour at this time relates, under the first subsection of rule 29, to the question of the urgency of debate.

I think that question now before you, sir, is one of importance and of very great significance to this Assembly, in terms of its precedence in the past and of our future business in the months ahead.

I submit, on listening to the submissions made by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, that he has not made a proper case to demonstrate urgency of debate in any way, and he has not advanced those arguments which come within the test and requirement of the first section of Rule 29.

He has, Mr. Speaker, perhaps pointed out that on a few of the highways in this province, there is some inconvenience for motorists, some nuisance factor to Alberta citizens who are driving vehicles, but there is, in my submission, clearly no emergency which would justify an urgency of debate. The member spoke of demonstrations. Surely government decision-making is not to be based on demonstrations on the highways of this province.

I recall last Thursday evening, Mr. Speaker, when Motion No. 2 was up for debate. When the Member for Spirit River-Fairview spoke, I can recall at no time did he make mention in any way of the subject matter which he brings forward today for consideration of the Assembly. It seems to me that that would have been the time to have made that approach.

Certainly, Mr. speaker, if interest in the subject is demonstrated at some time, tomorrow afternoon, Wednesday, the government would be prepared to call Motion No. 2 again, and to allow debate. But under the rules of Beauchesne and the precedents of this Assembly, I submit, Your Honour, that no valid case for urgency of debate has been made.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview in the emergency nature of this debate because, Mr. Speaker, there are demonstrations on the public highways of this province. It is pointing out a problem of a very serious nature to the people involved, and these are the people who are practically in the process of losing their livelihood because of an action, possibly, Mr. Speaker, of government. So it is an emergency. When we have this many groups involved, then we, who are servants of the people, must listen to the people whom we are serving.

I cannot think it's such a simple matter that it is just a nuisance factor, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. House leader indicates. If one person is injured, or one person is killed because of the blockage of our highways -- if these people are trying to tell us, the members of the Legislature, there are some problems out there, we must listen. Mr. Speaker, this is why I support the emergent nature of this issue.

I think that all members of this Legislature must be made aware of the fact that it is an emergency situation. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I support the emergent nature of this debate.

MR. SPEAKER: I think perhaps we might hear from the hon. minister, and then I think it would be time to deal with the matter, otherwise we'll lose a great deal of the afternoon.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I'll make it very short by giving a brief resume of the facts as they are. Peaceful demonstrations by certain farmers began in the Wandering River area about a week ago. Although these demonstrations have now ceased, some 13 similar demonstrations are taking place in the northern half of the province. One of them sometimes subdivides into 3, so that may come closer to the 17.

The demonstrations take a novel form. They comprise cavalcades of some 20 to 40 farm vehicles driving, properly spaced, on the right side of the road, sometimes covering up to 10 miles. This somewhat expensive way of making a point is orderly and legitimate. The RCMP personnel are at each location, and in some cases have convoyed truck traffic past the cavalcades on the other side of the road. The relations between the police and the farmers are friendly. The demonstrations usually take place between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m. in daylight hours. Although they are causing some slowing down of traffic, this is not intolerable and shouldn't cause undue concern.

#### Speaker's Ruling

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member did give notice as required under Standing Order 29. But I regret to say that the notice which was given is considerably different from the motion which has just been given to me now. They do refer generally to the same situation, but the notice which I have just received, and had about two minutes to look at, is really not the same as the notice which I received this morning.

There is no doubt at all about the importance of the ccw-calf program, or the problems which it was intended to meet. I'm sure these are presently in the minds of all members of the Assembly as well as of Albertans generally. Indeed, we've had some considerable discussion of the program already in the question period. I'm not suggesting that the question period should be used as a vehicle for debate, but the fact of the matter is that the topic was covered to some extent.

But the notice as I received it this morning did not indicate an intention to debate the cow-calf program. It was, rather, a notice to debate the situation arising out of the demonstrations. It referred to a series of tractor demonstrations and said: "The Assembly must debate whether something can be done to alleviate this situation which is causing inconvenience to Alberta citizens".

That part of the notice seemed to indicate to me that what was sought to be debated was a matter of inconvenience. I would have difficulty in knowing just what hon. members would be expected to debate

under a notice of that kind.

The cow-calf situation is in itself, in all its seriousness, a continuing matter. The hon. member has rightly said that a continuing serious situation may escalate into an emergency if it's suddenly aggravated. As far as I'm aware, there has not been any real change in the cow-calf situation since last week. As has been pointed out by the hon. Government House Leader, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview did engage in the debate on Motion No. 2. I referred to that speech. I think perhaps it deals with a dozen or fifteen topics. That would have been an occasion perhaps on which the matter might have been debated.

Whether there is another opportunity for debate is one of the criteria which have to be weighed in deciding whether the business of the House should be set aside for an emergency debate of this kind. I would question whether Standing Order 29 is intended to cover a matter which is referred to as an inconvenience. Certainly that does not prevent any hon. member from raising the topic in the usual way, but the situation is quite different from what we had earlier this year when we did have an emergency debate on another topic.

I think hon. members will agree, without wanting to be in any way dramatic about the responsibility of the Chair in this regard, that it is a serious responsibility, because it means turning around the priorities of the Assembly. Instead of going on with matters of which members have given the ordinary notice, it would, and I think that's why it has to be exceptional, give priority to a matter of which only two hours' notice has been given, with scant opportunity for hon. members to prepare for a debate, particularly if the topic is important.

So under the circumstances, while recognizing the importance of the topic, I would say that the motion does not come within the requirements of Standing Order 29. Indeed, I could see the debate becoming a discussion about a method of debate chosen by other people to further their interests in a certain subject, and I don't think that's the kind of topic that's intended to be covered by Standing Order 29.

x x

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### WRITTEN QUESTIONS

187. Dr. Buck asked the government the following question:

- (1) How much money has been expended from November 1, 1971, to November 12, 1975, on the opera-

tions of the MLA Task Force on decentralization of government operations, as established by order in council 221/72?

- (2) What appropriation does this money come from?
- (3) Has the committee made a report or reports to any minister?
- (4) Would the government consider tabling such report or reports in the Legislative Assembly of Alberta?

DR. HORNER: [inaudible]

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the hon. Deputy Premier referred to this question, but I think some people perhaps didn't hear what he said, including the Chair.

DR. HORNER: I just said that we were agreeable to Question 187, Mr. Speaker.

188. Mr. R. Speaker asked the government the following question:

- (1) What is the purpose of alterations to CFCN Broadcast House in Calgary for ACCESS?
- (2) Is \$14,830 the projected total cost of such alterations?
- (3) From what appropriation will such alterations be funded?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, may I ask that that question stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Do you agree that that question remain on the Order Paper and retain its place?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

199. Mr. Clark asked the government the following question:

- (1) How many research studies were commissioned by the Government of Alberta, its commissions, boards, or agencies in:
  - (a) January 1, 1974, to March 31, 1974;
  - (b) April 1, 1974, to March 31, 1975;
  - (c) April 1, 1975, to October 31, 1975?
- (2) How much did each study cost the Government of Alberta, its commissions, boards, or agencies?
- (3) What was the purpose of each study?
- (4) What were the names of the firms or individuals to which the studies were assigned?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, may I ask that that question stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

201. Mr. Taylor asked the government the following question:

Under the demerit system:

- (1) How many drivers received one-month suspensions in the fiscal

- year ended March 31, 1975?
- (2) During the same period, how many drivers, if any, were excused from the suspension required for the accumulation of demerit points?
- (3) During the same fiscal year, how many drivers have received a second suspension; a third suspension?
- (4) How many drivers have been taken permanently off the road because of continued accumulation of demerit points?

MR. FARRAN: We accept the question, Mr. Speaker.

202. Mr. Taylor asked the government the following question:

- (1) How many young people have participated in the green certificate training program to October 31, 1975?
- (2) What is the range of ages of these young people?
- (3) How many farms have been approved as training farms?
- (4) Have all students who applied been placed?
- (5) How many of the students placed were native Albertans?
- (6) What is the estimated total cost of this program for the year 1975
- (a) to the Alberta government?
- (b) to the Canadian government?

MR. MOORE: We'll accept that question, Mr. Speaker.

203. Mr. Taylor asked the government the following question:

- With reference to the summer farm employment program for students:
- (1) How many students were employed under this program
- (a) for less than two months,
- (b) for two months or more, during the summer of 1975?
- (2) How many of these students were from
- (a) Alberta?
- (b) other provinces?
- (c) other countries?
- (3) What were the average monthly earnings of student workers?
- (4) What was the total public cost of this program in 1975?

MR. MOORE: We'll accept Question No. 203, Mr. Speaker.

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

With respect to each and every loan guarantee issued to agribusinesses, prior to October 31, 1975, by the Agricultural Development Corporation, what provision was made for bonding of the firm concerned, so that farmers who enter into contracts for delivery of farm products are protected against the failure of said

company to honor its commitments due to insolvency and/or bankruptcy?

