

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**Title: **Monday, October 24, 1977 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 82**  
**The Industrial Wages**  
**Security Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 82, The Industrial Wages Security Amendment Act, 1977. This bill will repeal a section which is no longer required.

[Leave granted; Bill 82 read a first time]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 82, The Industrial Wages Security Amendment Act, 1977, be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table two copies of the Workers' Compensation Board report for the last fiscal year.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, 90 students from Victoria Composite High School. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Dennis Melnyk. Sixty students are seated in the members gallery and 30 students in the public gallery. I would ask that they stand and be acknowledged by the Assembly.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, sir, and through you to the members of the Assembly, a group of 30 students from the Hugh Sutherland School in Carstairs in the county of Mountain View. They are in the public gallery, and are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Chuck Brinton, who I might say has just recently been elected — as recently as last Wednesday — the mayor of the town of Carstairs. They are also accompanied by a number of parents, including the parents of Mr. Glen Roberts, who also was elected to the town council in Carstairs.

I'd like to ask the students from the Hugh Sutherland School in Carstairs to rise and receive the recognition of the members of the Assembly.

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS****Department of Education**

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, the need for Alberta students to know of the rich heritage of our province and the initiative and heritage of Canadian people has been identified and voiced in this Assembly. The widespread and continuing public demand for Canadian studies has been acknowledged by the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada, through their interest in sharing resources.

You may recall in May 1975 my drawing attention to our catalogue of Canadian publications for use in Alberta schools. You may also remember the travelling caravan which displayed the calibre of Canadian creativity to Alberta communities. In January 1976 the co-operative development of 13 units of Canadian studies for the grades 1 to 12 social studies program was announced.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me extreme pleasure today to propose an investment of \$8,387,000 from the capital projects division of the Alberta heritage savings trust fund to assure comprehensive development and distribution of much-needed Canadian learning resources for Alberta schools.

Mr. Speaker, the proposal provides for the production of an Alberta heritage series of learning resources that would highlight the courage and determination of our pioneers, and instil pride in present and future Albertans. The program, to be completed in just over two years, has four components. Here are the details.

First, the Alberta heritage books for young readers. This fine collection will consist of 12 quality references about Alberta history and natural environment. The series will be carefully selected from existing books by well-known Canadian authors and be specially revised and illustrated as children's editions for grades 4, 5, and 6. The specific titles will be selected by a panel of noted Alberta writers, educators, and citizens. One or more classroom sets of up to 30 copies of each of the 12 titles will be provided to each of the 1,100 elementary schools in Alberta. December 1979 is the target completion date for this portion of the project.

Second, the Alberta heritage books for youth. This 10-book collection will offer an outstanding selection of stories, poems, and plays written about western Canada by Canadian authors. The set will be produced for use in the junior and senior high schools as exemplars of noteworthy western Canadian literature. Again, the specific selections will be made by a panel of esteemed Alberta authors, educators, and citizens. Classroom sets of up to 30 copies of each of these titles will be provided to the 800 junior high schools and nearly 400 senior high schools in Alberta. We expect these to be in use in all Alberta secondary school classrooms by September 1979.

Third, from existing references relevant to the unique history, geography, and people of Alberta, with preference to those by Alberta authors, 30 titles will be selected for the Alberta heritage books for senior students and adults. In their re-bound form, 2,000 sets of this distinctive collection will be distributed to all senior high schools and postsecondary educational institutions. This selection, documenting the courage and initiative of early Albertans, will be

available in public libraries, libraries in senior citizens' homes, hospitals, nursing homes, and drop-in centres. Target completion date for delivery of this package is March 1979.

Fourth, taking advantage of this golden opportunity to improve comprehensively the resources for studying the geography, history, people, and nature in Alberta and Canada, we will be providing copies of the locally and specially developed sets of materials for social and environmental studies in all schools.

