

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: Friday, October 29, 1976 10:00 a.m.

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is my special pleasure today to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly, in your gallery members of a very high level trade delegation from Japan. These gentlemen are the senior executive officers of some of the largest companies in Japan, if not the world. I would like to introduce them as the occasion is very important.

They are led by Mr. Makita from Nippon Kokan K.K., Mr. Hashimoto of Mitsui and Company, Mr. Aoki from Honshu Paper Company, Mr. Koide from Tokyo Electric Power Company, Mr. Kondo of the Canada-Japan Society, Mr. Kozawa of the Bank of Tokyo, Mr. Matsuo of Toyota Motor Company, Mr. Motoyama of Nippon Mining Company, Mr. Takahashi from Hitachi Ltd., and they are accompanied by the distinguished Consul General of Japan here in Alberta, Mr. Kikuchi.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence, I would like to add to the comments made by the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, on behalf of the Legislature of Alberta, our warm welcome to our visitors who are here. We have discussed in this Legislature many times the important need for Alberta to have broad horizons on an international basis, certainly to be aware of the opportunities in the Pacific Rim to follow up on our important mission to Japan in September 1972. A number of ministers will be meeting with this important delegation. I am looking forward to the discussions with them and to our luncheon visit today. I think it's a very significant part of Alberta life that we have such a distinguished group visiting us, interested in Alberta, here in the Legislative Assembly.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I should like to take the opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of the Premier, and say to our visitors from Japan how much we appreciate your visit to Alberta. It isn't on every occasion that we agree with the government, but on this particular occasion I'm pleased to say that we of the official opposition in this Legislative Assembly warmly endorse the remarks of the Premier, and we look forward to an ever-increasing relationship between your country and the province of Alberta.

head: NOTICES OF MOTIONS

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to give notice to the Assembly of the timing of debate of Government Motion No. 3. Immediately following Orders of the Day, a special debate on the matter of the constitution and Alberta's future in Confederation will begin and will take place during the afternoon and evening of this coming Monday.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 239
The Blind Persons'
Guide Dogs Act

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 239, The Blind Persons' Guide Dogs Act. The purpose of this bill is to extend certain privileges to blind persons owning guide dogs. The bill will prohibit the barring of trained guide dogs accompanying a blind person in any public accommodation, facility, or service, or in the occupancy of any self-contained dwelling unit.

[Leave granted; Bill 239 introduced and read a first time]

Bill 88
The Universities
Amendment Act, 1976

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce Bill 88, The Universities Amendment Act, 1976. The significant principle of this bill will be to seek to withdraw the services of Visitor as a function of the Lieutenant-Governor in relation to affairs at universities in Alberta.

[Leave granted; Bill 88 introduced and read a first time]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask unanimous leave of the Assembly for the Minister of Labour to introduce Bill No. 89, The Radiological Technicians Amendment Act, notwithstanding the lack of notice.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Bill 89
The Radiological
Technicians Amendment Act, 1976

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 89, an act to amend The Radiological Technicians Act, and would note that the single important principle of this bill, the repeal of Section 14, will be to provide that women who are pregnant and who are operators of radiological types of equipment in places where Xrays are used will be able to continue those operations, despite the fact of

pregnancy. The existing anomaly in the law bars them from doing so.

[Leave granted; Bill 89 introduced and read a first time]

**Bill 222
An Act to Amend
The Land Titles Act**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 222, An Act to Amend The Land Titles Act. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to eliminate the section of the present act which permits the Attorney General to exempt some selected corporations from the necessity of supplying statements regarding citizenship in the process of land purchases. What the act would do, Mr. Speaker, is close a loophole which allows some corporations to evade disclosing citizenship when purchasing Alberta land.

[Leave granted; Bill 222 introduced and read a first time]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. CRAWFORD: I would like to table the annual report of the Department of Labour for the period ending in the 1976 fiscal year.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker it gives me great pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, 34 Grades 8 and 9 students from the Chipman School in my constituency. The Chipman School is the smallest in the County of Lamont. However, it has adapted itself well to the inflationary restraint. They are well accustomed to having combined classes and class loads of more than 30 students. However, records show that there have been more recipients of the Grade 9 Governor General's medals in this school than in all the other schools in the County of Lamont put together.

Mr. Speaker, earlier in the year it was mentioned in the House about a young cyclist who was apprehended on Highway 16 for travelling at 118 kilometres per hour on his 10-speed bike. This youth, referred to as a bionic cyclist, attended the Chipman school only a couple of years ago.

Mr. Speaker, the students are accompanied today by their teacher Mrs. Zacharkiw and their principal Mr. Borys. I would ask that the students and teachers rise and receive the welcome of the House.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Suburban Growth

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question in the area of — I suppose it could be referred to as trial balloons the government sent up since the spring session with regard to municipal government in the province. First of all, I'd like to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs what steps he has taken since he released his trial balloon on satellite cities. What's the government's position specifically on satellite city development in and around the city of Calgary?

MR. NOTLEY: Still being studied.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Just studying along.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is referring I suppose to one of the scenarios for growth being considered by the Calgary Regional Planning Commission and the Edmonton Regional Planning Commission where the question of location and the decentralization of some of the residential sites in the province takes place around the cities. I'm sure last spring, as I recall, we had ample debate on the question of Airdrie Mobile Park and the development in Airdrie. Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I don't know any more specifics the hon. member is referring to.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a supplementary question to the minister. Can the minister indicate what concrete steps the Department of Municipal Affairs has taken since the spring session of this Legislature on the question of the development of satellite cities in and around Calgary?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult to react to that, because I didn't know that was a position we were taking. In many cases we've been describing phenomena experienced around metropolitan areas, such as the phenomenon in the Edmonton area where you have very substantial rates of growth being experienced in the towns of St. Albert, Devon, and Leduc. I suppose by definition these could be considered satellite cities.

Intercity Transportation

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Has the government given any consideration to having developed in Alberta rapid transportation going to Calgary and to Edmonton in the mornings and coming back in the evenings — rapid type transportation, be it on the main line of CP or some other trackage?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I recall that question was asked of the hon. Deputy Premier in the spring. I believe if you want to pursue it with him, he could probably provide more amplifications to that answer of the spring.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Transportation. Has the minister's de-

partment been doing any studies into some type of discussion between the minister's department and the federal department with CN/CP on using commuter service between say, Leduc-Edmonton, Fort Saskatchewan-Edmonton, St. Albert-Edmonton? Have any studies been done in this area?

DR. HORNER: Well, Mr. Speaker, there have been all kinds of studies done in a variety of the areas that the hon. member is talking about, most of which have either been tabled or are certainly public documents. Earlier we tabled a preliminary assessment done by CP rail relative to the Edmonton-Calgary corridor.

The whole question of commuter service between the city of Edmonton and the surrounding communities was the subject of a study done more recently relative to busing. The question of the use of rail as a commuter system, such as is happening in the Toronto area where you have the Go-trains, et cetera — everybody, of course, is looking at it. So far it requires a very substantial population to make them anywhere near economic in any sense. So while I think we should preserve those rights-of-way for future considerations in rapid transit in the metropolitan areas of both Edmonton and Calgary, I wouldn't see that as of prime importance in the immediate future.

The question of Edmonton-Calgary service by a variety of modes is a compilation that my department is now finalizing. I would hope that finalization would be done very shortly, then that document can be made public. It just assesses the various modes we now have in place. The initial conclusion one draws from it is, in fact, that we have a pretty good transportation system between Edmonton and Calgary at the moment.

Suburban Growth

(continued)

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. In the light of the concern expressed in the Land Use report about urban sprawl over valuable farm land, have any studies been done on the impact that the growth of satellite cities, bedroom communities, whatever you want to call them, has on good agricultural land?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would have to say I can't answer the question. There could have been a substantial number of these studies which are always being considered by the regional planning commissions. I haven't got it at my finger tips, but there are none directly through my department that I can recall.

MR. NOTLEY: A further supplementary question to the hon. minister. With respect to future growth patterns of urban centres, has the government given any consideration to whether, through incentives, regulations, what have you, future growth should be in areas that are primarily unproductive from an agricultural point of view?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, Mr. Speaker. During our considerations, both in terms of the deliberations in front of metropolitan affairs and our considerations with

respect to annexations, that is very actively debated amongst the members and my colleagues.

Intercity Transportation

(continued)

MR. TAYLOR: Supplementary to the hon. Minister of Transportation. Isn't PWA just about the fastest service possible between Calgary and Edmonton?

DR. HORNER: It certainly is, Mr. Speaker, and doing very well.

MR. NOTLEY: How about the dirigibles?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Who pays the deficit?

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Transportation, and this is along the line of transportation. I know a fair amount of money has been spent on the study of bus service between the so-called satellite towns and the city of Edmonton. Can the minister enlarge on what some of these studies have indicated on bus service that's required from satellite towns to the city?

DR. HORNER: Well, Mr. Speaker, at the risk of repeating myself, because this was done at the spring session as well, the studies essentially showed that the demands by people were in the Sherwood Park area only, and that people in the Leduc, Spruce Grove, Fort Saskatchewan, Stony Plain areas didn't indicate any need for a commuter bus service at the present time.

Land Speculation Tax

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Minister of Housing and Public Works. What is the government's position on the question that was very dear to the minister's heart some months ago, the question of some sort of tax on land speculation?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition has much insight as to what's dear to my heart.

It's obvious there are very difficult issues that any government has to face at one point or another. Indeed during the course of the last election, this government indicated that we would study and review the aspects of the land speculation tax in other jurisdictions and, if appropriate and desirable, some consideration would be given to possible directions in this area.

I can only advise that as a result of that initiative during the course of the election, the matter is being studied in all its ramifications and depth. After the study is completed and all aspects are examined, I'm sure this government will make the appropriate decisions.

MR. CLARK: I would like to ask the minister if he can elaborate on the type of study being done. Is it being done just within the minister's department, a variety

of government departments? What kind of outside input has been sought by the government to date in the course of these studies the minister refers to?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, I think I've indicated publicly that interdepartmental officials are involved in the examination. It's an in-house examination and may be termed more an examination than a study of any great analysis, if you wish. In association with the examination, all the literature that's available from all other jurisdictions in regard to the whole area of land taxation is available and put together, and is examined with respect to the examination.

I must indicate again, Mr. Speaker, that this whole area is not a simple matter; it's a very complex matter. It has long-term and short-term influences and ramifications and stimuli. So indeed it isn't a case of just looking at something for a matter of a month or two and coming forth with some sort of inappropriate or inadequate decision.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a follow-up question to the minister. In light of the type of study the minister talks about, is the minister in a position to give us now, in general terms, the guidelines that have been given to the interdepartmental group that is in fact doing this study?