MR. MOORE: We'll accept Question No. 204, Mr. Speaker.

#### MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

189. Mr. Notley proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

- (1) A list of all guaranteed loans to agribusinesses made through the Agricultural Development Corporation during the period October 1, 1974, through October 31, 1975, showing the company or person concerned, the amount and purpose of the loan.
- (2) A list of all such loans on which the government has been required to honor its guarantee.
- (3) A list of all direct loans from the Agricultural Development Corporation to agribusinesses during the period June 2, 1972, through October 31, 1975, showing the company or person concerned and the amount and purpose of the loan.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment to Motion for a Return No. 189. It has to do, Mr. Speaker, with the date of October 31, 1975.

With the permission of the House, I would like to amend that to read September 30, 1975, in both question No. 1 and question No. 3, the reason being that it coincides with the quarterly reporting period of the Agricultural Development Corporation. I would be able to provide the information much more quickly using those dates.

[Motion as amended carried]

190. Mr. Notley proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

A copy of the Agricultural Development Corporation's file on Agriplast Ltd. of Camrose, Alberta.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, Motion No. 190 asks for a copy of a file with respect to the Ag. Development Corporation and Agriplast Ltd. of Camrose, Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, the Agricultural Development Corporation has in its offices in excess of 8,000 files involving individuals, firms, and partnerships from across Alberta. Many of the documents in those files, Mr. Speaker, deal with credit investigations and opinions from staff in the corporation, both in Camrose and throughout the province, with regard to the kind of credit rating or personal history those

individuals might have.

In addition to that, there are many different pieces of correspondence between individuals within the Department of Agriculture or the corporation; pieces of correspondence in many of those files that are directly related to the financial capability or otherwise of individuals who have applied.

Mr. Speaker, under Motion No. 189, and as a general rule of principle, I intend to provide for all members of the Assembly a listing of the guaranteed loans made to agribusiness, including Agriplast Ltd. of Camrose, the date on which that particular guarantee was made, the kind of security held by the corporation for that guarantee, in addition to a listing of the purpose for which the loan or the guarantee was made.

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, it's my view that a complete file relating to an individual, a group of individuals, or a company cannot generally be made available to the public. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I would ask hon. members of the Assembly to oppose this particular motion for a return.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to that particular motion, I'd like just to raise a question with the minister. If a member of the Legislature wished to review any file, would he have access to the files of the corporation in confidence? At the point of gaining information, it would be an obligation upon that particular member not to divulge it. If the member does, certainly the consequences are obvious. Is a procedure such as that open?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I think the previous Minister of Agriculture, Dr. Horner, did say that where a member was concerned, speaking particularly with regard to individuals who apply to the Ag. Development Corporation for direct lending, about the status of a loan or why it may have been declined, the credit report of the Ag. Development Corporation, or that type of thing, an individual could come and review the file in confidence in my office.

Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't want to say as a general broad principle that we'd make every or any file available, because surely, particularly dealing with the time constraints and so on, I wouldn't want to have to be in a position of making in excess of 8,000 files available through my office. But on an individual basis, if members are interested or concerned about a particular loan, I can assure them, Mr. Speaker, that I will do my best to provide whatever information they request. Once again, we wouldn't want to have the files put into the hands of the member for whatever purpose he might want to use them beyond that.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, if there are no other members who wish to take part in the debate . . .

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. member close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I realized in placing Motion for a Return No. 190 on the Order Paper that we were dealing with an area that really is difficult to resolve. On one hand, you have the question of privacy, Mr. Speaker; on the other hand, you have the requirement of the public to have certain information made available, if the public is to understand whether agencies funded by the public -- and the Agricultural Development Corporation is -- are doing a good job. In this particular motion for a return, we have very clearly a difficult, fine line to tread.

I can appreciate the arguments which have been advanced by the minister as they relate to individual files. But it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that when we get into a situation where we are making substantial amounts of money available, either in the form of guarantees, direct loans, or what have you, or even equity participation, to agribusiness or any other kind of business -- and I just don't want to confine this strictly to the Agricultural Development Corporation, Mr. Speaker, because there are certain other questions that could be related to AOC or eventually the Alberta Energy Company -- the arguments for access of information become somewhat stronger.

Obviously, if there is particular information which is necessary in the public interest, which an individual finds out about and can ask, fair enough. No doubt the government will be prepared to make that kind of information available. But too often, the problem of overall confidentiality being used to keep information secret which could well be made public, in my view, is really a troubling one.

I speak on Motion for a Return No. 190, knowing that it is not the clear-cut case, in my own mind, that the motions for returns were that I presented in the spring session concerning petrochemical development and various research papers, some of the documents which in fact were paid for by the public. In this case, we're getting much more clearly into a shade of gray situation.

But I simply suggest to the members of the Assembly that before voting down this kind of motion, they should keep in mind the rights of the public to know how its money is being spent: not just in terms of statistics that appear on a sheet of paper talking about loan guarantees, but the reasoning that went into the spending of the money, the negotiations that took place as far as the investment, loan, or guarantee are concerned. This is information which, in my judgment, Mr. Speaker, the public, as long as its money is being used, has a right of access.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, this motion for a return is not going to pass, but I raise it, and by raising it I ask the members of this Assembly to consider the implications of the rather difficult situation we're in, where increasingly we are making, through loans, guarantees, or direct equity, substantial public funds either directly or indirectly available to corporations. Mr.

Speaker, in my judgment, that does pose some rather difficult problems.

[Motion lost]

191. Mr. Notley proposed the following motion to the Assembly:  
That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:  
A list of all legal firms and/or lawyers who have done legal work on behalf of the Agricultural Development Corporation during the period June 2, 1972 through October 31, 1975 in connection with the issuance of loans or loan guarantees, showing the total amount paid to each.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would seek the permission of the Assembly to withdraw Motion for a Return 191. The reason for doing this is that the substance of the information was tabled several weeks ago, and it would be pointless to gain the additional information that this motion for a return requests.

[Motion withdrawn]

192. Mr. Notley proposed the following motion to the Assembly:  
That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:  
A copy of all correspondence between the Alberta Export Agency and officials or shareholders of Alberta White Cattle Ltd.

DR. HORNOR: [Inaudible] motion stand on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree that this motion may stand over and retain its place on the Order Paper?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

193. Mr. R. Speaker proposed the following motion to the Assembly:  
That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:  
For the fiscal years 1973-74 and 1974-75, each public opinion survey commissioned by the Government of Alberta, listing:  
(1) the department or agency of the Government of Alberta for which each survey was conducted;  
(2) the person, persons, or company, conducting each survey;  
(3) the subject of each survey; and  
(4) the cost of each survey.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the motion stand over on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree with the request of the hon. minister?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

194. Dr. Buck proposed the following motion to the Assembly:  
That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

The number of flights and hours logged for each provincial government aircraft during the period of May 15, 1975 to November 12, 1975, for the purpose of transportation of:  
(a) cabinet ministers and assistants  
(b) deputy ministers and assistants  
(c) all other government personnel.

[Motion carried]

195. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly:  
That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:  
Copies of any reports made as a result of each of the following trips which were documented as follows in Sessional Paper 200/74:  
(1) Department of Agriculture, January 24-27, 1973, San Francisco, California, Study of U.S. banking finance systems, H. B. Jeffery, C. J. Roth, \$1,154.23.  
(2) Department of Agriculture, Jan. 21, 1974, Mexico. Essential for success of program to import package bees from Mexico, J. Auram, \$3,562.84.  
(3) Deputy Premier, No. 14-20, 1972, U.S.A. (Los Angeles). Meetings with film people, T. R. Vant, \$3,678.46.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, before I move Motion for a Return 195, the Deputy Premier drew to my attention that under Motion for a Return 195, Section (3), it shouldn't be Deputy Premier, it should be Deputy Minister. It's a mistake we noted when we checked the information that was filed earlier. So I'd like to move the amendment, and make that Deputy Minister rather than Deputy Premier in Section (3).

MR. SPEAKER: If the Assembly agrees, we can just treat that as a typographical error without going through the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Notwithstanding the importance of the distinction.

MR. CLARK: I move Motion for Return 195.

MR. MCORE: Mr. Speaker, for a number of reasons, one being that I'm still not clear about the third paragraph, I'd like to have the motion stand till the next -- perhaps the hon. Leader of the Opposition and I can discuss it.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree to the request of the hon. minister?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

196. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly:  
That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:  
(1) A description of each gift to persons, governments or companies, outside of Alberta, ar-

ranged for by the Alberta Export Agency and paid for by the Government of Alberta, including:

- (a) the exact nature of the gift,
  - (b) the value of the gift,
  - (c) the recipient of the gift, and
  - (d) the date the gift was transferred to the recipient.
- (2) A list of contracts with, or purchases by, any of the persons, governments or companies mentioned in No. (1) subsequent to their receipt of such gifts as mentioned in No. (1).