The 13 Canadian studies kits currently being prepared with the co-operation of Alberta school trustees, teachers, students, and parents are nearing completion. These kits consist of locally and commercially produced books and pamphlets, films, videotapes, slides, charts, pictures, audiotapes, puzzle-maps, models, and puppets. Another three kits will be undertaken so that a total of eight will be available for elementary grades, four for junior high school grades, and four for senior high school. We intend to supply these to all schools, with the first eight kits to be in the schools by September 1978. Mr. Speaker, we expect several of these kits may be found useful for adoption by other provinces for use in their schools as well, and we will be delighted to work out arrangements for sharing these materials.

Another vital part of the social studies resources collection will be a specially prepared Alberta junior atlas. Sufficient numbers will be supplied so that every student in grades 4 to 6 will receive a copy for individual use. Four-foot by 8-foot basic relief maps of Alberta, originated and developed by Alberta Transportation, will be provided to all schools. These will be used as a working resource for students. A display version will be placed in prominent public buildings to give all Albertans a fuller appreciation of the diverse geography of our wonderful province.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, a nature studies set of 620 35-mm slides of the plants and animals common to Alberta and the prairies, with teacher guides and support literature, will complete this comprehensive package.

Some of these publications, or portions of the volumes, will be printed in their original languages and/or may involve translation into current languages of instruction used in Alberta schools. This again demonstrates this government's commitment to the preservation of the multicultural heritage of our dynamic province.

These projects should start immediately upon approval by the Legislature. Materials will be in use by teachers and pupils in just over two years.

Mr. Speaker, through this Alberta heritage series we are substantially enhancing the Canadian learning resources in our Alberta schools. A significant feature of this proposal will be the provision of opportunities for the Alberta publishing industry to become involved in the production of these school materials to the full limits of their capabilities. This proposal for a major investment in learning resources for Alberta schools and Alberta residents will assure that all children in Alberta will complete public school with a greater opportunity for a fuller knowledge and appreciation of the province, its residents, and our Canadian heritage.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

#### Department of Agriculture

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I have an important statement to make with respect to agriculture and our family farms. Before doing so I want to remind all hon. members that this week, October 24 to 28, is Agriculture Week in Alberta — a week designed, Mr. Speaker . . .

DR. BUCK: Tell Ghitler.

MR. MOORE: . . . to foster the understanding and the relationship that exist between our rural and urban people, and the importance of agriculture and our family farms to Alberta. For those of you who haven't already done so, I would ask that you pin on your Agriculture Week button and wear it with pride.

Mr. Speaker, since 1971 the government of Alberta has been aggressively involved in the development of viable family farm units and has recognized that agriculture is the most important long-term resource of this province. The problems confronting the industry are many, in terms of weather conditions and marketing opportunities. In spite of these, however, Alberta farmers have reacted positively and continue to provide a very significant contribution to the economic well-being of Alberta.

There is no doubt in our minds that this will continue to be the case; however, we feel that the government should further expand a very important role in furthering the long-term development of the industry. Over the past few years a variety of programs has contributed to this end. Of major importance was the establishment in 1972 of the Alberta Agricultural Development Corporation which, to date, has provided over \$110 million of direct farm loans, and over twice that amount in guaranteed loans to Alberta's practising farmers. This has provided a significant financial background for the development of farming operations.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, our government has placed priority on the enhancement of rural life. The REA program has been extended. Most Alberta farmers will have access to natural gas service. The Minister of Transportation has embarked upon a major road improvement program. Recreational programs have been developed through the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife capital grant program, and through our agricultural societies program. These facilities have contributed greatly to the recreational opportunities throughout the province and, in large part, have made the rural community a more viable and more enjoyable place to live.

A major directive, Mr. Speaker, of our government has been toward the improvement of gross and net farm incomes. To assist in that area extension services in the department have been extended, and now 62 district offices and six regional offices provide easy access to production and marketing information that may be required by individual farmers.