MR. YURKO: Well, Mr. Speaker, the guidelines are very broad and flexible. As everybody knows, a Land Use Forum report was put together, which looked at the whole area of land in all its dimensions. Indeed the chairman of that study is involved with the interdepartmental study so that his experience is directly used as an input in this interdepartmental examination. Nevertheless, as I indicated to begin with, the guidelines, if that's what you wish to call them, are very flexible and fairly broad.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Are the guidelines so flexible and broad that they only refer to the Land Use Forum's recommendations?

MR. NOTLEY: They go beyond that.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, I thought I indicated that the information from various jurisdictions was obtained and assembled and is being examined. Indeed such information may or may not go beyond that examined by the Land Use Forum.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in this exercise of frustration can the minister indicate to the Assembly when in the world we'll receive this airy-fairy report?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, I didn't suggest for one minute that a report would indeed be produced, if that's what the hon. member is looking for. I said an in-depth examination was going on. Indeed a number of memorandums, reports, summations, and proposals might be put forth, but as far as I'm concerned there will not be any sort of formal report put out that the hon. member may have access to.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. When does the minister expect the government will start to receive the benefit of this paper blizzard and make a decision?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, the government always receives the benefit of in-house examinations during the course of the examinations. So indeed the government is constantly a party to the information being generated in this area.

St. Paul Auction Mart

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. It flows from Written Question 208 concerning the St. Paul Auction Mart guarantee.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is: can he advise the Assembly why the government did not consider it wise to proceed with bankruptcy proceedings against the company in order to collect as much of the outstanding guarantee as possible?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question will involve some detail. I would like to review the matter and respond to the question fully, perhaps Monday or Tuesday of next week.

Heritage Fund Investments

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Has the government received applications from other provinces or the federal government for investments from the Alberta heritage fund?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, since discussions of that nature have been those that I have been involved with rather than the minister, I should perhaps respond to the hon. Member for Drumheller.

The only discussions along these lines, and they were very preliminary, were with the Government of Newfoundland with regard to the proposed power project, the lower Churchill power project. As the hon. member is probably well aware, there is a very critical and important dispute between the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Quebec. It would appear that the Government of Newfoundland's position at the present time is to attempt to resolve that matter first. So there has been some delay in the development of the lower Churchill project. If we get involved, of course, it would be essentially on a debt-financing basis under commercial terms.

The only other project that has been discussed in any significant way, but not by myself, has been the Bay of Fundy project of energy financing in the province of Nova Scotia. In that case the discussion really evolved around questions by journalists directed to me, not any approach by the government involved.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Has there been any discussion at premiers' conferences of interprovincial co-operation on various projects where money would come from one province but would be invested in another province?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, no, nothing that would come within that framework.

Beekeepers' Commission

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Could the minister indicate whether there are any plans in the works for an organization to replace the Alberta Beekeepers' Commission?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, no, not that I'm aware of.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As a result of the disbanding of the commission, does the government have plans for any new research programs for the honey industry in Alberta?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, we're only now in the process of winding up the affairs of the Alberta Beekeepers' Commission. After that is completed I will be having discussions with the Alberta beekeepers' association relative to what efforts they might like to make in co-operation with the government in terms of research and a variety of other areas.

Manalta Coal Mine

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. It's a follow-up to the question I asked the other day. Could the minister indicate the present status of the Manalta coal mine?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member is referring to the Manalta coal mine in the general Forestburg area. I had an opportunity yesterday to discuss that mine with the officials of Manalta. They advised me they are negotiating with Alberta Power an arrangement whereby they would continue to operate the mine on a contract basis, but Alberta Power may in fact purchase the actual coal reserves.

The hon. Member for Stettler has raised this matter with me in the past regarding the possibility of local purchases of coal being in some way prejudiced by this transaction. I'm advised that there will be adequate supplies for local purchasers, either from the Luscar mine operation in the area, the existing Manalta mine, or perhaps even a new Sheerness mine further to the south, but local purchasers will be adequately supplied.

Coal Survey — Bow City

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question to the hon. minister, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister had any results from the coal survey study that CanPac has had at Bow City?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, in the course of the cabinet tour in southern Alberta, I made it a point to be sure to see Bow City. You can spot it from a long way off. There are many tall buildings there, and I mentioned that to the hon. Member for Bow Valley.

Mr. Speaker, I have not had any information passed to me yet as a result of the studies being carried on on the coal deposits in that area.

Flu Vaccine

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Mr. Speaker, this is a follow-up to a question which was asked a week or two ago.

Can the minister indicate what the status of the swine flu vaccination program is in the province?

MISS HUNLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can. The status is unchanged, contrary to the very irresponsible news release that came over a national network earlier this week. The status is that the vaccine has not yet been delivered to any of the provinces, and when it is, we will proceed with our plans we have in place.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has the minister established the priorities as to who will receive the vaccination first, and will it cover all Albertans?

MISS HUNLEY: No, it is not our intention for it to cover all Albertans. The hon. member will perhaps remember that it is not recommended for children. Also, it has not been recommended as necessary for those in the middle-age group, such as me. The target risks are those over 65, but primarily even those will be those with chronic illnesses. They will be handled by the local health units and boards of health.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, is the minister in a position to indicate when the program will be initiated?

MISS HUNLEY: No, I'm not, Mr. Speaker. The program will be initiated when the vaccine arrives. We don't have a date yet, although we anticipate that delivery date will be soon. But we can't get a firm date of delivery yet.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. minister. If the vaccine is very much longer in coming, will it be effective in combatting swine flu which normally reaches its peak in September and October?

MISS HUNLEY: I think it's important that we understand that we do not have swine flu at the present time. The flu that people have is not that particular strain which is causing us so much concern. Flu will continue, but the swine flu, as it's called, is not at present — we have no notice that there is any anywhere in the world, much less in North America. Our original intent was to treat the chronically ill and those who were what I call a target group almost immediately when the bivalent vaccine arrives. That is still our intention. We think they are our top priority and must receive it immediately.

We were giving consideration to holding the other, and monitoring to see if any outbreak occurs anywhere. We are now rethinking that as a result of the meeting last week of our advisors and the advisory committee in Ottawa as to whether or not, as supplies become available, they should start allocating them on a pro rata basis.

MR. TAYLOR: A further supplementary to the hon. minister. Would the hon. minister be able to tell us if

swine flu would retard the ordinary flu or the ordinary cold?

MISS HUNLEY: I'm not sure I understood the question. Would the hon. Member for Drumheller please repeat it?

MR. TAYLOR: Would the hon. minister be able to tell us if the vaccine for swine flu would be effective in retarding or preventing ordinary flu or the ordinary common cold?

MISS HUNLEY: I don't profess to be an expert in that. It certainly would be useful, and that's why we feel it's advisable. We will give it immediately to those who are chronically ill, as soon as it's available, because it is very helpful.

Women's Rights

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Labour. It flows from the weekend conference of the Alberta Status of Women Action Committee. I wonder if the minister is in a position to advise the House what the position of the Government of Alberta is with respect to affirmative action [inaudible].

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member could try again. The microphone wasn't working too well at the end of his remarks, and I had reason to believe that wasn't the only reason I didn't receive his message with great . . .

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd be glad to rephrase the question. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. minister if he could advise the Assembly what the position of the Alberta government is with respect to the principle of affirmative action as suggested by the Status of Women Action Committee.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, because the question is directed to me, I know the hon. member is interested in having me canvass it from the point of view of human rights in the general sense, equality of opportunity, and the like. As minister responsible for the Human Rights Commission those considerations are often in my office.

Mr. Speaker, I think the answer to the hon. member's question is: the actual formal brief that the status of women group offered to the government a few weeks ago has not been formally or fully replied to. We indicated to them at that time that all the points raised would be responded to in due course. But at the present time I think I would only say that the meeting we had with them was one that we thought had a lot of good, strong points and favorable input from the women's groups, and they definitely have the attention of the government on those points.

If the hon. member wants to define one or another of the areas he's speaking of when he refers to affirmative action, I would either try to be more specific or repeat this answer.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I'm delighted that the minister had such an excellent meeting. My question relates to affirmative

action as it relates to making changes in The Individual's Rights Protection Act. Has the government or the minister received any representation from either the Human Rights Commission, members of the commission, or any other agencies requesting legislative changes that would relate to affirmative action?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I certainly have received official representations from the Alberta Human Rights Commission suggesting some basic and some not so basic, in other words major and minor, matters that might be dealt with in the area of The Individual's Rights Protection Act. I indicated to them that we wouldn't be responding to them until after some time had gone by because of the wide area covered by some of the proposals. By that of course I mean it's a matter of the entire government caucus having an opportunity to get that particular item of business, which only came to hand late this summer in my discussions with the commission, and give the caucus an opportunity to deal with it.

I could add that in the proposals — and I will not go into detail about what the proposals from the commission are at the present time — were included some matters that certainly would bear directly upon the rights and opportunities for women in Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Does the government accept the principle or the assumption that affirmative action is necessary if opportunities are going to be found for women in the work force?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, once again I am having just a little bit of trouble with whether or not the hon. member and I are using the same reference to the words "affirmative action". I am one of those who has noted for some five years now that there has been a great deal of affirmative action in the province of Alberta on a great many fronts. If by affirmative action he includes matters like positive discrimination, for example, I would say that we are very, very interested in the application of that principle in the right areas.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister for clarification. Would it be a correct statement of the government's policy, Mr. Minister, that in terms of positive discrimination in certain areas, the government would generally favor that approach?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, from the way the hon. member put his question, I think I could certainly say yes. I would like to add that it's in the overall context of the proposals the Human Rights Commission has made, as well as the experience the government has had with the operation of the existing act up to the present time, that leaves us in the position where our judgments are that there will be occasions where positive discrimination is justified. When the timing is right — after the proper consideration has been given, which is a matter I referred to previously — we would no doubt move in the area of some positive discrimination.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one supplementary question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Bearing in

mind the comments made by the hon. Minister of Labour, what steps does the government propose to take with respect to affirmative action, positive discrimination, call it what you will, within the Alberta public service?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad the hon. member asked that question because it gives me the opportunity of reviewing this government's policy in this area over the past years.

MR. NOTLEY: No more than five minutes.

MR. LEITCH: I'm sure the hon. member will applaud the efforts this government has taken and the leadership it has shown in appointing women to the various boards, agencies, and bodies, and that we have the important capacity.