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that this motion stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree with the request of this hon. minister?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

197. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly:  
That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

- (1) All trips taken outside of Canada in the fiscal year 1974-75 by employees of the Province of Alberta, which were paid for from public funds.
- (2) (a) The total cost of each trip paid from public funds;
- (b) the purpose of each trip;
- (c) the appropriation or appropriations from which the cost of each trip was paid;
- (d) the names of the civil servants who made each trip.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to the motion. However, I would ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition whether he intended to include deputy ministers and ministers in paragraph (1). It's my recollection that within the past few days we filed the same information he's requesting there with respect to four employees, with respect to deputy ministers and ministers. If the Assembly agrees that the word "employees" excludes deputy ministers and ministers, then it's satisfactory in its present form.

[Motion carried]

198. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly:  
That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

- In the case of the emission control order issued to Houg Cement Limited, the following:
- (1) each date since September, 1974, that a stack sample was taken at the plant;
- (2) the results of each stack sample; and

- (3) copies of communications with Houg Cement Limited following analysis of each stack sample.

[Motion carried]

200. Mr. Mandeville proposed the following motion to the Assembly:  
That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:  
Copies of reports which were submitted to the government as a result of the following research studies which were outlined in Sessional Paper 150/74:

- (1) Study, "To review present capabilities, potential for growth, demand and need for expansions in the area of fine and performing arts; to propose plans for growth, efficient use of resources and mechanisms for future planning and implementation." Firm: L. W. Downey Research Associates;
- (2) Study, "To mount an 'external' evaluation of the Athabasca University pilot project in learning systems development with the intent of providing feedback to the project itself and of informing the Department periodically regarding the progress of the report." Firm: L. W. Downey Research Associates;
- (3) Study, "New product development, e.g. foot long egg, Two Hills." Individual: R.A. Matherson;
- (4) Study, "To investigate and recommend on the feasibility of trout farming in Alberta." Firm: Lombard North Group Ltd. Ferguson, Harrison and Assoc.;
- (5) Study, "Preparation of a manual to examine methods of marketing Alberta's agricultural produce and recommendations of improvement of techniques." Firm: The Sibbald Group;
- (6) Study, "The objective of this survey was to determine the amount and distribution of damage by snowshoe hares to conifer plantations in Alberta." Individual: Dr. Keith;
- (7) Study, "To conduct comprehensive micro-study of the Kananaskis Road Corridor to determine its impact on the environment and to consider potential recreation development." Firm: Lombard North Planning Ltd.;
- (8) Study, "To review the scientific literature relating to the establishment and operation of day care centres." Individual: Dr. R. A. Briggs;
- (9) Study, "Situation sample of former inmates of correctional institutions (employment, welfare, reincarceration)." Firm: L. Downey Research Associates;
- (10) Study, "To develop an effective inexpensive procedure of transport pricing in Canada." Firm:



- Hu Harries & Associates;
- (11) Study, "Evaluation for the next 15 year period of the economic viability of the manufacturing of chemicals in the Province of Alberta from natural gas." Firm: Associated Engineering Services Ltd.;
  - (12) Study, "Independent analysis of advantages of the tax environment of Alberta." Firm: Woods Gordon & Co., Clarkson Gordon & Co.; and
  - (13) Study, "Emerging North America Oil Balances, considerations relevant to a tar sands development policy." Firm: W.J. Levy Consultants.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Government House Leader, may I ask that this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the request by the hon. minister, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

205. Mr. Notley proposed the following motion to the Assembly:  
That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:  
A copy of all correspondence between the office of the Minister of Agriculture and officials and/or shareholders of Royblu Feeds Ltd. prior to March 26, 1975.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, we'll accept that, subject to the usual concurrence of the other party involved.

MR. SPEAKER: There is some question about amending a motion of this kind in that informal fashion. It might be advisable for there to be a formal amendment, because there have been occasions when questions of privilege have been raised on motions of this kind.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I move an amendment to Motion for a Return No. 205, to add, "Subject to the concurrence of Royblu Feeds Ltd." before the words "copy of all correspondence between the office of the Minister of Agriculture and officials and/or shareholders of Royblu Feeds Ltd. prior to March 26, 1975."

MR. NOTLEY: I would like to just very briefly say that I hope and trust that Royblu Feeds Ltd. will, with great enthusiasm and despatch, respond to this motion for a return, as I will be keeping an eye on the progress we make in gathering the information contained in this motion.

[Motion as amended carried]

#### MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

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

Be it resolved that, the Government of Alberta consider incentive programs to encourage private property owners to protect wildlife.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I often question the wisdom of these particular days, and whether these resolutions really make very much impact on the direction in which we go. I would also say that I think it's only proper that members of the Assembly bring to the attention of the public, through the Assembly, some of the concerns that members might have on occasion, and I suppose this is as good a reason as any to bring forth this resolution.

The resolution is: "Be it resolved that the Government of Alberta consider incentive programs to encourage private property owners to protect wildlife."

Earlier this week we discussed a moratorium on bad debts, and I sometimes think we should have a moratorium on the slaughter of wildlife in the province. You know, I think back over some 30 years to my childhood, when we were able to see vast numbers of wildlife in the particular area in which I reside. Today we have very little of anything. Rabbits are something one seldom sees. Pheasants are gone. Probably very few members of the Assembly even know what sharp-tailed grouse look like anymore, certainly in the area where I reside. The Hungarian partridge must have got into the Hungarian revolution and didn't survive, because the Hungarian partridge is another real game bird that is seldom seen. So, as I say, we should probably consider a total moratorium on hunting of all wildlife, and that's not to exclude some of our four-legged animals, such as the mule deer, and the white-tailed deer in particular in my area.

Of course, when you get into discussions about this problem with fish and wildlife people, fish and game people, and others, everyone tries to find out who's the scapegoat for the lack of wildlife, and the first thing they turn to is the government. Well, the government must be responsible, who else, because you know the government gets blamed for pretty well most things.

I looked through The Wildlife Act. It's some 43 pages, and over and above that, many, many pages of regulations. Most of those regulations -- most of that act is designed to protect wildlife. Section 8 provides for bird sanctuaries. Section 9 has provision for a wildlife damage fund. Section 11 is a large section which provides for hours of hunting, the days, the places, the kinds of animals, and on and on ad infinitum. Section 14 covers regulations regarding licences. Section 86 covers regulations with regard to wildlife officers.

I could go on and on, and list all the things laid down by The Wildlife Act to protect wildlife, and yet we don't have any. Not only that, it costs government vast sums of money to try to protect wildlife, and yet many of our species are coming almost to the point of extinction. So I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, whether we

can blame government for what has taken place.

Others would like to blame private property owners and, I suppose in particular, farm people. But when you think about it, they're basically interested in the dollar. You can't really blame them for doing what they're doing in attempting to survive. Even those people out on the tractors for the last few days are basically interested in making a livelihood, in making provision for food for the rest of the consumers, and so they have a genuine concern.

Whether you can blame property owners totally for what has taken place, I couldn't totally agree with that concept, because their total purpose is to try to make a living. Now, when they attempt to make a living, they have to do certain things. I would say the basic problem with the lack of wildlife is no habitat. I can go into a number of areas and describe to you what basically happens when we have no wildlife habitat, and that's both for bird life and for animals. First of all, a farmer has continually, over the years, drained low-water areas into channels which eventually find their way into other channels, and so on, down the stream into the major rivers, which end up in the Hudson Bay or some of the great oceans. They do this for a particular reason: they have to increase production in order to pay their taxes, or in order to survive in a very competitive world.

The counties and municipalities, and those in the road-building business, have probably done more than any other group to destroy habitat. It used to be at one time, when they had the old-type road construction equipment, that you had sharp banks where the ditches were, yet you had heavy tree cover on both sides of the road. Today, the whole concept is changed. Because of the high cost of road construction, because of the high cost of maintenance, all roads today throughout the province are basically constructed by back-sloping and by taking out any vegetation whatsoever along those roads, even to the extent of persistent spraying to destroy any regrowth. So, I suppose that's contributed as much as anything to destroying wildlife habitat.

The destruction of trees on farms -- it's a rather interesting thing to observe, from my experience working as a councillor for a county, that persistently at annual meetings the ratepayers would get extremely irate and concerned about the fact that the county was stripping all the brush along roadsides and back-sloping, in fact destroying habitat. But when you turned the question around and asked them what they were doing to protect wildlife, they weren't really doing much of anything. They had already stripped the trees from their own property, and yet they expected the county, in turn, to preserve habitat for the birds. So this, in fact, has done an extreme amount of damage. Birds, let's face it, have to have a place for protection, not only in the summer, especially for migratory birds, but in the winter for

other kinds of birds and animals.

I can relate several situations and also, in my particular area, the kind of conflict that occurs between property owners and protectors of wildlife. One in particular, a large drainage system that covers 20 or 30 miles, has continually over the years been in conflict, in that certain property owners want the vegetation removed in order to destroy the habitat of the beaver. Other property owners on that drainage area conversely want all the vegetation left so that they can watch the beaver.