On the marketing side, a major effort has been made toward the development of long-term markets. The marketing division of the Department of Agriculture was established in 1971 as the major vehicle to achieving this end. Since that date the marketing division has progressed to a point where it provides a variety of information services to both individual farmers and agribusinesses. A foreign approach was

instituted in the formation of an international marketing branch in order to ensure wider acceptance of Albertan and Canadian products in the market place. Our knowledge of international marketing has since led us to become firmly involved in trade and tariff negotiations, recognizing that many of the obstacles to export of Alberta's and Canada's products lay in artificial barriers caused by unrealistic treatment of agriculture in trade and tariff negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, this government recognizes that the value-added concept is vital to the development of our province and, accordingly, we have embarked upon a vigorous program of encouraging the location of agricultural processing industries within the province, so that we can export manufactured goods rather than raw agricultural products. A rapeseed crushing plant, the alfalfa pelletizing industry, the meat packing industry, cheese processing plants: all attest to the success of this approach.

Mr. Speaker, since agriculture has become established in western Canada, all major changes in productivity and production, other than increase in land, have been related to technology. The continual fight through research to provide better grain varieties, new grains, grains that were resistant to rust and smut, improved livestock breeds, and better machinery has led to our current agricultural success. Changes in productivity, capacity to produce, or efficiency in production are thus related to changes in technology. Recognizing these factors, we have over the past six years expanded our commitment to research through such institutions as the Alberta Horticultural Research Centre at Brooks, Alberta, the Veterinary Infectious Disease Organization in Saskatoon, and through contract research programs such as the Alberta weather modification project. Our departmental commitment to research in agriculture in 1977 will exceed \$3 million, a considerable expansion in attention to research during the last six years.

In view of the substantial benefit that research can provide to the long-term viability of agriculture in the province and to the improvement of net farm incomes, I would like to announce today a new investment for tomorrow's farmers. A new program called Farming for the Future will be introduced. It is proposed that \$10 million over a five-year period will be provided from the Alberta heritage savings trust fund to the Farming for the Future program. These funds will be used for agricultural research to augment and complement existing programs carried out by the government of Alberta, our universities, our federal and private agencies.

These funds will be administered by a new agricultural research committee, chaired by the Minister of Agriculture. This committee will include representatives of Alberta's farm groups, agribusiness, the Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry at the University of Alberta, the Alberta Research Council, the Department of Agriculture, and other departments of government. This co-ordinated approach, Mr. Speaker, will result in strong research programs in close co-operation with the industry they serve. Involvement of producers on the committee will ensure a practical approach to research, and an effective transfer of new information to the farming community.

Initially, a substantial contribution will be applied to the Alberta Agriculture Research Trust. This trust has had strong support from the agricultural industry.

Some 50 companies and farm organizations have, together with government on a matching grant basis, financed on the order of \$3 million of research. We anticipate that support to continue and grow with our commitment. Priorities in research will range across all areas of agriculture, although we will initially direct the major portion of the funds to crop and livestock research, with special emphasis on northern agriculture. In the carrying out of anticipated research programs, all efforts will be made toward maximization of the usage of existing research capabilities and facilities.

Mr. Speaker, this announcement is another visible example of how funds from the Alberta heritage savings trust fund can be invested today for long-term benefits tomorrow.

#### head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

##### **Laycraft Inquiry**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question today to the Solicitor General. The question flows from various comments made by the federal Solicitor General. My question to the Alberta Solicitor General is: did the hon. minister sit down with the Hon. Francis Fox and discuss this question of alleged bugging of Alberta cabinet ministers' conversations on the topic of Royal American Shows?

MR. FARRAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I haven't discussed this matter with the Hon. Francis Fox.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Solicitor General. Have there been any discussions between the Alberta Solicitor General and federal members of the Executive Council with regard to the question of bugging of certain Alberta cabinet ministers during the Royal American Shows investigation?