The hon. member will also remember that earlier this year I advised members of the Legislative Assembly that on applications for senior positions within government, that is within the civil service, we found that a higher percentage of women applicants had been successful than the percentage of men who had applied.

With respect to affirmative action, one of the areas we're now considering — one of the disappointments that we've had, Mr. Speaker, is the lack of applications from women for these positions. One of the areas we are now exploring, and I've had discussions with the Public Service Commissioner about this, is taking affirmative action by perhaps interviewing all the women in the civil service who are now holding senior and middle management positions, endeavoring to encourage them to make application for the more senior positions as they become available.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order and speaking of discrimination. Mr. Speaker, is there any significance to the fact that the Member for Spirit River-Fairview has a red light on his broadcasting thing, or did he request a red light?

MR. NOTLEY: As long as it isn't blue.

MR. SPEAKER: I was going to make an observation in this regard at the end of the question period. The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview has not requested any notoriety of that kind. I don't know how the red light got there. All hon. members of this Assembly are entitled to have the green light and when the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview's light goes on, until it's changed, I'll be seeing green.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, maybe the light has a message for the hon. member.
[laughter]

Municipal Government — Calgary

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, after that exchange I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and ask if he's had discussions with officials of the city of Calgary regarding changes in the appropriate legislation that would make it possible for single aldermanic wards in the city of Calgary.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, answering the question directly I have not had discussions with the officials. I have had correspondence, and I'm sure if the hon. Leader of the Opposition is patient till Monday he'll find that reflected in our proposed amendment.

MR. CLARK: Would you repeat that? Did the minister indicate that legislation will be coming forward at this fall session that would make it possible for single aldermanic wards in the city of Calgary?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we will be amending The Municipal Government Act with respect to the ward system.

MR. CLARK: When?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, this fall.

Safety Inspectors

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour with regard to The Occupational Health and Safety Act. I'd like to ask the minister if his department has hired the 15 inspectors that were proposed in the spring session.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, very significant progress is being made in meeting the anticipated new staff requirements for the branch of the department dealing with occupational health and safety. I would have to check to see to what extent that recruiting has been completed. We have had a very vigorous effort in that regard since spring. I could find out for the hon. member.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Is the minister or his department developing a training program for these personnel at present?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I don't know to what extent it will be necessary to train people who come on strength basically as professionals. The question of retraining staff may apply to some inspectors who will be taking on duties that are new to them. There will be some of that. Of course on-the-job training is something that takes place in the sense of the experience that a person has in the work over a period time. But no specific training programs for new fully qualified recruits are anticipated.

Airship Study

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Transportation. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Transportation could outline to the House, in view of the recent publicity on the return of the dirigibles and making Alberta the airship capital of the world, what field, what opportunity he sees in this province for that particular mode of transportation.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, essentially the tabling of the document on Monday — and it took some time for

even the honorable gentleman to find out it was tabled — was a study done by some Calgary consultants for the former Minister of Mines and Minerals relative to an alternative to the transportation of natural gas from isolated areas. A number of private people have expressed a great deal of interest in this form of transportation and had asked me to make the study public so they could follow up themselves relative to this means of transportation. I just feel it is useful that we in the transportation department should be aware of other modes that might be useful to us in the coming years.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Are the private concerns that are showing some interest in airship development primarily locally based, or is this part of a worldwide interest among certain airship enthusiasts in bringing back this mode of transportation?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, essentially two groups in the world are working in a major way — that's in Germany and England — but the people who have approached me are local Albertans who have some imagination and want to carry it on. I don't think we should put any roadblocks in their way.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair]

head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS** head: (Committee of Supply)

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee of Supply will come to order. If you would turn to the Alberta heritage savings trust fund, capital projects document.

Grazing Reserves Development

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could ask the Associate Minister of Energy and Natural Resources to advise the committee what priorities he sees in the next few years on the development of grazing reserves. We are allocating a million dollars this year. Does he see this as an ongoing commitment from the heritage trust fund? Does he see it being increased in the future? There are obviously going to be some limitations as to the amount of clearing we can do. Perhaps the minister would just take a moment or two to outline to the Assembly what the government has in mind in terms of opening up additional grazing reserves in the province.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Chairman, in regard to the appropriation of \$1 million for a study for the plan of grazing reserves throughout the province. In reply to the question, it will be an ongoing program on a 10-year basis. It is our intention and our hope that in that 10-year program we should close to double the grazing reserves within the province, based mainly in the northern part of the province and in some of the

gray-wooded soils in west-central and northeastern Alberta. At the present time the total grazing reserves in the province number 18. It is our hope that perhaps over the ongoing 10-year program we can add a minimum of 12 to 15, depending on need and availability of suitable land.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. minister would give us a little additional information. The last three or four years, but not this fall, I have had farmers who were very concerned because they couldn't get cattle into grazing reserves. I am wondering if the backlog has been caught up with at the present time, or if there is still a pretty severe need we are not able to meet.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Chairman, in response to the hon. member, that is a fact. Of the 18 grazing reserves in existence, we are handling a large number of animal units, but the demand at the present time is exceeding the facilities we have. Because of the shift basically in cattle populations throughout the province and the growth of the livestock industry, which basically because of the type and the use of land lies mainly from Red Deer north, the investment for grazing reserves presented before you is being considered for the use of land that has a productive capacity in the forage area, to provide this land and make it available to individuals in the livestock industry who then have the opportunity on a fee-to-serve basis to utilize Crown Land, in this case to its best agricultural productive capacity. It gives them the opportunity to further diversify and concentrate on their own deeded land, which at the present time is not possible because they're keeping it for pasture purposes. This diversification of their own deeded lands should relieve the individual of certain financial responsibilities and should consolidate both him as an individual and the industry as a whole.

We have some 10 million acres available under Crown holding, which in most cases has some potential for grazing. The million dollars stipulated in the appropriation gives the department the opportunity to commence a study that would designate those areas because of need, suitability of the existing available land, access that would be available to the property to make it usable to the individuals. It is our hope that after the initial stage and initial study on the ongoing program — perhaps because of the conditions of clearing of land, the breaking and reseeding is dependent not only on season but on the amount of moisture during that season — that perhaps we could have as high as three to four grazing leases on stream at one time in varying degrees of construction and completion.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I'm very heartened to hear the hon. minister's words. While some people object to studies, I think there's a proper place for them. I would hope that the studies the hon. minister mentioned will result in the grazing reserves being placed strategically throughout the province, so they'll be available and not too far from any particular area that is active in raising cattle. I think this is a very splendid program and should really mean a great deal to the province as a whole in the years to come.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, a couple of questions to the minister with regards to the study. Are the studies going to be carried on by the department? Will this million dollars be spent within the department, or will outside consultants or persons be hired to do the studies? I want to ask the minister also, what type of new information is he looking for, or is the government looking for, in studies such as this? I'm sure the department has reviewed this matter, has looked at it, knows the quality of soil, and has much information. I raise the question: why would \$1 million be spent on further studies?

The other part of the question is relative to capital input to such projects — where does the money fit in? And where does the operational budget to perform the plowing, the reseeding, fit in? Will that be in your budget in the coming spring session?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the misuse of the word "study" denotes exactly the many connotations "study" denotes. Perhaps we should call it planning. It is the intention that the expertise we have, not only within the department of lands but the other agencies that will be involved, have sufficient knowledge — the material that has been gathered at the present time in regards to the land, its capabilities, its use, demands. The million dollars, basically, will go towards the overall plan of the total program. The ongoing capital expenditure will be funded over a period of 10 years through the capital division of the heritage trust fund. It is estimated that the total program over the 10-year period, including the \$1 million to start the program, should meet \$26 million over the 10 years. I would hope that the majority of the material to provide this plan already exists or can be done with the departments we have at hand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we have the permission of the committee to revert to introduction of visitors?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS** (reversion)

MR. STROMBERG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Today it's quite an honor for me — and I'm not going to make the mistake I made yesterday in Introduction of Special Guests. I have my old home town school with their 20 students, their principal Mr. Wiberg, and their bus driver Mr. Sielemann with us today. They are sitting in the public gallery.

MR. CLARK: Are they as proud as you are?

MR. STROMBERG: Well, I don't know if it's something to be proud of or if it's a plus for the New Norway School that I graduated from it. But I would ask them to rise and be recognized by the members of this Assembly.

head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS** head: **(Committee of Supply)** (continued)

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, from the remarks the minister made, I had the feeling that the development of these reserves would be mainly Edmonton and north. From the comments of the Member for Drumheller, I got some feeling about diversity or spreading the reserves across the province. Could the minister be a little more specific on potential location of reserves?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Chairman, I guess that is part of the \$1 million allocated for basic planning. I mentioned the north basically because it has the largest potential of land for the use we wish. I would think that over the period of the next year, in setting up the basic plan, one would have to look at need and availability. Rather than state — because at the present time I cannot state the exact locations where grazing reserves will be established — that the program will not be one hundred per cent tied to the north, if need exists in other areas, it will be part and parcel of the planning.

But I think it's fair to state that of the 18 existing grazing reserves in this province, only three are located in the northern part of the province. There are 10 in the central part of the province and we have five in the south. I don't think numbers really denote the need and use of the land because there are many grazing associations, 89 in number, scattered throughout the province. Land in the southern part of the province is probably more diversified from an agricultural point of view, and Crown land is being used to its full extent whether it be on an individual lease or whether it be an association or a grazing reserve. But the basic plan that is arrived at will look at need, the area, and the consolidation of sufficient land in an area to provide that necessary service.

I would have to say at this time that areas of this province are not excluded because of their location but because of the type of land and its capabilities. The chances of more grazing reserves being established in west-central and northern parts of the province are probably greater than in the south.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, a last question for clarification. Pastures or land that can be irrigated and turned into pastures would qualify under this particular vote: is that a correct assumption?

MR. SCHMIDT: On a broad view, I think any grazing reserve that could provide potential for the agricultural — and in this case the livestock industry — that could serve as many people as possible, regardless of its area or its use, would fit under this policy.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, on October 25, I had an opportunity, along with the minister responsible for native affairs, the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife, and the Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray, to be in Peace River at an all chiefs conference of Treaty No. 8. Some 25 bands were represented. A request was made that the government and the minister responsible for lands give consideration in the planning process that Indian reserves be considered under this program of devel-

opment of grazing reserves.

I wonder, first of all, if any consideration is being given in the study to this land being used for that purpose, or to co-operation between the government and the bands to provide the same benefits to them as to other Albertans.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Chairman, the study has not really started in earnest. I can assure you that consideration will be given to all Albertans.