So you run into a kind of conflict, even on a drainage right of way. That is an extreme conflict, because there's almost an impossible situation for government or any other group to try to resolve, when half the property owners who border on this particular creek want the area drained, and the other half want the vegetation left for protection of wildlife. I know the former Minister of the Environment had discussions on this particular area I refer to, the Parlyb Creek area. I can assure him that the situation really hasn't changed very much, and discussions are still ongoing.

We have in my constituency a gentleman, probably in his seventies today, who's devoted a good part of his life to the preservation of wild birds. I suppose he has the most spectacular demonstration of protection of wildlife, certainly in any area that I know of anywhere near my constituency. It costs him virtually hundreds of thousands of dollars a year to provide food for these birds, and in particular to migratory birds. Some day down the road in the not too distant future, I think he'll have to make a decision as to whether he can possibly continue such an operation strictly on a voluntary basis, out of his pocket, or whether some agency may be able to take over this kind of operation.

To point out that property owners in general aren't all destructive, by any means, I relate a situation in my own case, where some three or four years ago I had a visit from a goose and a gander. You know, that's a pretty good combination, because usually something results from that. Today, because I was very friendly towards that goose and gander, I have some 90 Canada geese. I shouldn't say this to the duck and geese hunters in the Assembly. But it's a fact that, if you show some concern and show some reaction to the importance of habitat for wild birds, it won't be very long before they look upon your particular area as a source of protection.

It has got to be a tremendous traumatic experience, certainly to me, to know those birds are coming back every spring, and they are going to come back to the particular area that I own at the present time for protection. My greatest problem right now is they're multiplying so fast that I'm going to have to figure out some way of removing the problem. So what I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, is there is a balance between the wildlife, the wildlife habitat, and the property owners.

One of the other areas I should mention -- in the few minutes that I have -- is the importance of river property, and the importance of maintaining this habitat area along the rivers.

Basically, to conclude, I would like to make one proposition to the Assembly and to the government, to consider. We have a very large heritage trust fund. This fund, I think, should be preserved for Albertans and for future generations -- and I know we'll have a chance, perhaps, to debate this further along in the session. I would make a plea and a request that the government carefully consider the use of some of this fund to purchase land, and, in particular, to purchase wildlife habitat. In this way, I think we could preserve, Mr. Speaker, some of the great things that we have in this province for future Albertans.

Certainly, if people can come from other lands with foreign money and purchase our land, knowing that it's a great and very safe investment, we should be able to take some of our own funds and channel them back into this, I would consider, a very worthy cause, the protection of wildlife habitat in the province.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a few remarks in support of this resolution. I think I've possibly got more confidence than the hon. Member for Lacombe, because I look down here at Motion No. 2 and it's already been accepted, so I'm sure we'll get some recognition on this motion in the House.

I have to agree one of the biggest problems that we have with our game in this province is the habitat. I think we do have to look at giving our farmers, who own 30 per cent of the land in this province, some recognition or some incentive to protect our wildlife. Pheasants for example; if we could possibly recognize our farmers by giving some small remuneration program to feed the pheasants during the winter. Our losses in the wintertime are heavy for pheasants as well as with many of our other specimens of wildlife.

I think another area we could recognize our farm people is to give them some tax rebate through the municipal counties or a tax rebate on some of their marginal land. This would be some incentive for our farm people to protect our wildlife.

Another area: in speaking to many of our rural people, they would like to have more input to our regulations. I realize there are areas where they can have input to our hunting regulations. However, I would like to see them encouraged to put more input to the regulations, because they realize many more of the problems that we have in this area, much more than some of our other people who are working with the regulations.

There is one area down in my constituency that always causes a problem. We have a resolution that comes from our county down there -- it's annual -- a resolution that comes from the eastern irrigation district, to close the season on antelope. But we've never been able to have the closed season on antelope down there. As

soon as the season opens, the posters go up all throughout the eastern irrigation district and the county of Newell, to prevent the hunters from hunting. It certainly causes a lot of hard feelings.

Another area I think we need to take a good look at -- and I think that fish and wildlife are taking a look -- we need more game officers to enforce the regulations that we do have. I certainly support the mover on using some of our heritage money to come up with some type of program. Possibly we could work it through our Fish and Game. I know they're doing a lot of work in this particular area.

When we get all these areas solved there's one other area -- I hope we're going ahead with it -- we've got to put some emphasis on the hatching of our pheasants. We approved \$600,000 for a pheasant hatchery in Brooks a year ago. I would certainly like to see us go ahead with this project in Brooks so we can distribute some pheasants throughout the province.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate I'm in support of this resolution.

MR. TESOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to lend my support to the resolution, "that the Government of Alberta consider incentive programs to encourage private property owners to protect wildlife."

The key to wildlife retention is a suitable habitat. We are all aware that all suitable habitats are rapidly disappearing at an alarming rate. This is especially evident in the areas of this province adjacent to larger population centres, but it is also becoming a factor throughout the province as more and more land is cleared.

Gradually, the population has experienced a shortening of workday and workweek. This trend has tremendously accelerated during the last five years. Thus, this in turn has caused an increase in leisure time and resulted in more people turning to outdoor recreation, which might include fishing, photography, et cetera. One must note most of the above activities involve wildlife or its habitat, and are not usually compatible with developed land.

The only habitat which would likely be found in areas of intensive land use would be small patches of bush, wetlands, watercourses, poor soil areas, and steep hill-sides. With the exception of wetlands, most would likely be much less than a quarter section in area. However, it seems that even these sooner or later become converted to marginal agricultural lands through drainage projects, brushing, or other efforts. A viable alternative use of marginally productive lands is a habitat for our wildlife.

I believe landowners could be persuaded to leave marginal land in its raw state through some incentive such as tax reduction. This incentive would likely be well received by many of us who are appreciative of the preservation of wildlife. However, there would be some opposition to this program by some landowners -- to a large extent because of the distinct possibility

of vandalism. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I feel that participation by the landowner should not be tied to any guarantee of access by the public. Permission to enter these lands must remain with the landowner.

Mr. Speaker, I truly believe we must offer Albertans the incentive to preserve our wildlife habitats.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to bring to your attention problems we have in east-central Alberta. Basically, this is the problem of the Battle River basin. This Battle River basin, which extends from the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc's constituency directly across central Alberta to the Saskatchewan border, has quite a unique area and a habitat very favorable to a high deer population. Of course, only being anywhere from an hour to an hour and a half distance from the city of Edmonton, each fall an unbelievable amount of hunters go through that area.

It's caused enough trouble, Mr. Speaker, that farmers with livestock in the valley are forced to move their cattle to other lands. I would like to point out that the trespassing problem seems to be building up each year. Now the Battle River basin at one time had a game preserve at Driedmeat Lake. It offered some protection to the deer population. For reasons unknown to me, the Department of Lands and Forests, at that time, threw it open for deer hunting. Now we have this group of people -- and rightly so, because the citizen here in Edmonton normally cannot afford to hire a guide, an outfitter, and go for a week's hunting in the west or the north country. But he has an opportunity to drift out of Edmonton, a two-hour drive, oxford shoes, a darn good walk, and maybe the possibility of getting a deer. It's his right. But somehow we've got to come up with some sort of management.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that about three years ago, I introduced to this Legislature a private member's act, the trespassing act. I came under considerable fire at that time. As a matter of fact, I believe the Alberta Fish and Game Association had a bounty on me, and the only protection I had was under the game laws of this province.

MISS HUNLEY: An endangered species.

AN HON. MEMBER: Just like Tories a few years ago.

MR. STROMBERG: In that act, I pointed out the problems of trespassing. I was pleased to hear the Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray offer the suggestion that land suited to habitat be removed from the assessment roll. I realize that counties cannot afford this loss of assessment. Perhaps, as the Member for Lacombe indicated, this is where the heritage fund could come in.

If in our parkland areas a farmer would be allowed, say, a maximum of 20 acres left as habitat -- in my own personal farming experience, Mr. Speaker, I have 35 acres of woodlot and some of the better land in

Alberta just to keep 3 deer. It's very expensive. Our trend today in farming is to tear down our fence lines, four-wheel drive vehicles, farming basically from roadside to roadside.

If we were to allow some sort of tax relief that would allow us to keep a body of water as a slough for duck habitat, or a woodlot, I think we would be going a long way. If we continue the same trend of land-clearing, we will probably be in the situation that North Dakota and South Dakota found themselves in, in the late thirties, and Russia is finding itself in today, where we will have to plant trees.

Another suggestion to the department of recreation and wildlife: perhaps we should use these areas, such as the Battle River basin and the Buffalo Lake area, take a look at the total picture, then bring in a game management zone. I can see a game management zone such as the Battle River basin where certain areas could be set aside as a sanctuary for the protection of wildlife, then allow issuing of licences based on the game population. You know, this 1,000 hunters to get a deer is a little out of proportion.