MR. FARRAN: No, Mr. Speaker, unless you call a member of the RCMP under provincial contract to Alberta a federal member.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister, so there's no misunderstanding. The question dealt with federal cabinet ministers having spoken to the Alberta Solicitor General on the question. Have there been those discussions?

MR. FARRAN: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK: A supplementary question to the Attorney General. Has the Attorney General of Alberta had discussions with the Hon. Francis Fox with regard to the alleged bugging of Alberta cabinet ministers by the law enforcement agencies of Canada during the investigation of Royal American Shows?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I think I've been asked this question about half a dozen times now. Maybe I can be consistent. I say that because I read a CP report on the weekend that attributed statements to me that were entirely false. I've talked to CP about it, and I want to make it clear that I have refused to either confirm or deny rumors of that type while the

Laycraft commission is sitting. I've said that the Laycraft commission may — and I don't know — choose to deal with this allegation. If it does, I think it would be extremely inappropriate for me to comment on it one way or another.

So I'm not prepared to answer questions on the subject yet, at least; who I've talked to, who I haven't talked to; who I've discussed it with, who I haven't discussed it with. If I think there is any actual foundation to the allegation, I'll be doing something about it; and if I'm doing something about it, I'm not going to talk about it. If I don't think there's truth to the allegation, I'm not going to talk about it while the Laycraft inquiry is considering it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm in the position where I can neither confirm nor deny the situation. Any reports by the news media to the effect that I have or have not discussed this specific subject with a particular police officer, that I have or have not discussed it with a particular politician are inaccurate, because I have simply refused to comment on what is or is not happening. I will some day, but not now.

MR. CLARK: That's reassuring.

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Solicitor General. Has the Solicitor General had discussions with senior RCMP officers in Alberta on the question of bugging of cabinet ministers in Alberta?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, when I heard the report from the media I did ask the commanding officer of the Mounted Police in Alberta whether there was any truth in the story, and he said no.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, one further question to the Solicitor General. Is the Solicitor General leaving the matter there, or in fact is he following up on those discussions? To put it another way, is he satisfied that the matter is now finished?

MR. FARRAN: I'm satisfied that the commanding officer of K Division has told me the truth. I don't intend to carry out any personal investigation of his men, because I don't doubt his word.

#### **Eastern Slopes Development**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Associate Minister of Energy and Natural Resources responsible for public lands. It flows from the announcement with regard to development in the eastern slopes. Will the minister provide the Assembly with a list of land-use priorities in the eastern slopes region which will act as a basis for resolving conflicts among various resource users?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I think the announcement of the eastern slopes policy defines a reasonable degree of priority in land use, tied directly with the physical capability of the land. If the question is directed to the areas of conflict for a particular use in a multi-use zone, that administrative procedure is also taken care of in the announcement of the eastern slopes policy.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Considering the limited extent of land

zoned for agriculture in the eastern slopes, why is coal development permitted in those areas?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. leader's question is certainly one that could be construed as an invitation to debate, and inviting arguments to justify a policy.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'll rephrase the question then. Having regard for the limited amount of agricultural land in the eastern slopes region, would the minister be in a position to indicate why the government did not prohibit coal development in areas zoned as agricultural areas?

MR. SPEAKER: I am unable to distinguish the nature of that question from the nature of the one preceding it.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps we could move on to the next question then, and go at it this way. Is it the intention of the government to increase or decrease the size of Willmore Wilderness Park?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, Willmore Wilderness Park and its future, both as to size and use, will come in the future. At the present time the interdepartmental planning committee of the eastern slopes committee is taking a long look, and certainly a closer and fine-tuning look, at Willmore Wilderness Park, and will be coming up with some recommendations, both if any changes are necessary and for the direction of its use.

MR. CLARK: It's this fine-tuning, Mr. Minister, that causes some concern.