MR. ZANDER: I wonder if the minister would consider, in some of the areas that are now over-utilizing the existing grazing areas, and I'm thinking of two in particular, funnelling some of these funds into extending these, if the Crown land is available in the area, to enlarge them or at least make the area more productive. In some of these areas the cattle coming in are not coming from a 10-mile or 20-mile radius which had been proposed before, but are coming in from an area of some 200 or 300 miles around. Therefore some of the people who are living within the 20- or 30-mile area cannot fully utilize their potential in the community.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Chairman, certainly consideration will have to be given to existing small grazing reserves that have a potential for enlargement. The total program will also have to consider the use of local personnel to help not only in the planning and administration [but] in the running. The total plan will also have to look to its end use and primarily grazing reserves in an area. Some priority should be taken or reached for those people in the industry who live within the basic area that's within reason of reaching grazing reserves. If their capacity in animal units that can be handled is greater than the locale, I see no reason for livestock not being brought in from further afield. The intent is to enhance, supplement, and make viable an industry that has a fantastic future in this province.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, just reverting to the part of the estimate which refers to location. I note the Member for Little Bow has expressed whether this was to be isolated to the northern area of the province. The hon. minister gave the answer that this was not necessarily so. However, I'd like to emphasize the fact that it is very essential that the gray-wooded areas in the north receive consideration in this, to a large extent, because now we have the situation where a number of people are engaged in livestock industry, and they are using some of their limited acreage for pasture purposes.

If they want to diversify into the growing of grains, forage, grass seed, rapeseed, or whatever, this probably would mean they would have to cut down on their herds. I think that increase in the grazing reserves development would be of great benefit to the type of people who want to keep their herds if possible, awaiting a better situation in the livestock market, and diversify into other areas of farming as well. So I do hope very serious consideration will be given to increasing the number of public grazing reserves in the northern area of the province.

I note what the Member for Little Bow said about possibly creating reserves in irrigation areas. I think this is probably legitimate. But comparing the \$1

million in this estimate with the start of the irrigation program — \$14 million, and that's only a start — I can see it's quite a difference as far as funding is concerned. I think that creating grazing reserves would be an entirely different thing that we would have to consider. So I would like to emphasize that I would like to see a further increase in the number of grazing reserves in the northern area of the province.

MR. NOTLEY: First of all, I would like to say that I certainly agree with the comments made by the Member for Athabasca.

I would like to put several questions to the minister, but before I do that, just a comment or two. There really is no doubt that there is a need for more grazing reserves in northern Alberta. I had a number of constituents complain to me — for example, in the vicinity of the grazing reserve north of Wanham — that the number of cattle they've been able to put on the reserve has been seriously cut because of the broad area and the needs of the overall area. Of course the question they raise is a very proper one: we need more grazing reserves. We need to expand the facilities we already have, or to improve them. So as far as I'm concerned I think the primary emphasis of this program would have to be in the northern part of the province. I can appreciate that in other parts of Alberta there may be need for it, but I think the primary emphasis has to be in northern Alberta.

The other day when we were on the Boundaries Commission, both the minister and I drove from Hanna up to Coronation through the special areas, and I couldn't help but be quite impressed. I've been in that area many times, but [on] this occasion the gentleman who drove us was one of the officials of the special areas. He went into a pretty detailed description of just how the lease arrangement works, has worked, and the benefits that accrue to leaseholders in that part of the province.

I am not here today to denigrate that program. I think that's an excellent program. Aspects of it have been voiced on a number of occasions by the former Member for Hanna-Oyen, Mr. French. Mr. Butler and Mr. Kroeger on occasion have raised questions on it. So in terms of a well-established program in a major cattle producing part of western Canada, the special areas provide grazing land at a reasonable cost.

But I hearken back to the point the Member for Athabasca raised. A young farmer in northern Alberta who has to use his own deeded land, or a large part of it, for pasture purposes to get into cattle, is in a sense almost at a disadvantage. We can't right that disadvantage in a single stroke of the pen, but we can make it somewhat fairer, in my judgment, by expanding grazing reserves. That's why I think we are concerned, and I'm sure most of us are, about the cattle industry in the north. I'm not one of those people who says the cattle industry should only be concentrated in the eastern or southern parts of the province. I think there is an important role for the cattle industry in northern Alberta.

That being the case, one of the primary facets of our efforts to diversify northern Alberta agriculture, to make sure that people who have been primarily grain farmers, who were encouraged in the late '60s to go into cattle and are now into that business — that they can continue. So when they come out of the valleys

and begin to reach the peaks again, they can share in some of those peaks. As the Member for Athabasca pointed out, one of the ingredients of doing that, it seems to me, is the grazing reserve program.

I can understand the points outlined by other members. I think the primary emphasis has to be, as described here, in the gray-wooded regions of the province: in northwestern Alberta and the western Drayton Valley area, that part of Alberta.

The only question I would put to the minister, and I would ask him to respond, because as MLAs we are continually receiving requests from various people about additional grazing reserves: I wonder if you could be a little more specific about the planning process. You mentioned 12 to 15 additional reserves. Obviously you're going to be dealing with the ADC committees, but perhaps you might just outline for the members how quickly you see moving ahead in the next 10 years. You mentioned 12 or 15 additional grazing reserves in the period of a decade. Are we going to look at one or two or three a year? What will the process be when people come to the members for Drayton Valley, Athabasca, to me, or what have you, and say, we want to go ahead with a grazing reserve. Obviously you say, okay, part of that function has to be assessed by the local ADC committee. What are the steps beyond the local committee?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to receive the concurrence of all members that we have certainly made a step in a wise investment, and that they agree with the direction we're going.

May I say that the area is not defined and stipulated in the statement for the same basic reason: because of need changes because it's a long-range program. First, the capability of land assembly — the amounts of marginal land that have a productive capacity denote that the north will certainly have a priority. It's difficult to give the total planning of the direction we will be going when we're looking at the passing of the appropriation that sets up the basic plan. But I would hope by the year 1978, which gives us one year of basic planning, we would be in a position perhaps to announce and perhaps to start a maximum of four, dependent upon the availability of labor, machinery, and because we are limited to winter clearing, early summer breaking, and spring and summer seeding, with an ongoing announcement of two each preceding year, carrying on with the capital improvement of each on a staged program. So hopefully we could make available to those that are started a minimum use over the period of years and, as we improve, reach a maximum stage of its total potential.

Limits on the rate of growth will be tied, first of all, to the moneys available to us for the capital improvement program on a yearly basis. But after the original plan, with the announcement we hope of a maximum of four, perhaps our limits would be tied closer to two a year not only because of money but the physical aspects of doing the actual work itself.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, I was just wondering if any consideration has been given to a block of grass in the southeast part of the province, the Suffield Block. There's approximately 1,000 square miles or 600,000 acres in this block that's certainly not being utilized at this point. I think one of the

reasons it's not being utilized — and I realize that it's under federal government jurisdiction and the British Army is in there which is certainly destroying a lot of our grass. There's a heavy growth of grass and they're starting fires down there with their tracers, which is killing the crowns of our grass. The specimens of grass that are coming back certainly aren't palatable for livestock.

A consultants' report — I don't know if the minister has seen it — was made down there. They say that most of the deterioration of grass down there was the result of cattle deteriorating the land, cattle going to water and eroding the land. I certainly think that's a fallacy.

I was wondering if the minister has given any consideration, as far as the planning is concerned, to getting this block for — it could be for multi-use. We could use it for army training and get a portion of the block to use for a reserve for our stock-growers in this province.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Chairman, we are aware of the capabilities of the Suffield Block. The announcement of the grazing reserve program does not mean that we will not be doing everything within our power to provide grazing over and above. If some arrangement can be made between the federal government and the provincial government for the use of the Suffield Block for grazing for Alberta residents, we would certainly put every effort towards that end.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to inquire of the minister if consideration is being given to the sheep producers of Alberta in the planning of these community pastures?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Chairman, I might announce that the sheep producers are being taken care of and are being utilized in the existing grazing reserves at the present time.

Certainly it has proven in the past that they are compatible. The numbers I can give you basically are: we have three grazing reserves that are now on dual use, in other words, sheep and cattle. We are running approximately 6,000 head of sheep; 40 individual users provide that many head. But it's not a problem. It's something that can be utilized on a togetherness and an ongoing basis, and it is being considered.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, as Minister of Agriculture I would like to address a few remarks to the committee with regard to this program. First of all I'd like to say to all members that we've been discussing in this Legislature, and as a government we've been working very hard in and outside the Legislature, to improve the position of our beef producers over the course of the last two or three years.

Most of the public attention in that regard has been focused on the market price. Everyone knows the market price, regardless of production cost, is simply not bringing a return. One of the things we can't forget is that although the market price is poor, we need to continue to try to assist wherever we can in ensuring that production costs are as low as possible.

In that regard, the Department of Agriculture, the lands division, and others have been involved in a variety of programs to assist in forage improvement,

better utilization of land, better utilization of forage for winter feed, and that type of thing. It's in that context that we were able to identify some pretty extreme differences in this province between operators in northern and central and southern Alberta. Indeed one of the differences is that operators — in many cases rather large operators — in the southern part of the province have access to public grazing land. In many cases that access came about one or two generations back.

What this program is really trying to do is look at the total context of our beef producers in Alberta and create a situation, as much as we possibly can, where each has an equal opportunity in terms of the use of public land. All hon. members know that for many years this government and the previous one as well has protected the price of public grazing land in Alberta by providing it at a pretty reasonable rate in terms of what might be offered if you were to put it on the open market for lease to whoever wanted it.

Having identified some of those problems, it became pretty clear that a lot of our smaller operators, not just in what might be considered the area north of Edmonton but certainly in the fringe areas of the province where cereal production is not possible, where the land is tree covered, did not have the same kind of opportunity and access to public grazing lands as they did in other parts of the province.

I think most hon. members understand that an individual with a 50- to 75-cow herd doesn't have the ability to obtain a large grazing lease, often doesn't have the ability because of the lack of available land or the lack of funds in his own operation to go out and form a community pasture association and proceed in that manner. The feeling is that one of the best ways you can assist smaller operators in many parts of this province is to provide summer pasture so that they in turn can utilize their own deeded land in a better way. I know of many operators who can take some of their deeded land and indeed cereal grains on it, or forage for winter feed.

This program of providing some of those small operators with four or five months' summer pasture so they can better utilize their own deeded land is indeed one that I think will do a lot for the beef cattle industry in many parts of our province. I certainly agree with some of the hon. members who suggested that much of Alberta, and indeed the northern part as well, is capable of and should be in the beef cattle industry. Indeed, if you look at the land capability in this province today, you'll find that we have under cultivation about 28 million acres in total. Of that 28 million acres, 6 to 8 million acres must always be in forage; at least that's the recommendation, and indeed it often comes close to that.