MR. HANSEN: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to support this motion: "Be it resolved that the Government of Alberta consider incentive programs to encourage private property owners to protect wildlife."

I think it is very important that we look at the loss of the habitat, even over the last few years. To preserve this natural habitat is one thing that we have to do, if we're going to save wildlife in Alberta. I would like to mention upland game such as partridge, pintail, prairie chicken, pheasant and other game birds.

I would like to say a few words about what has happened in the last 15 to 20 years in my area. We have more than doubled in population -- also with the air base which now has a population of around 10,000. The land has also been opened up for farming more rapidly in the last 10 or 15 years, with big bulldozers. Before, there was a lot of brush cover and not the amount of hunters. I feel that the pressure on all wildlife has grown tremendously. I think the only way we can implement this as a government -- and I'm hoping the government will consider it -- is to start compensating ranchers and farmers for setting aside land, or leaving strips of grain, so that after the snow comes in winter, the birds will still have feed.

Also, if strips of grain are left, it's early feed for the birds, which in the end pays off in better nesting and better production. I think, though, we have to have the co-operation of farmers, local government, and provincial government. We also have to include the sportsmen in this, so they all understand there is a desire and need to start protecting these birds and animals before they are completely eliminated.

If you'd been in my area 10, 15 years ago, you would have seen flocks of prairie chickens, as high as 40 or 50 to a flock. I've seen 3 in the last year. Your partridge in that area -- this fall there was

the odd flock, throughout the area but a week after the hunting season opened, I don't think you'll see one on any roadside or field at this time. These are the things that happen when you get an overpopulation of hunters for the production of animals we've got.

This is why I would urge the Government of Alberta and other governments in Canada to take a long look at the habitats, also at wildlife itself. I think if it is managed right, it gives good recreation, which we promote in Alberta. I think it can be managed so there will be birds and animals for our children and their children. But if it's left to nature itself, with all of the things against nature, I don't think they can survive. They will be wiped out, especially our native upland birds. I would like to make a plea that this government put money into a plan that would last at least five years in advance, so people can see what's happening, and after the five years, go into a full program with the experience they would have. Thank you.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, since I had such remarkable success with my motion, No. 2 on the Order Paper, having it introduced into legislation without even having the opportunity to speak upon it, I hope my hon. member friend on the left will have equal success with his, because it's closely associated on the Order Paper.

I wish to speak in support of the principle of this resolution. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Member for Lacombe presented it with a great deal of sensitivity in impressing upon this Legislature the fact that he has a true and deep abiding feeling for preserving habitat for wildlife and for preserving wildlife itself. Many of the things he said regarding certain species of our wild game and the disappearance of these, unfortunately, are facts. The other members who have supported this resolution have emphasized that in the words they presented to the Assembly this afternoon.

I have a deep sense of conservationism myself. In our farmland we have treed areas and bluffs. We have on our land perhaps 20 deer; he has 90 wild geese. We have a number of Hungarian partridge. We don't do any hunting ourselves. We don't encourage any hunting on that land.

But this is not to say I do not hold any brief for people who enjoy their hunting in a sportsmanlike manner. I do believe we have hunters who are sportsmen, and just plain hunters. We have those who respect the game laws and the bag limits, who get their game, look after it, keep it, and make sure good use is made of it. Then we have other people who just go out and shoot things for the sake of shooting.

I'm reminded, by the remarks of the Member for Camrose [about] being under fire, because of one evening, towards dusk, when I was out working in one of my fields. Some deer were in the far end of the field. I stopped to do something to some of my equipment, and all of a sudden I heard some rifles going off and bullets whistling over

my head. I looked out towards the road, which was a few hundred yards away, and saw somebody out there shooting down at the deer at the far end of the field. Fortunately they weren't very good hunters. But I was rather perturbed, and I went over and really tore a strip off these people. Afterwards I went home and said to my wife, you know I was sort of foolish, wasn't I. They might have shot me and, today, might have got a week in confinement for that, or something to that effect -- a suspended sentence -- because it wouldn't be premeditated, you know.

I noticed the Member for Bow Valley has said we need more game officers. But the fact I would like to emphasize this afternoon is that I think we need more outdoor education. I'm very pleased to see that many of our schools are now taking up this sort of program. They are not only taking it up in the higher levels, but even in Grades 5 and 6 in the elementary schools -- taking groups of children out, letting them see nature, the wildlife, the habitat, and the things to be enjoyed as far as outdoor living is concerned. I think that's important, and I think that's one area where perhaps the government, if they're going to encourage private property owners to preserve habitat, could also encourage people in other ways to make sure they have a great respect, or more respect, for the type of thing that is being preserved for them.

One other thing I would like to mention -- and I have done this before in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker -- is the use of herbicides in roadside spraying. When we come down to habitat -- and we've heard discussions this afternoon about maintenance of the roadside habitat areas -- the sprays probably destroy more wildlife along those roadside areas than any other means of destruction in those areas. If you mow the land or cut the brush, at least you're not leaving any chemical residue which can be absorbed by birds or animals or whatever, and cause injury in that respect.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, the impression I want to give is that we should be encouraging outdoor education, we should be taking a very close look at the use of roadside sprays, and we should be trying to grow people in this country who, when they become hunters, are hunters in the name of sportsmen and not only as shooters of game. Thank you.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me again to get into a discussion on wildlife. I think it's one of the great recreational resources Alberta has. There's no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that Alberta is bountiful indeed in its natural resources. We have our oil and gas, we have our coal, we have our skiing potential up in the mountains, and we have our game hunting opportunities. I think we've done very much indeed to realize the potential of the oil and gas, and we're working hard on the coal situation right now. We've also done a good deal to capitalize on the recreational ski potential of our mountain

areas.

On our fish and game areas, I don't think we've fully realized the potential we have to offer. There are a lot of reasons and I'd like to speak particularly, Mr. Speaker, on the pheasant situation. It's one I'm more knowledgeable in, if such is the right word, than in the other areas. One of the things that attracted me to Alberta, when I came here some 17 years back, was the numerous recreational opportunities here. Pheasant hunting was one of the most attractive at that time.

A number of factors have contributed to a reduction in the pheasant hunting opportunities and the success hunters have; among them severe winters, bad springs, loss of habitat -- previous speakers have talked of that. Another one was the introduction of a hen season. I suppose that was a matter of judgment. I think many would agree it wasn't the right judgment, and was a contributing factor to the large reduction in the pheasant population. Another great factor has been the hunter pressures other speakers have adverted to. We have unprecedented prosperity here. We have more people with more money. We've had great population growth, and more people looking for recreational opportunities such as pheasant hunting. This has caused tremendous pressure on the birds. So that, with the other factors, has caused a very serious reduction in the available number of pheasant.

I suppose we need more management. We've come up with a number of ideas that will help bring the pheasant population back. But with the increasing pressures, I think it just isn't going to happen naturally; we will need additional supports and props for it. And I think that's where the resolution of the Member for Lacombe is such a good one. It urges consideration of incentives from government to the private sector to increase habitat and other opportunities that will provide for wildlife protection.

Hunting, Mr. Speaker, particularly in the pheasant area, is one of the great tourist potentials of our province. I think it's worth millions and millions of dollars a year to the merchants of southern Alberta, particularly those in the hotel and motel business. I've forgotten the dollar numbers, but it seems to me I saw that southern Alberta motel operators yielded something in the gross of \$4 million this past year, and that's without any really good opportunities for hunting. So if we can just forecast that into a situation where there are many, many more birds than there are right now, it is very obvious that it could be a great resource for this province.

Mr. Speaker, I recall the discussion we had a couple of years back on this question, or a related question. At that time, I remember looking at the petty trespass bill, introduced as a private member's bill by the hon. Member for Lacombe. I've enjoyed many hours in the field hunting with the Member for Lacombe.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, it was the Member for Camrose -- very important.

MR. McCRAE: I stand corrected, Mr. Speaker, it was indeed the Member for Camrose. In recalling the bill, I thought at the time that, although it was well principled and well intended, it would probably be the only bill in the statute books with punishments provided for which there was no parole. I thought it was that severe, Mr. Speaker. I don't recall the detail of it right now, but certainly, as I said, it was well intended but perhaps a bit severe at the time.

Mr. Speaker, there are many things that could be done in the present area to improve the situation. One is the hatchery the hon. member mentioned that is to be established in the Brooks area. I understand it's a replacement for the existing hatchery, which has a yearly capacity of 6,000 birds and, when in full operation, will have a potential of some 50,000 birds. This will have to make a very positive impact on the situation.

Another possibility is the purchase and dropping of birds each year. This year there were, I think, some 4,000 or 6,000 birds dropped, including hens and cocks. That certainly is some assistance, Mr. Speaker. It will no doubt leave feed or stock birds over the winter. Some of them will continue on and raise others in the spring, but this in itself will not be sufficient to turn the whole thing around and assure us sufficient birds for the hunting population in the future. As I said, the new hatchery proposed for the Brooks area will go a long way in assisting that.