Supplementary to the minister. Is the government giving consideration at this time to alterations in the boundaries of Willmore Wilderness Park that would allow expansion of coal mining in that area?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, until that planning portion is complete, I couldn't answer that question.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then let's put the question to the minister this way. Is the minister aware of any proposal that would call for a change in the present boundaries of Willmore Wilderness Park?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I'm aware that submissions have been made to the planning committee in regard to Willmore Wilderness Park.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Would the minister indicate to the House the nature of those submissions?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, without checking individually, I could not.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, could the minister then confirm for the members of the Assembly that at least one of those submissions deals with the possibility of reducing the size of the park so that coal mining could go ahead in an area adjacent to the park?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I think I just answered that I could not particularly cover those applications that are made. So I wouldn't be passing any com-

ment on an application being made to remove or change the boundaries in regard to the coal policy.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then perhaps the minister would be so kind as to check the applications presently before the government and report to the Assembly to indicate if any proposal is now before the government that would call for the reduction in the size of the Willmore Wilderness Park, and whether a coal mining development is a portion of that.

Mr. Speaker, could I ask one further supplementary question of the minister? Is the minister giving any consideration to the establishment of some sort of citizen advisory committee, perhaps comparable to some of the ECA advisory committees, that would guarantee some public input with regard to developments on the eastern slopes?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, not at the present time in a general way.

#### **Nursing Home Construction**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Could the minister indicate whether he has promised a loan to The Salem Manor Society to build a 100-bed nursing home facility?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I've indicated in the Legislature, I think during debate on Bill 66 and at other times, that my travels throughout the province indicate to me that the private, voluntary, and particularly the church groups throughout Alberta are doing an outstanding job.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm unable to recognize any connection between the answer and the question.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I was just leading up to the fact that I'd indicated in conversations with Salem Manor that because of this, I was searching for a way to provide a loan fund for church groups throughout Alberta. When this loan fund decision is made and announced, it would provide funds for a group like Salem Manor to expand its role in the nursing home field.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Is the minister aware of the action taken by the society following his discussion with them, and their interpretation of his promise?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I've indicated to Salem Manor that I was confident we would be having a loan fund that I would be announcing in the near future. As I've indicated to them in my office, until such time as I've announced that and worked it out with my colleague the Minister of Housing and Public Works, through the Alberta Housing Corporation administratively — after that is completed, those funds would be able to flow to Salem Manor.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, for clarification to the minister. Could the minister then confirm that Salem Manor has received, in a sense, his approval to

proceed with hiring an architect and doing soil preparation for Salem Manor?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I believe officials of the commission have indicated they could go ahead with those parts of the design and some of that kind of work. But I had not indicated there would be a definite loan fund. I did indicate to them I was confident that in the near future we would be announcing a loan fund which Salem Manor, as well as other groups, would qualify for.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister on the basis of the answer. When or if the present loan fund is not approved, what contingency plans has the minister?

DR. BUCK: Invite the Premier and he'll give it to them.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that in a matter of the next number of days I'll be clarifying that matter. That's what I and my office have indicated to Salem Manor.

MR. CLARK: How many other promises have you made?

#### **Waste Disposal**

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Are there any plans to amend The Clean Air Act or its regulations so there will be more flexibility in allowing municipalities, under the control of their councils, to dispose of municipal wastes by burning, particularly those wastes that are easily burnt and do not give off an odor?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I think some municipalities are aware that there can be controlled burning with the department's permission. There are administrative procedures to be followed if they decide to do that. On the other hand, I should say that the thrust of the department is to try to make improvements in existing methods of garbage disposal, particularly when using open pits as a method of disposing of garbage. I must say quite frankly, we're trying to discourage burning, not encourage it.

#### **Trilateral Trade Discussions**

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier arises from remarks made by the United States ambassador last weekend in Calgary that his government is willing to bargain for a fair deal on our beef and petrochemicals in exchange for our gas. Since our province was instrumental in starting these talks, I'd like to ask the Premier: will Alberta be involved directly in these discussions with the U.S. government and our Canadian government?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, all I have at the moment are the news reports of Ambassador Enders' speech in Calgary on Friday. I've asked for the text so I can read it carefully.