People ask why we need the beef cattle industry. We need it because our land base is such that 6 to 8 million cultivated acres need to be forage. There are some things we can do with forage besides feed it to beef cattle, but in the main that land production is going to go into the beef cattle industry.

Mr. Chairman, I think it's pretty exciting if, over the course of the next 8 to 10 years, we're able to provide \$20 to \$25 million through the heritage savings trust fund to improve that industry, to put it in a better position the next time we have difficulties like we've had the last two or three years. It's particularly important to me that we're able to do that through the

heritage savings trust fund, Mr. Chairman, because I doubt we would have an opportunity to make this kind of move if it were not for the capital projects division of the heritage savings trust fund.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, to the minister, it's sure nice that this government is now going to help all the cattle producers of Alberta.

Thank you.

Agreed to:

Grazing Reserves Development

\$1,000,000

Land Reclamation

MR. JAMISON: Mr. Chairman, before I say something on land reclamation, I would like to reiterate the remarks of the hon. Minister of the Environment. We are discussing today, and have been for the last couple of days, the capital projects division of the Alberta heritage trust account. I really want the Member for Clover Bar, if he's awake — this heritage trust account is the only heritage trust account, I believe, in the world. I'm very proud to be part of a government that had good business management to set aside funds from a depleting resource and put them into a heritage trust account for our future generations.

As the Minister of the Environment said last night, we've had studies done, we've had studies on top of studies. The hon. Member for Macleod said it's time the studies were completed and planning started and some action taken. I'm very proud to be part of this government that is finally going to put money into an area of southern Alberta which is very productive. I think this money that's going into irrigation is going to be paid back many, many times.

If I had the sole responsibility of coming up with the projects in the first year of capital projects of \$187 million, I don't think I could have come up with anything better than this government has come up with by recognizing the health care facilities that are going to be the very best in the world. We already have tremendous doctors in the province of Alberta and we will be attracting more. We will be the centre and the envy of the whole world.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, on point of order, on which appropriation is the hon. member speaking?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're on Land Reclamation. There will be an opportunity for members to speak at the conclusion, after we have come to the total. So perhaps the member could keep to the subject of land reclamation.

MR. JAMISON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just thought it possible that it was slipping by that this was something very innovative of this government. I thought the Member for Clover Bar should really recognize that we are discussing something that no other government in Canada is discussing: money set aside for this purpose.

DR. BUCK: Tell us how you blow it too.

MR. JAMISON: Mr. Chairman, to the Minister of the Environment, I was very pleased to see that \$2.5 million is going to be put into land reclamation. With the upsurge of population in the province of Alberta, there is a tremendous impact in the greater metropolitan area around Edmonton. I'm sure you're aware, Mr. Minister, of the study going on at the present time, the Onoway gravel study. I know the study has cost the government about \$85,000. With the number of eyesores we have around the Edmonton metropolitan area, I would hope this land reclamation money will be used to put this land back to good use, such as for recreational purposes.

I would like to make a suggestion, as on March 31, 1977, we will be adding another \$118 million to the capital projects fund and more as time goes on, many, many millions of dollars. I'd like to put my smoke in to the minister at the present time. We have a lot of rivers, streams, and creeks in the province of Alberta that are in very bad shape; they are polluted. I'd like to have taken into consideration, in the future moneys that go into the Department of the Environment end of the projects, that money is put aside for cleaning up our rivers and streams.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, I also am really pleased with the recognition the government has given to this most sensitive area of environment and reclamation, so we can hand to our future generations a province that is in good shape. I have a couple of questions I wish to direct to the minister, but first a bit of history.

Back in 1967-68 the previous administration put in place a policy in my constituency that rather than construct physical works or reclaim land that had been lost as a result of damage to the environment, the government would purchase that land from farmers. As a result of the damage that has been done to the environment in our area, some 20,000 acres have been lost to agricultural production as well as tremendous tourist potential along the shores of Lesser Slave Lake.

The question I'd like to ask the minister is: is there any possibility of funds over and above the \$2.5 million outlined in this vote being available if the policy is changed prior to March 31, 1978?

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make one or two points. For a change I agree with a portion of the speech of the Member for St. Albert, and that's on the reclamation of gravel sites. But at the same time I say that, the view of the Member for St. Albert is of course always very narrow. He didn't worry about all the other gravel pits in the province, just the ones close to his immediate vicinity.

My question to the minister comes out of a promise the former minister made that some of these small gravel pits throughout the municipalities would be reclaimed. I would just like to offer a suggestion to the minister, or maybe he could reply. Will all these small areas throughout the province be looked at?

In conclusion I'd like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I hope the Member for St. Albert writes better editorials than speeches.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I just have one or two comments. I notice the fund is to be used for blots

that have come on our environment prior to 1973. That brings me to the two points I want to make. Number one, when he made his opening address the hon. Premier mentioned that he had noticed these blotches on our province while in helicopters, airplanes, and so on. They look even worse when you get down right close to them. I think it's a pretty splendid thing to start to repair some of the damage done in the past when legislation was not as rigid or as stringent as it is today. During the last few years, people who have destroyed or damaged the surface of our province have generally been required to bring it back to its norm. I think that is good. It should be part of the capital costs.

At one time the deep-seam coal mines in the Drumheller Valley — when they finished their operations they simply walked out. Then there were cave-ins for five, eight, or up to 10 years afterwards which were a danger to life and limb. Finally we secured legislation that made it necessary to make sure that all these things were remedied before closure was given, that timbering in the undermined surfaces was properly looked after and so on.

There are a few places where the undermining of coal mines has come to the surface. I think if it hasn't come to the surface within five to eight years, it probably never will. We have many areas in the Drumheller valley where there is undermining but 20, 30, or 40 feet of surface in between. If that were going to cave, you would certainly think it would cave within five to 10 years after the mine closed. I would be quite willing to bet that if it hasn't occurred by that time it likely never will, barring an earthquake which we don't expect to have in this part of the country.

But the few areas that have not been repaired I imagine would come under this program. If we have blotches that have occurred because mines have closed and not properly looked after the underground operations, I would hope this would be covered in this program. We might get those very few, and I don't think very expensive, areas done away with.

That might lead us to the point where we can forget about putting caveats on people's property where there has been undermining 20 or 30 years ago. I really don't have too much objection to the caveats, but I have quite a bit of objection when a regional planning commission will not give approval for a subdivision because there was an underground mine in that area 20 or 30 years ago. It just doesn't seem to make sense to me and I don't think it makes sense to some of the outstanding engineers of the province who have had a great deal to do with cave-ins, slips and slides of the earth's surface, and so on.

The other point that I want to make is that some times in the past the surface has been hurt badly. I remember one time the Minister of Municipal Affairs gave a permit for surface mining of an area right along what we call the main street of the Dinosaur Trail. I was very angry about it at the time. This was a place where thousands of tourists were starting to come, and the permit was going to permit them to destroy the beauty — and I call it beauty, because it's beautiful to me — of some of those outdoor rocks by tearing them aside and taking the coal that was underneath.

This permit was granted even though we had a terrific fight about it. So part of that Dinosaur Trail was destroyed by a mining operation. Much of has

been overgrown and so on, but some of it is still visible — a very bad mistake because there is enough surface coal in that area without going to the main thoroughfare where we had hoped to bring people in to enjoy that beauty for many years to come. So I think this land reclamation program is going to do a tremendous job.

There are gravel pits throughout the province. The last few years I was in the Department of Highways, and I am sure it has been followed even more rigidly since, people who took out gravel were required to leave the pit in reasonable condition. Sometimes it's hard to put back in the condition where you can grow things, because gravel pits aren't there for growing things. It might be necessary to haul in thousands of tons of black dirt to put on top of it which was never there before. But if we can get these to resemble the condition they were in before man started to disturb them, I think we are going a long way. So I would like to commend the government on this program.

There are one or two questions I would like to ask, which I would appreciate hearing about from the minister. One, if these areas are available, what formula is going to be followed? If the owner who did the work is still available, will he be required to pay for it, or will it be paid for entirely from this fund? Will this reclamation work be done, paid for, and completed by the fund? If people know of areas, is the idea to write to the minister and bring it to his attention so it can be examined?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to support this appropriation of the capital projects division. I think it is very fitting that we are going to expend some of our funds which have been accumulated from non-renewable resource revenue in reclaiming some of the damage that has been done to certain areas of the province, particularly those sites that have been damaged by industrial development prior to 1973 and the introduction of some very progressive conservation legislation by this government. I would like to go over a few concerns in my constituency with regard to coal mining that has occurred there in the past. There are a number of abandoned coal mine sites, strip mines, and spoil piles. I just hope that consideration will be given in this appropriation to reclaiming some of those sites.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, do you care to close the discussion?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate very much the comments and the interest of the members who have spoken on this matter. I think the title of the vote speaks for itself, and it is a very worth-while place to put some of these investment funds. I will try to deal with the points that some of the hon. members asked specifically.

The Member for Lesser Slave Lake, of course, had many long and concerned meetings with me, with respect to the incredible erosion problems that he does face in his riding, particularly in the Swan Hills area and around Slave Lake. We are aware of those problems and we're trying to overcome them. The point he makes about the policy decision of acquiring rather than trying to save or rehabilitate eroded lands, particularly at the entrance to Slave Lake itself, is a very good one. It's a matter that we have under

review at the moment — to see if that is the best program to continue.

Insofar as additional funds being available as a result of a policy change that might come about, those would not be available under this particular vote. This is fixed until March 31, 1978. My understanding is there are no special warrants under this legislation, so if we were looking to a change in policy and it required additional funding, it would not come as a result of this particular vote.

I was interested in the comments from two or three members with respect to gravel pits, because that certainly is a matter of concern in many parts of the province. I was just looking at the '75 tabulation of what we did in the present reclamation program. We reclaimed a total of 45 gravel pits throughout the province. So if some of you have these in your constituencies or if there are ones you think ought to be repaired, we'd certainly like to know about them because that's one of the prime thrusts of this program.

The hon. Member for Drumheller asked a couple of specific questions: first of all, what is the formula for funding? To date we have only been doing this work on lands that are either municipally or provincially owned. If they're privately owned we will acquire them if they're deemed worthy of reclamation and then do the reclamation work. The cost is 100 per cent provincial funding. Insofar as how people get to know about them, in the municipalities throughout the province there are locally appointed surface reclamation councils with local members on them. Each year they are asked for their list of recommendations — and this is in the rural municipalities — concerning appropriate reclamation projects. So if they are interested, all members from rural areas should find out who their surface reclamation council member is and simply submit the information or the suggestions through him, or of course directly to the department. We would be pleased to receive recommendations.