Another assistance to the bird game population would be the killing of predators. There has been recent feeling among the people in our land that killing our predators is all wrong, it's against the balance of nature and we should leave things alone. I know many of the fish and game people and many of the hunters don't support that theory and would like to actively, say, decimate the blackbird, the magpie, and to some extent the hawks and the owls. I don't want to comment on the merits of that. I think the magpie has certainly become almost our national bird, and I wouldn't mind seeing the extinction of a good many of those. The hawk and the owl -- I'm much more conservationist-minded in that area, and wouldn't really support any active program to decimate them.

I think one thing we can do to improve the situation is to involve the private sector. A couple of weeks back I was particularly pleased to have been involved in an announcement in the Calgary area where the hon. minister of recreation and wildlife, along with some fine people from southern Alberta, Calgary and south of there, put together a program, I think it's referred to as Upland Birds Ltd., under which the government will make available to the association some \$15,000 to assist it in putting together pockets or areas where birds can be raised, fed until they reach some form of maturity, and at that time

released into the surrounding area.

The ground area itself, or the area of the location, would be a reserve. No hunting would be allowed on that site and, I think, within a half mile of that area. So that would provide a sanctuary where the birds could be fed, husbanded, and looked after. The birds would fan out from there and offer hunting for would-be hunters in the immediate proximity of the site itself. Hopefully, a program like that could be [inaudible] not only to the three present areas, but also to numerous other areas in southern Alberta. Hopefully, not only fish and game clubs, but 4-H clubs, local chambers of commerce, and individual citizens would get involved in an organization such as this, with a view to expanding the recreational hunting opportunities.

We've talked about incentives to private property owners to protect wildlife, and the question, I suppose, is what kind of incentives might there be. Some of the members have talked of local municipal tax contributions or discounts to assist property owners in setting aside some of their land for hunting or wildlife preservation. I suppose another opportunity would be to register individual associations so they qualify as tax deduction associations, that is associations that, when you contribute money to them, qualify under the federal Income Tax Act for relief, or at least your contributions are allowed as a discount or reduction in your income tax. I think that's something we might consider doing, whether fish and game organizations could not qualify for that type of deduction.

Another area we should be looking at, Mr. Speaker, is the area of hunter training and the relationship of the hunter and the landowner. In recent years, with the vast increase in the number of hunters and the reducing number of birds, we've seen a tremendous exacerbation or increase in the friction between the landowner and the hunter. Many well-meaning hunters will arrive at a landowner's property, and the landowner might himself be very sympathetic to the hunter, but there always seems to be one bad apple who will come along to the farm or the landowner's property and ruin what has otherwise been a good relationship between the hunter and the landowner.

I think we need some very active efforts in this area to encourage hunter training, hunter responsibility, so that when they do go out there they don't irritate the farmer to the point where farmer after farmer is saying, no, you can't hunt here, and is posting his land. That merely increases the pressure on the few farms that are left. The more lands that are posted, the less land that is available for the hunter, and the pressures become greater and greater.

I think we have to reverse that trend. We can only do that through encouraging greater hunter responsibility and reaching some sort of accord between the hunter and the farmer. I think, again, this is where involving local organizations comes into it. If we can get the 4-H clubs, the fish and game associations involved, then with their relationship and understanding of the

hunter and his wishes and ambitions, the relationship will become a lot closer, and the frictions will become a lot less.

Hunting, to me, is a very enjoyable recreational opportunity, something a father can do with his son and friends, and I think it's part of a maturing young person. I think if he gets out into the field, he gets a better appreciation of nature, of conservation. I think it's something that should be encouraged by the government. How many dollars we should put out there, I think is an open question. I would like to think that the private sector could do most of it itself.

It's got to be a recurring thing. There's no way we can correct the, say, pheasant lack or imbalance at this time and expect it to hold in years ahead. The same conditions that reduced the flock or the number of birds at this time will come back again on us: the severe winters, the bad spring hatch, the pressures, and all that. There's no way we can redress or correct the problem right now and expect it to stay that way.

So, I don't think we can continually be pouring government money into it. We can in the way of game management. We can in the way of a new pheasant hatchery. But essentially, it's got to be you and I and John Q. Public out there who get involved in it and say, let's have some birds, let's protect those we have, let's try to look after our ditches, the habitat, and let's have a relationship between the hunter and the landowner so that we're all concerned in it, we're all interested in trying to cure and correct the situation.

Mr. Speaker, those are but a few of the observations I wanted to make. It's interesting, when you come from a hunting area, such as Calgary, the number of people you run into who are keenly concerned about this area. I just wanted to mention the name of one Bill Fisher, who is a gentleman about 90 years of age right now. He was involved originally in the introduction, I believe, of the Hungarian partridge here, and very active in pheasant propagation with fish and game organizations and what have you, in the early days.

I have seen some of Mr. Fisher's film on not only the habitat -- which was just unbelievable in the early days, in the thirties, forties, and early fifties -- but also on the number of birds available. I think if we can involve people like that, who know the background, how the birds were first introduced here, how they came to grow in numbers, and the great recreational tourist potential that was there. If we can use some of their ideas, I think we'll go a long way to correcting the present difficult situation we have.

In my remarks, there has been no suggestion at all of a condemnation of government policies. I think we've done the best we can under a very difficult situation, a situation that grows in complications each year with the increase in the number of hunters, the increasing recreational opportunities, the reduction in habitat with our concern for growing more and more food for the world. But



coupling the government opportunities with the contributions people in the private area will make, I think we can correct the situation and look ahead in a few years to some very excellent hunting. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. MCCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, it's indeed a pleasure again to be able to speak on this topic. I remember three years ago I brought in a resolution with respect to fish hatcheries and their development. The resolution was unanimously accepted, but no additional fish hatcheries have appeared since that time. So I hope this isn't true of this resolution, because I think that this section of the wildlife and fish and game preservation in our province is probably one of the most important things, much more important than a great many people realize.

With respect to the resolution, I think it's an excellent one. To me there is some concern how the financial end of this can be handled as to compensation to landowners, farmers, people who own bush land and even prairie land, for antelope and so on. It's difficult for me to envisage any type of program that would cover all the eventualities.

We do have at present the wildfowl program for compensation to farmers. I think it's been reasonably successful, although over the past year I have had quite a number of farmers say that the compensation factor has been raised on 70 cent barley, and it's not quite the situation now that it was when this program came into force. This may seem a small item, but there are a lot of farmers who have land adjoining major waterfowl areas who every year lose anywhere from 40, 50, to 100 acres of grain. Now, if they have a balanced compensation, probably adjusted to grain price, this would be, I think, a much more satisfactory arrangement than it has been in the past.

There have been one or two problems that I wonder if the department may not look at. It has appeared to me that over the last number of years, there has been a great emphasis on enforcement in the department -- and I think this is a very important section of the department. But I wonder if, instead of concentrating so much on enforcement, we shouldn't perhaps alter the emphasis to increased production of supply, because I think a great many of the game officers have a good sound basis of policy that they'd like to see developed as to increased supply of game.

To cover a few of the areas, I'd like to go back to my fish hatcheries. It's true that Calgary came on stream a year or two ago -- probably one of the finer fish hatcheries in North America. I was delighted to hear the minister a few months ago mention, due to the fact that the egg supply would probably be drying up in the States, the Raven hatchery would be transferred to an egg production plant.

However, I think perhaps we should be able to go further than this, and in northern Alberta particularly, where we have so many lakes and streams. With the

fact we have all the streams of the eastern watershed of the Rockies, I think we have to develop literally millions and millions of fish and spawn every year to plant in these streams. There are some ideas that perhaps just by habitat -- and I can't believe that -- there are just too many fishermen to allow, through natural development, the fish to be born in these streams and grow in those streams to maturity. There are just too many fishermen, and it doesn't seem practical to me. They have to be planted, and they have to be built up. This can be done.

Perhaps we could take a look at some of the states just to the south of us. Montana has shown that it has an excellent program, and I think many here have gone fishing at that lake just across the border in Montana that's renowned for rainbow trout. But they pour literally hundreds of thousands into that lake every year. I think we have to multiply our production in fish, get our staging stations, and perhaps get smaller fish hatcheries located in the north where we don't have to haul the fry for 200 or 300 miles and lose a good proportion in the process.

There's been a good deal said about pheasants. Living in central Alberta all my life, practically, I think we probably have one of the better areas as far as pheasant is concerned. In the south the hunters can clean the pheasants out in a year, because they don't have the basic cover on the prairies. But in central Alberta, there is good cover for pheasant, and I don't believe the hunters would ever clean out the pheasant population. It's the bad winters we have here that do it. I know, in the last 25 years, 3 times within my memory we have had the pheasant population come up to an excellent standard, and yet, in the course of a winter, it's been decimated and practically wiped out. I think probably the worst blow was 2 years ago this winter, when it just completely cleaned central Alberta out of the pheasant population and a good many of the other upland game.