From the news reports, of course, all I can see is that he has clearly assured those of us involved that the statement that emanated from an unidentified

source in Washington some weeks ago — that there was no possible practical way in which factors such as our agricultural products and petrochemicals could be part of a discussion of a gas swap — wouldn't be considered. Ambassador Enders, I would gather from his remarks, has now said that that's not so, as an official U.S. government position, and hence may be a long way from that point to an actual conclusion satisfactory to all parties involved. At least it's clear that the United States government is prepared to participate in such discussions, and we welcome that. We as the Alberta government will certainly be fully involved in it.

MR. STROMBERG: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. If the bargaining commences, will the government of Alberta allow our natural gas to be used as a feedstock to our American competitors in the petrochemical industry?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I again noted that remark by Ambassador Enders, and would have to give it further thought. It would depend, to a large extent, on the area in which the natural gas was used, the nature of the products that were developed from Alberta natural gas, and whether they competed with our proposals and plans here.

On the other hand, if the gains were sufficient for the farmers of Alberta, it might be possible for us to consider the nature of that trade-off as still being satisfactory. But it would be a complicated matter, and we'll have to watch it closely.

MR. STROMBERG: One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, also in regard to the [remarks] made by Mr. Enders. Is the Premier receptive to the suggestion that the United States would like to join Canada in a joint *in situ* research and development program in our oil sands?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I noted again that observation. We'll be having a meeting with Ambassador Enders soon in terms of a discussion of a number of matters. There may be a factor there, but I take the view that as a result of decisions made by this government and the ingenuity of the private sector we're now about 10 years ahead of the Colorado oil shales.

MR. NOTLEY: Supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Will the Premier advise the House whether, in reviewing the reports of Ambassador Enders' speech, he has been able to determine whether or not the *quid pro quo* or the trade-off would be on the basis of a swap, but only within the context of our rolling 30 years' supply?

MR. LOUGHEED: Well of course there's no question in any discussion that the 30-year supply for Albertans would be maintained in any event. We would presume that's an established position — 30 years' supply for Albertans on a rolling requirement basis. Any additional supply is over and above the 30 years. It's not within the 30 years that's contemplated.

MR. NOTLEY: Supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Has the government obtained any recent studies in the last few months to determine the

competitive position of Alberta petrochemicals in the United States market, in light of Ambassador Enders' suggestion that feedstock might be the basis of a *quid pro quo*?

MR. LOUGHEED: Though I think it would be premature to respond to that question at this time, I should say in answer to the previous question that in the event we were involved in a swap of natural gas, the guarantees may be sufficient that they could come within the 30 years' supply to assure that we receive the supply of gas, presumably from Alaska, within the 30-year period. I should clarify that second last answer. But the final question, I think, is one that it's premature to respond to at this time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Business Development and Tourism. Can the minister advise the Assembly whether the Department of Business Development and Tourism has undertaken any surveys or commissioned any studies with respect to the competitive relationship of Alberta petrochemicals in the United States market?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, we haven't [commissioned] any from the department, but from time to time we do have discussions with the principals involved in the development of petrochemical plants in Alberta. They have undertaken, of course, some studies indicating the competitive position of their petrochemicals coming out of Alberta with those in worldwide plants.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Can the Premier advise the House whether or not the ministers of the government have had any formal opportunity to discuss the proposal of the Alberta government, vis-a-vis a swap for entry of Alberta petrochemicals and agricultural products in the United States market, with the new federal Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, no there hasn't been. The discussions we had on this subject took place with federal government ministers prior to the appointment of the present federal Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. We would anticipate, though, that the next step really would be whether or not the United States government and its interests are at all serious about any desire to prebuild the pipeline, and hence any desire to look into the matter of accelerated natural gas supply or a gas swap. It may be that nothing will come of it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Is the Premier in a position to advise the Assembly whether or not the federal government is in favor of the proposal made by the government of Alberta?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I always have difficulty anticipating what the federal government is in favor of or against. But in this case we've received indications that I think are quite firm that the federal government has no objection to this approach of bilateral discussions on the specific matters related to agriculture products and, subsequently — and clearly

subsequently or secondarily — petrochemicals, and that the bilateral discussions would involve both the federal government and the Alberta government with whatever United States interests are involved.