Insofar as the matter respecting coal mining is concerned, and the effects of it from earlier days, I think the hon. Member for Drumheller again pointed out that so far this act and this appropriation specifically refers to the surface of the land and not anything that might be under-ground. So his comments concerning abandoned underground mines are something we'd want to give further consideration to for future appropriations.

The other member who spoke on coal mining, the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, is of course in an area where the visual effect of that industry is very much evident. We propose to make the Crowsnest Pass a prime and priority area for reclamation work insofar as the work that's going on with old slag heaps, with abandoned mines, and with the tipples themselves. Our long-term objective, of course, is to remove the tipples from their present location. The company is aware of that. When I say long-term, I should perhaps have said final objective, because I hope that won't take too long.

But an emphasis in 1977 will be to get started on that work in the Crowsnest Pass, and to continue the work with respect to the abandoned gravel pits throughout the province. There are other things like old sanitary landfill sites, old sewage lagoons, old industrial sites. I'm sure many members have those

kinds of projects in their own areas that would be very worthy of funds to be expended. So I appreciate very much the comments I have received.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister, and I should have asked that before, can the minister indicate if in some of the areas where we have old used gravel pits any of those areas have been used for sanitary landfill to certain designated materials — you know, dry materials, not just straight garbage type of stuff? I know at one time when the city of Edmonton was looking for a sanitary landfill site, the suggestion was made that they should be speaking with Calgary Power to reclaim some of the area in the Wabamun area. At that time they indicated they could economically move garbage 40 miles, because once they got it compacted in the truck there was not that much of a problem. I would just like to know some of the parameters on the use of some of these areas.

MR. RUSSELL: It's a good question, Mr. Chairman, because the uses can vary so much. In these reclamation projects you find that you start out with one thing and by reclamation convert to another very useful classification of land use for this specific site.

I can't specifically answer a question about a particular abandoned gravel pit without going back to the files, but what the member says is absolutely correct. It's possible they can be used for recreation purposes by means of a conversion to an artificial lake which may or may not be stocked with sports fish. They can be used for sanitary landfill sites.

Some other examples of conversions are for instance in Cardiff, south of Calgary, converting an abandoned coal mine ultimately to a golf course. Another old coal mine site in Castor is being prepared for use as a municipal sewage lagoon, the Drumheller slag sites are being converted for eventual residential development, and I could go down the list. So you can see there's a great variety of opportunities there.

MR. JAMISON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to correct that statement. Cardiff is not near Calgary; it's just north of St. Albert.

Land Reclamation	\$2,500,000
------------------	-------------

Establishing and Improving Recreational Facilities

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say a word or two on the Capital City Park. First of all I'm pleased to see that we've finally received from the government some dollar value on what we're going to be spending. I would like to ask: is this \$28 million on top of the \$35 million the Premier said the project would cost, or is this the first \$28 million of that \$35 million figure the Premier used?

Secondly, I hope my concerns are unfounded, but as we see large cities get larger, the crime rate just seems to follow along. I would feel very, very badly, Mr. Chairman, if the park we're proposing, the bicycle paths, the walking paths were, say, in 10 years down the road, unsafe for people to use. I'm sure, Mr. Solicitor General, it would concern you as

the chief law enforcement officer for this province. But I think we as members should all keep in mind that when we provide these facilities, let's make sure our people are going to be able to use them. Mr. Chairman, these are the two points I'd like to bring to the attention of the members of the committee.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, I think I should respond to the point the hon. member just raised concerning the financing of the park. I don't agree with him of course that the cost or the estimated funds to be expended on the park had not been presented to the members, because they were. As accurate a breakdown as was possible was given to this House. It totalled \$35 million in terms of 1974 dollars, and that was written into an agreement which was signed by both the province and the city, so the breakdown of those figures is well known. They're under a state of continual adjustment because, as was said when they were made public, they're estimates at the very best. As you get into detailed design and into tenders that are received, some of the breakdowns within those categories have been adjusted upwards and others downwards.

There was another major change in the budget for the park. That came about as a result of the removal of the weir, and the \$1.5 million that had been allotted for water quality treatment as a result of the weir construction. Just to refresh your memory, Mr. Chairman, when the weir was removed, we were very concerned that that major element being removed from the park might tend to fragment the park. Therefore it was very important to make sure that the other elements remained strong or that additional ones were put in. After pretty careful study, that was done.

A fourth pedestrian/bicycle bridge was added, which was not in the original agreement, in order to replace a crossing that would have been available on top of the weir. A large off-stream artificial lake was provided for in Rundle Park, to provide water recreation facilities that would otherwise have been provided by the construction of the weir. The budget for the trails and cycling path system that will tie the whole park together — because it's a very long geographic area — was nearly doubled. That went from \$2 million to \$3.5 million. To answer the hon. member's specific question, the funds that are in here are deemed to be a part of that original \$35 million estimate that was given to the park.

Now, I mentioned the figure \$35 million, with the changes that were made as a result of the deletion of the weir and the addition of some others. That \$35 million is now \$34 million in terms of 1974 dollars. But I fully expect that by the time 1978 comes along, the real expenditure will be somewhere between \$42 and \$45 million when those '74 dollars are converted. That's simply as a result of inflation due to construction costs and the increase in costs of land acquisition that we were committed to.

Insofar as a breakdown of this \$28 million asked for in these estimates, we're dealing with approximately two fiscal years here because of the length of term of this bill. We're looking at \$14 million for the current year, and \$14 million for the '77-78 fiscal year. Of course, 1978 is the year we're aiming to complete the park.

DR. BACKUS: Mr. Chairman, I raise a question at this stage of consideration of the estimates because the matter has been raised by my constituents. I don't want to ask the government to change their priorities or estimates this year, but I would like them to take these concerns into consideration for future years.

The viability and importance of the Fish Creek Park and the Capital City Park to all people in Alberta are recognized. But the advantages of these parks to people are directly proportional to their availability, which is inversely proportional to the distance from them. Seeing the cultural and recreational advantages of large urban parks to a city, the people of Grande Prairie would like to see the government give equal consideration to other cities in the province, particularly to a city that is 300 and 500 miles, respectively, from these two southern parks. The latter mileage will, of course, be greatly shortened when Highway 40 is completed.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Chairman, I just thought I'd make one observation on a good point raised by the hon. Member for Clover Bar in regard to law enforcement in these large natural parks within the metropolitan areas.

I've had some discussions with the police commissions concerned and, of course, the legal position is that the police forces are responsible for law enforcement within the boundaries of the city, regardless of who owns the property, whether it's owned by the private sector, the province, the federal government, or the city. However, as these parks develop, there is the possibility of special problems in relation to those areas that are not easily accessible to patrol cars. The hon. Member for Clover Bar quite rightly points out cycle paths. On the western side of the Fish Creek Park in Calgary there's a lengthy ravine which will not be accessible by road.

So I expect, as the parks develop, to have continuing discussions with the police commissions in those two cities to see whether some portion of their conditional enhanced policing grants could be directed toward some sort of special patrol, at least during the summer months. Obviously during the winter months the situation would not be as critical.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add some comments to the idea of parks for the heritage fund. Having lived alongside a provincial park for a number of years, there's an element of slowdown, if you like, when you have recreation facilities near you. I am just so thrilled for the people of Edmonton and Calgary that they can also enjoy some of the outdoors and the beautiful country we have. I certainly endorse the park idea to the fullest.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Chairman, I may have to apologize, perhaps, for putting forward some of the questions I will and the comments that I make. I was just a little delayed in getting back into the House prior to the debate and comments being made with regard to the Capital City Park. However, I hope you will bear with me.

There are a number of matters I want to raise. Number one, sometimes there's a question in my mind as to whether the citizens of Edmonton, and people generally, truly recognize the significance of

Capital City Park in Edmonton and Fish Creek Park in the city of Calgary. The matters that raise this question in my mind are some of the controversial debates that have gone on over a period of time since this government announced in this House its intention, in its planned parks policy, to develop in the urban centres.

Somehow it seems to me the message may not have been getting across very clearly that the parks in the two major urban centres are under the same kind of consideration and level as they would be out in the rural areas; that is, to provide the kind of recreational and park facility that is not possible for municipalities to develop within their financing constraints.

The degree of funding that is being allocated towards these two parks, it seems to me, is certainly determined very much on the per capita basis to some extent — in other words, the concentration of people in the two major urban centres and the difficulties the two major urban centres have in providing parklands and recreational facilities within their financial constraints. As well, the fact had to be taken into consideration that recreational land or parkland immediately accessible to people who are concentrated in these two major centres was rather extensive. The mileage, the distance, is rather great. The difficulty or the expense involved in reaching such facilities was beyond certain income levels. As I recall, the debate that initially took place in the House when the resolution was first brought in, I believe in 1972, was in fact to take all these matters into consideration.

I recall in the past couple of years the controversies raised by various interest groups with regard to the provincial government attempting to push down the gullets of citizens in the two major urban centres something that they really did not wish. That, in fact, was not so. It was truly with the consideration and understanding and exchange of dialogue that the plans for the two parks were made. As far as I'm aware, and I think this has been borne out time and again, the discussion and the dialogue with the city council of Edmonton — and I'm sure the same took place with Calgary — with regard to incorporating those aspects of park or recreational development along the river valley that the city had in mind were incorporated.

I would like the minister to clarify a couple of areas, because some changes have taken place, I believe, from the initial plan. I recall in the earlier debates that consideration was to be given in the plan to provide the kind of activity that could be participated in by senior citizens as well as the younger groups who are more agile and have a wider participation in the types of activities they enjoy. I'm not sure the bicycle trails and the walkways, the pathways along these routes, adequately provide the availability for activities which could be enjoyed by senior citizens. I wonder if the hon. minister will include in his remarks, if he has not already, some expansion of this type of provision.

I'd just like to comment on the remarks put forward by my honorable colleague from Grande Prairie. He has made the proposal that similar consideration should be given to providing provincial parks in centres of a certain size of population other than the two major urban centres. I think the point that needs to be considered and debated here is the accessibility

from these other small cities, so to speak — the small but larger than the very tiny — the accessibility they have to the land surrounding the recreational and park land available to them. Is the distance extensive? Are there provincial parks in place that perhaps just need some expansion and upgrading? I think those need to be the criteria, rather than solely population.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Chairman, being a member representing the rural area, I thought I should just express my satisfaction and support for the Capital City Park and the Fish Creek Park. When we realize that 50 per cent of the population in Alberta resides in the two cities, I feel the people in Edmonton and Calgary are entitled to the recreational areas that all the people in the province [have].