I think we'll go back to the same policy again. We still have to produce these birds. And when I [say] produce the birds, I mean in the hatcheries. I was delighted to notice the memorandum that came around from the minister the other day, that perhaps a new method of trying it would be to have pheasant farms with high fences, and a restricted area around those farms. This might be a way of increasing production at a more reasonable cost. And, of course, then move those birds out around the province.

It is getting to the stage too, I believe, pheasants are not the only type of upland game that this government may have to go into the production of. A few years ago the prairie chicken was a very common bird, a wonderful game bird, and wonderful to see around the province. I haven't seen a prairie chicken for five years -- and I'm out in the country a lot. There are a few partridges around, and a very few Hungarians.

We may have to consider the possibility



of going into the production of these other types of upland game. Some of them are perhaps more native to this country than is the pheasant, and perhaps the possibility of them surviving over a bitter winter is a little better than the pheasant. I think they have been hunted out, because, as you all know, the partridge and the prairie chicken are not as smart as a pheasant; they are easier to hunt, they're easier to kill. Consequently, they disappear during the hunting season at a much faster rate.

There's one other item I'd like to bring up, and that's with respect to migrant waterfowl. I know my particular area is a pretty good duck hunting area. To the east of us is Buffalo Lake, which is a restricted hunting area -- this only came about 15 or 20 years ago, I believe it was. Since that time, the bird population on Buffalo Lake has really built up. So the birds have a safe place to go in the fall, and on top of that there's excellent hunting around the area for many miles.

One area in my constituency -- known as Samson Lake or Battle Lake, an area of some several thousand acres -- is just an ideal waterfowl preserve, and yet it is not a preserve. Unfortunately, every fall the hunters are out there, in boats and in every clump of grass and little island over this huge area, banging away at the ducks. And yet, if that was kept clear of hunters from a half mile back, it's just a natural, normal waterfowl sanctuary where they'd be by thousands. It's loaded with wild rice and all the requisites of an excellent area. Not only does it protect the birds, but it actually makes better hunting for the area if these places are restricted, because those birds are there and they go out to the area surrounding the lake for miles and miles.

This may also be taken in consideration for the main flyways, because I think there are certainly restricted areas in our main flyways. But some of them are not, and hunters are lining the shore, banging away every time a goose or a duck comes off the water. Perhaps consideration could be given to more sanctuaries for migrant wildfowl along the normal flyways throughout the length of Alberta.

With respect to the moose, deer, and elk population, I can't help but feel that we have to slow down and probably stop the shooting of female animals if we're going to keep the population up. I know that the argument put up is that a lot of these dry cows don't produce anything. But if you issue a licence to a hunter to shoot a female, the chances of his shooting a dry cow are no greater than his shooting a young female of one or two years that has many productive years left ahead of her.

I realize that the population is down over the province. In areas where there used to be good hunting, it's not that good any more. This may be due to the moving back of the farming area into the forest area, increase in population, increase in accessibility through skidoos and other forms of travel that aren't in the best interests of the animals themselves as far as hunters are concerned. But I think

perhaps one of the biggest factors is this shooting of females and this business of cropping them, as they call it. It's all right if you're operating a feedlot, you can do it this way. But when you have thousands of miles of forests there's no way of telling a hunter you can shoot this one, but you can't shoot that one, as far as a female animal is concerned. I think there's too much destruction of our younger females in the deer, elk and moose population.

As far as this type of program is concerned, I think the deer population seems to be able to hold its own and come back quicker than the elk and moose. I know in central Alberta, within 10 or 15 miles of town, we have excellent deer hunting. Put, speaking of compensation, most of these deer seem to live a good part off the farmers' surrounding land and I have yet to hear a farmer complain about a few deer coming in and nipping a bit of his crop.

I think the incentive program would have to be several-pronged if it is going to be successful at all. One going into each field: the upland game, deer, elk, moose, migratory birds, and so on. How this could be arranged is a question that perhaps the minister would put his mind to over the next few years. Thank you.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure this afternoon to participate in this motion presented by the hon. Member for Lacombe. I'd just like to go back into history for a while -- we've had a lot of up-to-date things in the Assembly this afternoon -- and look at some of the things that have happened in the province previously. Many discussions have been held in regard to the decline in wildlife in the province of Alberta. But was the decline a product of production or of killing? I believe it was a change in habitat or the altering of the ecological system.

We can go back many years ago when buffalo were slaughtered. Buffalo, like cattle, require summer and winter ranges, and in the pre-settlement period great fires swept the prairies, killing everything. When the buffalo disappeared from the prairies, the wolf, which depended on the buffalo, also perished. The buffalo bird, which rode on the back of the buffalo and picked a livelihood from the subcultures on the hairy backs of this animal, made an easy adaptation and today is known as the cow bird. The fire and the plough drove the whooping crane along the fatal trail of the buffalo. Settlement pressed back the elk, the moose and the pronghorn antelope.

Human predation and, more particularly, changes in the environment brought in these changes. Within the past decade there has been a dramatic illustration of the impact of the environment on game species. In the droughts of the early 1960s, the slough bottoms cracked, the duck population collapsed.

Ducks Unlimited, which is a program which started in the United States but most money is being spent in Canada, spent

approximately \$3 million in 1974 to construct dams and other control sources to stabilize water levels in waterfowl breeding areas of the province. Some 400 projects have been developed in Alberta in an effort to reduce the hazards to nesting waterfowl of drought or flooding. Numerous projects have also been developed in other provinces, particularly Saskatchewan and Manitoba. Resultant water management on private land benefits the landowner through increased water supply for livestock and irrigation supply.

With game animals, such as domestic animals, the habitat is crucial. The great shift in game population over the decades, in centuries past, has been in response to the changes of habitat and environment. Given that the environment is a crucial deterrent of game population and the survival of game species, it is a very short step, indeed, to conclude that the most single element in the future of hunting in this is the attitude of those who control the habitat. Their co-operation and, indeed, activity and committed support must be considered to an absolute end.

Figures are available -- and I picked these figures up through periodicals -- that two 500-pound elk on an Alberta ranch consume about an even amount of hay that would be consumed by a 1,000-pound steer. The presence of 100 elk on a range constitutes a subtraction of 50 head of mature cattle from the capacity of that range. The man who controls that habitat also bears the supply cost. Every grass-eating animal that he produces has a negative result on his standard of living. He is provided with a built-in incentive to minimize the number of animals he produces, and while he is paid to assault the game population on the habitat side, the Government of Alberta collects almost \$1.25 million from hunters intent to gain access to someone's land in order that they may collect free game.

We only have to look at The Wildlife Act, Mr. Speaker. Section 13 of the act states:

The property in all wildlife within the Province is vested in the Crown in right of Alberta. No person shall acquire any right of property therein otherwise than in accordance with the provision of this Act.

In short then, the wildlife resource is publicly owned, but resident on both private and public lands.

We may also want to look at the definitions of public lands under The Wildlife Act. It states:

... "occupied lands" means  
(a) privately-owned lands under cultivation or enclosed by a fence of any kind and not exceeding one section in area upon which the owner or occupant actually resides, and  
(b) any other privately-owned land which is within one mile of the section referred to in clause (a) and which is owned or leased by the same owner or

occupant.

It also goes on to state that:

No person shall hunt any wildlife [or discharge any firearm] upon or over occupied lands or enter upon such lands for the purpose of doing so, without the consent of the owner or occupant thereof.

I've tried to outline that within The Wildlife Act there is a conflict of interest between the hunter and the landowner. The object of the hunter is to acquire a relaxing hunt with reasonable territory in which there will not be severe competition for cover, so that he may have some prospect of driving cover or making a stalk without having other people interfere. He wishes to have a reasonable prospect to achieve a gratifying kill.

The object of the landowner is to run a farm or ranching operation and to maximize his income from doing so, while being reasonably free from trespassing persons whose object is at variance with his own.

As I stated in my opening comments, it is worth underlining that the disappearance of the game herd is not alarming. Mule deer have disappeared from Manitoba, and much of Saskatchewan. Grizzly bear, elk, buffalo, antelope and other species have disappeared from the historic ranges in many parts of the Canadian plains. Including pressures on habitat through industrial encroachment, land clearing, loss of quality of habitat, quite apart from the hunter pressure, can be expected to continue the trends of the past century.

I believe the questions before us are: what policies are being planned, particularly relating to privately owned land? What will ensure the maintenance and improvement of habitat? The second question would be, what policies are being planned that will satisfy the legitimate aspiration of the hunter? It's interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the Alberta Fish and Game [Association], at its convention of February, 1975, brought forth much the same resolution. It read:

Be it resolved that the Alberta Fish and Game Association recommend to the Alberta government the implementation of a tangible incentive plan to rural landowners, farmers and ranchers who effectively protect, preserve or create on their property specified portion of their land in wild, natural state for the purpose of wildlife habitat and conservation. And be it further resolved -- That such a program be encouraged by direct taxation reduction or in a yearly cash payment from the habitat fund specially so designated for qualifying participants of the program.