#### AHC Resignations

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works. I'd like to know if the minister can advise the House if we've had a large number of resignations of professional level employees from the Alberta Housing Corporation in the last six months.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, we've had one or two.

#### ANDCO Management Review

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Minister Without Portfolio responsible for native affairs. Notwithstanding the minister's desire to expound at length, I'd like to ask a question that can be answered very succinctly. Can the minister confirm to the House whether the Native Secretariat or the minister refused to accept the proposal advanced by the presidents of the Indian Association of Alberta and Metis Association of Alberta that an independent auditor and management consultant be selected by agreement of the two associations as well as the government of Alberta?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the current position of the Indian Association is that they fully concur with the provincial government's desire to have an independent audit and management evaluation of the books and management of the Alberta Native Development Corporation. At the present time we are awaiting concurrence from the Metis Association of Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can the minister confirm that he received a submission that in fact suggested an independent auditor and management consultant agreeable to both organizations as well as the government of Alberta?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I have just responded that the position of the Indian Association of Alberta is identical to that of the provincial government. Once we have the concurrence of the Metis Association we will proceed with that audit and management review.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can the minister advise the Assembly whether it is true that he received a letter from both organizations as well as ANDCO, which set out the suggestion that the auditor and the management consultant be acceptable to the two organizations and the government of Alberta, as opposed to a unilateral decision with consultation afterwards?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, over the last two years or so, many positions have been recommended by one or all of the three parties concerned. What I have outlined to the hon. member, through you, Mr. Speaker, is the current and most recent position.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can the minister advise that on or about September 6, the proposal that I have outlined was made to him?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the letter the hon. member refers to was one of a series of proposals made by the board of ANDCO, not by the presidents of the associations. As I have indicated, other positions have since been taken by those associations.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly what was meant in his letter of September 9: if a positive response is not received by September 26 "appropriate action will be taken"?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I think we're now getting into an area that would require considerable explanation. If the hon. member wishes a detailed account, I think it should be put on the Order Paper.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can the minister confirm that the quarterly core funding for the Metis Association of Alberta has not been received, and is there any connection between this letter and the failure to receive the quarterly funding?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the question is yes, and to the second part, no.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the last supplementary on this topic.

MR. NOTLEY: Can the minister advise the Assembly the grounds for the holdup in the quarterly core funding of the Metis Association of Alberta?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, funds are provided by the Native Secretariat to a variety of native associations and organizations throughout the year. The constant policy that we've taken, which was established by my predecessor the Hon. Al Adair, is that funding should be on a quarterly basis; and the funds would be provided after we had received a copy of an audited statement, which was one of the requirements for the Secretary of State. It should be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that the office of the Secretary of State provides the core funding to these organizations. In most cases the Native Secretariat provides program funding. As I've indicated, the funds are provided quarterly.

From time to time, funds have to be withheld until a proper explanation can be given for the expenditure of certain funds. I'm sure all members of the Assembly can appreciate that financial accountability is one of our main concerns. When a budget is received by an organization, that they wish to spend funds in a certain way, and there is some question whether or not that budget is actually being followed, it's the responsibility of the Native Secretariat — and they have my full concurrence with this action — that the funds should be withheld until proper answers are given.

I might go on, Mr. Speaker, to say that the treasurer of the Metis Association, Peter Pelletier, has had a number of discussions with Bill Donahue of the Native Secretariat. I see no reason for alarm; it's a routine check. I think these discussions are such that we should soon know whether or not those funds were expended for the proper reasons, as indicated in the budget of the Metis Association of Alberta.