When we see that there's more and more time for recreation — many people already work only four days per week — they must spend the other three days in a place other than a high-rise, or cramped into a little lot in the city.

Furthermore I have noticed, particularly over the last while, when a weekend comes the provincial parks in the rural areas get filled up so quickly that we people in the rural areas don't have a chance to enjoy them. How often on a Thursday afternoon you will hear on the news, no more place in Miquelon Park or Garner Lake or Vermilion Park. What happens? Where are the people from the country going to go now? These parks will not be only for the city people. The city people will continue to go to the rural areas, but not in such quantities. Also, I'm sure I will take advantage of the city parks.

Why I say this, as the hon. Member for Drumheller mentioned just a couple of days ago, is that it's very often said by the rural people that the government does everything for the cities, and the city people say that the government does everything for the rural people, and they're both wrong. Well, I just can't agree with the hon. Member for Drumheller, because I think they're both right.

MR. ZANDER: Good going, John.

MR. BATIUK: I also found it very perturbing when the Leader of the Opposition stated: well, I go along with this \$182 million, but why not a couple of million dollars for libraries? All very good, but he did not say where he would want to see those \$2 million taken off — from the parks or from the oil sands technology or from any other area. I'm sure our government will look into it and provide the extra funds for libraries if they need them that badly. But \$2 million is neither here nor there. Yet the other day when the Minister of Housing and Public Works announced about the repayment of a \$2 million loan that Alberta Housing Corporation took in 1969 from the Bontal bank in . . .

DR. BUCK: On a point of order [inaudible] within the confines of the debate.

MR. BATIUK: You know, it was very unfortunate to hear that for \$2 million out to Germany — I just wonder whether half of it was for the expenses of negotiating.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I strongly

support this; even though it's for the cities, I'm very glad this is going through.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I too am speaking to Votes 1, 2, and 3. I think it's a tremendous idea that when we have 85 per cent of the population of our cities in the province of Alberta living in these two cities, I would agree that indeed it's a wise move to provide the Capital City Park as well as the Fish Creek Park — not that the third largest city in Alberta wouldn't also like one, and the fourth largest city, and the fifth largest city. However, there have to be priorities.

I would simply like to comment that I think the Member for Clover Bar has a very valid point that we might be the future Chicago of Canada and Calgary the future Detroit of Canada — with the Central Park problems they have in New York City. I think he has a very valid point, and it certainly should be given consideration.

One thought I had may just appease other parts of the province — and this would involve the Minister of Transportation in conjunction with the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife — with all the rail lines being abandoned, consideration could perhaps be given to paving between a lot of those rails, and we would have perhaps the longest bicycle paths in North America.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, do you have any closing remarks?

MR. RUSSELL: Just a couple, Mr. Chairman. I certainly appreciate the comments from the members for Vermilion-Viking, Vegreville, Lethbridge East, and Grande Prairie with respect to lending their support to the metropolitan centre parks. I think that shows a really good understanding, and I appreciate that.

Insofar as a specific point the Member for Grande Prairie brought up — and it was also brought up by the Member for Lethbridge East — that there are other cities that perhaps would like to be in line for one of these kinds of projects, I think we had a very good debate on that in the House when the now Solicitor General brought in the original motion that really led to these parks. The concerns expressed by members from all parts of the province were of course noted at that time. I recollect that the motion was amended to take in some of their concerns.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood asked about the kinds of activities. I think in the case of Capital City Park, which is a joint agreement between the city and the province, both partners to the agreement are trying to make absolutely certain that the kinds of concerns the member raised are being attended to. For example, in the design of the pedestrian cyclist bridges, one of the bridges connecting Gold Bar and Rundle parks, which will be the two most active areas, is specially designed to take light vehicles, particularly for the movement of the elderly and/or the handicapped. So at least they won't be required to walk that distance across the river if they're not able to.

Also, the city, under our recreation projects program, is now building in Rundle in conjunction with the Active club the recreation and athletic centre for handicapped persons. There is a variety of other activities through the park, whether it's just bird

watching and nature loving or floating on an artificial lake in a craft of some kind or whatever. But I think our senior citizens are going to get a lot of enjoyment out of many elements of the park.

MR. GOGO: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, [inaudible] the Minister of the Environment doesn't assume he has the automatic support of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I would recommend that he correct his reference to the Member for Lethbridge East to the Member for Lethbridge West.

Agreed to:

Capital City Park	\$28,000,000
Fish Creek Park	\$13,000,000
Fish Creek Park	\$4,000,000

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any closing remarks?

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, I am certainly humbly proud to be able to say a few words on the Alberta heritage savings trust fund capital projects division. I think [it] bears repetition that it's up to 20 per cent of the fund in these 1976-78 estimates. Mr. Chairman, the \$182.5 million out of \$1.5 billion is a significant amount for Albertans.

Mr. Chairman, as we all know, the Alberta heritage savings trust fund is not only a historical item in parliamentary democracy but, even more important than that, this bill allows us in this Legislature to allocate funds to Alberta citizens now and for the future. Today and over the past few days, Mr. Chairman, this in fact is being carried out.

Mr. Chairman, what would be more important of course than health care for our citizens? Mr. Chairman, the opposition members have indicated they don't understand some of these items. I suggest that they indeed understand very well.

Mr. Chairman, my constituency would say it's great and, I know, would applaud the government on making the choices for health care facilities and applied health research to continue to make Alberta a leader in this area, and enhance that leadership for diagnosis, treatment, and applied research in the two leading public health problems; namely, heart disease and cancer, but also in the overall health field. Mr. Chairman, I am particularly pleased too that I as a member of this Legislature raised this item during initial debate of the Alberta heritage savings trust fund, as other members have.

Mr. Chairman, the decision for expenditure on health care mainly, and the other areas which have been mentioned, discussed, and voted on, including irrigation, renewable resources improvement, oil sands technology, and parks — including the Capital City Park which, I want to underline, was a concept of the Edmonton MLAs, supported by all members here, of course — seems to me, and I'm sure it seems to all the members in the Legislature, to be an ideal initial thrust to use the Alberta heritage trust fund. Mr. Chairman, it echoes the social values and the social concerns this government places for Albertans across this province. Certainly it should be rated as 4-plus, A-1.

Mr. Chairman, there are many needs that have not been mentioned. There are many needs that have

not been met, and we all know this. But I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that these will be dealt with at future times. Where else could it be better, when you consider health care in the province of Alberta, the top level of educational opportunities, business opportunities, agricultural opportunities, the availability of homes, quality of life, the lowest taxes in the country, and so on. Mr. Chairman, if it were not for this fund, I suggest that the items we have discussed in the past few days would not have been done. So there is particular pride in this area.

It's an honor, on behalf of the Edmonton Kingsway constituents, to speak on the estimates of the Alberta heritage savings trust fund. Mr. Chairman, I will continue to speak firmly for the improvement of health care and delivery of health care to our citizens, as well as on other items. These estimates have done very much to satisfy the requests I made previously regarding health in the debate on the Alberta heritage savings trust fund.

Mr. Chairman, it's very satisfying to see that one of the MLAs — and other MLAs of course have participated — but I speak of the MLA for Edmonton Kingsway, who, in all humility, has played some role in influencing the direction of this fund not only for Edmontonians but for all Albertans, especially in the area of health.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased, I am humbly honored, I am overjoyed for Albertans, I am overjoyed for Edmonton Kingsway constituents. I know more will be said for the future disposition of this fund or investment, and I totally and unequivocally support the initial investments for the capital projects division of this fund for the period ending March 31, 1978.

Mr. Chairman, two recommendations. There are others, and I am sure others will come out from time to time. I make these recommendations again in humbleness that the ministers, who are to be complimented regarding the initial thrust, will consider them in future investments. Number one, I hope that future investment in the area of health will place more emphasis on outpatient care, community care — including home care — and care out of institutions and, Mr. Chairman, as I have stated many times in this House over the past five years, offer and complete that key or final link in health delivery: to offer the prevention diagnosis treatment, rehabilitation, and education on a co-ordinated and integrated basis with paramount emphasis on prevention.

Mr. Chairman, prevention should not be just a slogan. I suggest it's time to put it into full action. Much has been done in community care, and I recognize this. Much more has to be done, and I hope the ministers involved will consider this in future investments.

The other recommendation, Mr. Chairman, is that the ministers consider the demonstration of other forms of energy. I speak primarily of solar energy. Mr. Chairman, I had the unique opportunity of attending the United Nations Habitat conference in Vancouver. Apart from the tremendous need expressed for clean water and housing around the world, a new form of energy was also discussed. I had the opportunity to sit in on one of those discussions, and I felt very impressed and very moved that solar energy certainly is one form of energy that this province should take note of, and possibly set up

some demonstrative project in Alberta.

It was shown to me, and I suggest that the government might want to explore this area, Mr. Chairman, that with the present knowledge of solar energy there is an ability to provide the energy necessary to heat a population grouping of some 30,000 people, not only to provide them with heat but with energy, including crop raising on an indoor basis. The region has nothing to do with it, because they have shown they could actually do this in an area as far north as Siberia. Certainly there is no reason why we in Alberta, who are known to be progressive, could not set up such a demonstrative project in the near future.

With those comments, Mr. Chairman, I urge unanimous support of this capital projects division.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one or two brief comments. When we're speaking on an issue as important as this, we could all take our turn saying the money should be spent here, the money should be spent there, it should be spent elsewhere. I think it's only fair to say that this, in my humble opinion, is as good a way to spend the funds, and as reasonable a way of spending the funds, as we can. As the Member for Edmonton Kingsway has just reiterated, we could all come up with pet schemes. I think it's a most difficult chore for government. When you have a large amount of money, there's always going to be somebody with special interests saying, we should have what we think is our fair share. It is a difficult task. It's not often that I compliment the government. But if I consider they have done a fairly decent job, they should be complimented.

It was really quite interesting in the debate last night on water resources to find out what a great job the former minister had done, and how he seized the initiative to make sure we got help from the federal government and we did all these great things. But I'd like to ask the former minister just what he has done for the Bassano Dam and the aqueduct since he took control? He has done nothing.

MR. YURKO: I've signed an agreement.

DR. BUCK: Signed an agreement. Great, that's good, that's a step in the right direction.