Their brief stated that wildlife habitat in the settled areas of the Province of Alberta has rapidly diminished since colonization began. It is still diminishing at an alarming rate. It is therefore imperative that such a program be soon developed and implemented.

It will also directly serve other purposes, for example: green areas, preventative to wind and water erosion, watershed management to alleviate deterioration of stream and flash floods, encourage re-establishment of native flora and fauna. We would suggest that the government appoint an advisory committee to formulate such a program, recommending said committee be composed of landowners, municipal authorities, fish and game representatives, and officials of the employees of the Department of Lands and Forests, which is now the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife.

This resolution was carried at the annual convention in February, 1975. It now appears we have one group in the province aware of the problems that have happened, and I am sure other groups are cognizant of this fact.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to look at some happenings in parts of the world where incentive programs have been brought forth. Most states and some provinces provide technical assistance and information to land owners and users interested in habitat development and management. Under various agricultural conservation programs, trees, shrubs, and other planting materials have been provided to landowners without cost. The program, typically, has not been very successful. As a consequence, Kentucky, Louisiana, Kansas, Mississippi, Idaho, and several other states have discontinued distribution.

In Kentucky, a follow-up survey revealed that 70 per cent of the material distributed was not planted. Other states report that even when planting was completed, the planting often was not well done, and there was little or no benefit to wildlife. A state government correspondent wrote that most states find it extremely difficult to get private landowners to undertake habitat programs when they do not receive any monetary return.

Idaho has had some success with its habitat program. A trade agreement has been worked out with two or three large livestock operators, whereby they get limited sheep and cattle grazing on some state land not crucial for wildlife. They exchange this for reduced or no livestock grazing on certain crucial big game wintering areas they own or control. The state has provided improvements beneficial to the rancher and the game herd on these private lands, and so has enhanced the ability of the land to carry game.

As I stated earlier, through Ducks Unlimited and the Canadian Wildlife Service, a program was established in 1967 to preserve waterfowl production areas and enable the wetland owners to share in the revenue attributable to the increased waterfowl. Under this program, farmers in 3 prairie provinces were paid easements based on 6 per cent of the value of the surrounding land for each acre of wetland retained. This program has achieved modest success.

Under the United States cropland adjustment program in 1965, there was a provision for cropland diversification under 5-

to 10-year contracts, and grants for permanent retirement of cropland. This program was familiarly known as green span. It was required that there should be public access for hunting, fishing, trapping, and hiking as a supplementary agreement on cropland diversion. In national terms, the green span program did not result in significant participation. Only 14 agreements to purchase and permanently retain cropland had been entered into.

In terms of cropland diversion, approximately 36 farmers in 48 states diverted 2 million acres of land under the 5- to 10-year contract. About one-quarter of this acreage was covered by the public access payment contracts, making it available for public hunting.

Although habitat programs are desirable on private lands, many fish and wildlife departments in many provinces in Canada and in many states in the United States have discontinued these programs and are concentrating exclusively on programs on publicly owned or controlled land. The State of Washington is in the planning process with respect to a pilot program designated to determine the feasibility of leasing or purchasing habitat area. They are considering this crucial to the maintenance of wildlife.

There is also a special program in a number of states which relates to hunter control. Under the fee free to hunt program, government personnel take full responsibility for patrolling certain closed areas on farmland, and in return the owner makes the best of the farmland available for public hunting. Under this so-called Williamson plan, a number of landowners grouped together and pooled and posted their land in co-operation to control hunting. Hunters must come to the farmyard and leave their cars. They are then given an assigned card by the farmer and are permitted to hunt on the land for that day. The farmer issues a limited number of green permits, by which means there is not a heavy pressure on the land. The hunter must check out of the yard the same way as he came in. These and similar systems do not provide income for landowners, but they do resolve the significant problem, which is landowner control of the hunter.

The resolution states that we should make incentives available. As I stated earlier in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Wildlife Service did initiate the wetland program. By this agreement between the farmer and the federal government, the farmer agreed not to drain or fill the marsh, or burn the surrounding marsh vegetation. This program was discontinued because it was not achieving the desired results. It was found that many farmers were violating their easements, and payments may not have encouraged some farmers to drain their wetlands rather than protecting them. Now existing easements are being honored, provided the landowner fills his end of his agreement. It is interesting to note that nearly all land immediately adjacent to water bodies is Crown land under The Public Lands Act.

The provincial government recently

moved to initiate a program for habitat development on private land through the buck for wildlife program, and it has had some results. The program was conceived to reduce the rate of habitat loss, and to improve existing habitat for all fish and wildlife in Alberta. Attempts will be made to preserve areas that presently provide habitat through leasing, easement, or purchase. Where practical, required areas may be improved for wildlife by planting bush and crop, installing dikes, water manipulation, or creating feeders. The \$1 resource development stamp required by each hunter or fisherman provides the fund for this program.

There are other ways a farmer might help, such as by controlling spring fires. I believe that, if a survey were taken, you would find a substantial number of bird habitat areas are being burnt, especially after birds have gone to nest. I think we could leave some area along road allowances, creeks, and marsh areas, when we are clearing land, especially along the marsh areas. When most of this land is cleared, it may be a very dry year, and when it comes into production the next year, it is under water.

I would hope that the hon. member's resolution does not encourage private hunting resorts in this province, because I believe we have many acres of Crown land and other areas that are still open to the hunters of Alberta. The resolution, Mr. Speaker, is good, but I believe it doesn't go far enough. Therefore, at this time, I would like to propose the following amendment to the resolution and add, after "private property owners", the words: "Crown leaseholders and industrial developers to protect wildlife".

Shall I continue with the amendment now, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is entitled to speak to both the motion and the amendment; the only member who's entitled to do so.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, by amending the resolution and including the Crown leaseholders and industrial developers, we are going to broaden the strength of this resolution, if adopted by the Assembly.

I'm particularly interested in developments in the eastern slopes and what will happen in that particular area. We have areas in the eastern slopes that are crucial for grazing of our bighorn sheep, and there's only one small area of the mountain range left for the wintering of this animal. If we allow development without any forethought, we are going to erase from the face of this province the history of the bighorn sheep.

With coal development in this area, which is a crucial development to the province, we'll have to, I propose, make incentives available to some of the companies that are going to lease these particular lands. Legislation, or regulation, may have to be offered where areas that have a concentration of game will not be developed at this time. Look at some of

the other areas where proposed production plants for a certain area [would] not be built at the present time, but a gathering system be built and taken to the proposed plant.

I'd like to look at the Milk River-Lost River wilderness area. There have been some gas companies, including a number of companies from the province, which have used gathering systems that have been in existence for several years. Once again this past winter, they began exploration. Activities resumed, supposedly to determine the limits of the gas reservoirs. The exploration activities appear to be generally confined to the Pinhorn Grazing Reserve and to the land extending to the west.

The proposed wilderness area lies east of the Pinhorn area and extends to the Lost River valley. This area probably does not overlie a significant gas reservoir, considering the number of dry holes that have been drilled there. Rugged coulees and badland bordering the Milk River and lying between the proposed wilderness areas have been disposed of for oil and gas reservations. However, access problems so far have included there . . . At these sites minimal impact was found, no construction of access roads, and satisfactory landscaping of the area. In essence, wellheads have been carefully rehabilitated.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, we have been carrying on discussion in regard to the Mackenzie Valley pipeline. In April, 1972, the federal government announced a decision to build and complete the Mackenzie highway. The federal government then stated that hearings would be held, and established by legislation an environmental impact assessment committee. They had the criteria to screen and ensure that they do the least possible damage to the environment. But within the criteria set forth, no actual statement was made in regard to protection of wildlife.

In regard to the eastern slopes, Mr. Speaker, the Public Advisory Committee on the Environment held a convention recently under the offices of the Environment Conservation Authority. The Public Advisory Committee did bring forth concerns in agreement with the resolution which we are debating today.

In view of the time, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree with the motion for adjournment?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, as to business tomorrow, we would see proceeding with second reading of bills on the Order Paper, 5 in number on pages 1 and 2, beginning with Bill No. 54, and if those are completed, move into Committee of the Whole, starting with the one at the top, No. 37, The Teachers' Retirement Fund Amendment Act, 1975. The order in which the bills will be taken will depend, to some extent, upon availability of members, but that will be the general order.

MR. SPEAKER: The chairman of the Public Accounts committee has asked me to remind hon. members, who are members of the committee, to be sure to keep in mind the meeting tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock. It's particularly important, because there

are one or two members who are unable to attend.

The Assembly stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30.

[The House rose at 5:30 p.m.]