As I say, we could all argue forever where the money should go. I just want to bring one point to the attention of the hon. members of the Assembly. When we're speaking about heritage and we're speaking especially about parks, I would like to challenge the government members on the front bench and the back bench to go home this weekend and ask their constituents what we should do about the Alberta Game Farm. I think that's a challenge I offer to the government members this weekend.

MR. FOSTER: What do you suggest, Walter?

DR. BUCK: I suggest, hon. Attorney General, that the government take more initiative than it has taken at present, [interjections] that it take some initiative. When we are looking at the Capital City Park project of \$28 million, Fish Creek Park \$13 million plus \$4 million — \$17 million, which is just the beginning.

MR. FOSTER: That's real initiative.

DR. BUCK: That is just the beginning. I would say, Mr. Chairman, standing in my place, that it behooves the government to move a little more expeditiously than it is presently moving on negotiations between this government, through its minister, and the owner of the Alberta Game Farm.

MR. McCRAE: What are your priorities Walter?

DR. BUCK: Because this is an area — the hon. minister responsible for restricted development areas and Calgary doesn't have to start telling me about priorities. This is a priority issue, I think. When I ask people in my constituency and other constituencies, they want the game farm to stay here in Alberta. If it leaves, Mr. Chairman, the responsibility will rest right on the shoulders of this government. [interjections] Okay, fine, fine, provide some free enterprisers. Certainly. I would like to know if this government really knows what free enterprise means anymore. Because when we start getting into that area we could be here all afternoon, and I don't intend going that long. [interjections]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

DR. BUCK: So, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that I think the government is nitpicking when they are hesitating about purchasing the Alberta Game Farm and making it a provincial park. I don't think the figure of \$8 million that's been bandied about is the price we would have to pay for that facility. All I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, is when we have 'loosey-goosey' figures here about \$28 million for the Capital City Park, and then the Minister of the Environment says that will be \$40 or \$42 million in '78 — what will the price be when we get finished? It will be well over \$100 million, I venture to say, and I don't care if you use 1974 dollars or 1981 dollars; it's going to be way over the \$100 million.

So, Mr. Chairman, I very seriously ask the government members to kick this around in caucus just a little more than they have, because I'm sure the government has discussed this. I mean, that's not telling tales out of school. That's what governments are for. They're supposed to serve the wishes of their people.

So, Mr. Chairman, in my conclusion, I would just like to say that, in whole, I support the projects in this. It's a difficult chore. I think the government's done a more than adequate job.

AN HON. MEMBER: Just say "good job".

DR. BUCK: What's wrong with "more than adequate"? Let's be a little bit modest, Mr. Minister. You know, there is nothing so good that it couldn't be better. I'd like to say to the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking that it would have been fair for him to say who was responsible for all the small provincial parks we have scattered throughout this province. I mean, modesty prevents me from telling the hon. Attorney General who initiated those parks. But that's beside the point.

Mr. Chairman, there's just one word I'd like to leave to this government. The old saying in sports is:

when you lose say little, when you win say less. I'd just like this government to remain humble.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Agreed to:

Alberta Heritage Savings

Trust Fund Capital

Projects Division \$182,500,000

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee of Supply rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[Dr. McCrimmon left the Chair]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

[applause]

MR. SPEAKER: I must explain to the Assembly that I didn't intentionally adopt this easy way of getting applause. I think perhaps there is something wrong with the line that looks after my buzzer. That's the buzzer in my office, I mean, [laughter]

MR. COOKSON: Maybe it got colored red.

DR. MCCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration the following resolution and begs to report the same:

Resolved that from the Alberta heritage savings trust fund sums not exceeding the following amounts be granted to Her Majesty for the period ending March 31, 1978:

\$10 million for the purpose of making an investment in the southern Alberta children's hospital project to be administered by the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care;

\$30 million for the purpose of making an investment in the Alberta health sciences centre project to be administered by the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care;

\$7.5 million for the purpose of making an investment in the southern Alberta cancer centre project to be administered by the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care;

\$10 million for the purpose of making an investment in the cancer and heart disease research project to be administered by the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care;

\$14 million for the purpose of making an investment in the irrigation rehabilitation and expansion project to be administered by the Minister of Agriculture;

\$9.5 million for the purpose of making an investment in the irrigation headworks improvement project to be administered by the Minister of the Environment;

\$9 million for the purpose of making an investment in the Alberta reforestation nursery project to be administered by the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources;

\$1 million for the purpose of making an investment in the grazing reserves development project to be administered by the Minister of Energy and Natural

Resources;

\$2.5 million for the purpose of making an investment in the land reclamation project to be administered by the Minister of the Environment;

\$44 million for the purpose of making an investment in the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority project to be administered by the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources;

\$28 million for the purpose of making an investment in the Capital City Park project to be administered by the Minister of the Environment;

\$13 million for the purpose of making an investment in the Fish Creek Park project to be administered by the Minister of the Environment;

\$4 million for the purpose of making a further investment in the Fish Creek Park project to be administered by the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege I'd like to correct a statement I made in the House yesterday. On reading the unofficial Hansard, I find that I inadvertently said the federal government introduced a bill in the Legislature. Of course I meant to say that the federal government had introduced the bill in Parliament. That was in answer to a question from the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, Mrs. Chichak.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd ask leave of the Assembly to revert to Introduction of Bills.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree with the request for leave by the hon. Government House Leader?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS (reversion)

Bill 90 The Temporary Rent Regulation Measures Amendment Act, 1976 (No.2)

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 90, The Temporary Rent Regulation Measures Amendment Act, 1976 (No.2). This bill puts into legislative language the announcement made by me as Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs on August 25, 1976, respecting the termination of tenancies in mobile-home parks, and requires one year's notice of eviction when a mobile-home park is to be closed.

[Leave granted; Bill 90 introduced and read a first time]

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**
(Second Reading)

Bill 79
The Mental Health
Amendment Act, 1976

DR. BACKUS: Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of Bill 79, I would like to dwell for a moment on the matter of confidentiality. To hear some speak of it one would think that the concept of confidentiality was invented by politicians and the CBC. In fact this concept has been practised by priests, lawyers and doctors for thousands of years. These and others have striven over the years to defend their rights to maintain the confidentiality of the public with whom they deal when the Legislature has imposed legislation that attempts to break down that confidentiality and gain access to records for the sake of the so-called public good.

It is therefore with pleasure that I extend the umbrella of confidentiality to cover treatment centres which were not previously covered under The Mental Health Act or The Hospital Act. I should add that some protection has existed in these centres as a result of policy, but has not previously existed in legislation. Some may feel that under Section 6, there's a list of circumstances in which information may be released to some responsible authority. In this way it appears to be putting more emphasis on who can be told than on the need for absolute secrecy, which is the privilege of every patient to expect from his or her doctor. This is the very concern that I spoke of initially.

I would emphasize that this amendment does not give to authority new opportunities to pry, but merely restates those same privileges that already exist in The Hospitals Act. I believe that certainly as long as we have a minister as charming and concerned as we presently have, these privileges will not be abused.

[Motion carried; Bill 79 read a second time]

Bill 84
The Education
Statutes Amendment Act, 1976

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in the introduction of Bill 84, four statutes are involved in The Education Statutes Amendment Act: The School Act, The School Election Act, The School Buildings Act, and The Alberta School Trustees' Association Act. Amendments to these four acts are being put forward in Bill 84.

In respect of The School Act and The School Election Act, amendments which are preparatory to the elections of school trustees throughout the province of Alberta will be taking place in the fall of 1977. The amendments will provide for consistency between The School Election Act and The Provincial Election Act, so as to eliminate the reference to British subjects in determining the qualifications of electors throughout the province.

It also provides, Mr. Speaker, for clarification of the definition of elector under certain circumstances

which exist under The School Act, circumstances including the nomination of a candidate for trustee, the vote for the election of a candidate for trustee, votes on a petition, or votes for other than elections of candidates, and all other functions and responsibilities that an elector might have under The School Act. Clarification is provided as to who in fact an elector is.

Other provisions, Mr. Speaker, deal with the area of discipline, first of all extending the ability of school boards to make rules not only for the school buildings and other areas under their jurisdiction but including school buses that transport children to and from school. In addition, where a board determines that the actions of a pupil warrant ultimate suspension or dismissal from school, the amendment provided in the bill will require that the board deal with the principal's report within 14 days of receipt, so as to confirm, vary, or deny the request, the recommendation in that regard.

Certain other areas of the bill make more current provisions of The School Act with respect to the value of services that can be provided by a trustee to that board before that trustee is disqualified from running, or from continuing to hold office on the school board.

The previous figure of \$600 is being increased to \$1,000 and recognizes, Mr. Speaker, that in some cases, particularly in the outlining areas of the province, a school trustee may in fact have the only hardware store that could provide brooms or things which are necessary to the board, and that the limit of \$600 as it presently exists does in fact provide hardship for school boards in some cases. The same also applies to substitute teachers who find themselves in a position where they can no longer substitute for a missing teacher within that particular jurisdiction because they are board members and have reached the \$600 figure. So the extension to \$1,000 will provide some relief in this area.

Other sections are of course dealt with. If any hon. members have questions perhaps I can respond, either in closing debate on second reading or during committee study of the bill.

I might also point out that the amendment to The Alberta School Trustees' Association Act would permit the government to guarantee the capital indebtedness of the Alberta School Trustees' Association. In this regard, hon. members will probably be interested in knowing that the Alberta School Trustees' Association is in the process of constructing permanent headquarters for that association and have requested this type of assistance which, although it doesn't require any monetary funds from the provincial government except in the case of default — which I would think would be almost a non-existent possibility — but the result of such a guarantee would in fact lower the interest rate that the Alberta School Trustees' Association would have to pay on its mortgage loan. The resulting lowering of interest rate, saving of costs, is a direct saving of course to the members of the Alberta School Trustees' Association, namely the member boards throughout the province, which has an ultimate beneficial effect on education in the province and is, I think, a very useful amendment to the association's act.

In all other respects, perhaps if there are questions or comments I can respond when closing debate or during committee study of the bill.

[Motion carried; Bill 84 read a second time]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, before moving that we call it 1 o'clock, I would again remind the House that we will proceed with and call Government Motion No. 3, on the matter of the constitutional debate, immediately on Orders of the Day Monday, for debate that afternoon and evening. On Tuesday, the Government Designated Business will be Government Bills and Orders for the first hour. The Assembly will be sitting

on Tuesday night next, in addition to Monday and Thursday.

I move that we call it 1 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Assuming your agreement to the proposal by the hon. Government House Leader, the Assembly stands adjourned until Monday afternoon at half past 2.

[The House rose at 12:56 p.m.]