#### **Travel Agents**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Business Development and Tourism. Could the minister indicate whether the government is considering requiring travel agencies to come under government controls?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, from time to time we have met representatives of the Association of Travel Agents with regard to their request that all travel agents be licensed in Alberta. The purpose for this licensing would be twofold: one, to bring about some sort of establishment of standards for operation by the travel agencies. Secondly, it would protect the consumer against any major defalcation by a travel agent; in other words, taking the money for a particular tour, the tour falling apart, and the customer being left holding the bag for the money or being left in a foreign country.

We examined it some time ago and found there was not a major problem. We are very hesitant, as you well know, to become further involved in the private sector if it's not necessary. The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and I and our officials have had a number of meetings with the travel agents and the association. We have a meeting coming up in mid-November, I think, at which time we will discuss the matter further and, I hope, would come to the concurrence that the travel agents themselves can develop a bonding system or an assurance fund which would in fact protect the consumer of Alberta.

#### **Rail Passenger Service**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transportation. Has the minister had an opportunity to review the final plan for western transcontinental passenger train service issued by the Railway Transport Committee of the Canadian Transport Commission? If so, could he advise the Assembly whether or not the final plan reflects the changes requested and the representations made to the CTC by the Department of Transportation of this government?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, we received just today the final plan put out by the Jones committee — the Railway Transport Committee. I think I would have to be preliminary in my remarks to the hon. member and say that it's substantially improved over the so-called preferred plan, which is the one they put out six months ago. They now have the transcontinental time down to three days instead of four, and I think the times are essentially what is required.

Another important comment I could make, Mr. Speaker, is that we're pleased to see in the final plan many of the recommendations that we made to the

Jones committee now carried forward into that plan, particularly insofar as the recommendation for the two transcontinental services through both Calgary and Edmonton; and the other important comment relative to improved equipment which is required to make an effort to sell or market rail passenger service.

MR. HORSMAN: A supplementary question. Would the minister advise the Assembly whether he is prepared to carry on ongoing discussions with the directors and operators of VIA Rail with regard to any additional improvements that the government of Alberta would like to see in this proposal?

DR. HORNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would hope to have ongoing communications, both personally and through my senior staff, with the new president of VIA Rail. I think it is particularly important for western Canada that we become very aware of their thinking and their intended plans, so we can assess what its impact will be on our various communities in western Canada, and be able to have some input to an improved rail passenger service.

#### **Parks Policing**

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering whether the Solicitor General can advise if the plans for a police force in Fish Creek Park are now in place. If they are, will that police force be answerable to the civic authorities or the provincial authorities?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, both Fish Creek in Calgary and Capital City Park in Edmonton fall within the boundaries of those two cities, and law enforcement within the boundaries of the cities are the responsibilities of the respective city police departments.

I have made no secret of my opinion that these huge natural parks should be best policed by a mounted patrol; that it's difficult to get into ravines and coulees with cars and motorcycles, and helicopters are too expensive. However, this is a decision for the local police commissions. They've received generous funds from the province for the purpose of law enforcement, and it is their decision as to how they spend those funds. I understand that the Calgary Police Commission still has the question of a mounted patrol under consideration.

MR. PLANCHE: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if I may. Can the Solicitor General respond as to whether it will be his intention to fund this incremental police force in its entirety?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, the city of Calgary is already being funded to the tune of in excess of \$6 million a year. This is the only province in Canada that gives such generous fiscal support to urban police.

#### **Trade Mission — Iran**

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, since this is Agriculture Week, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. The hon. Premier, in his state of the province address on the opening day of the fall session, stated that since his trip to Russia and the



Middle East there has been a request from the government of Iran for samples of Canadian wheat. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture, has anything further transpired?

MR. MOORE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge that is going ahead with the full co-operation of The Canadian Wheat Board. In addition, we've had enquiries from that government with respect to having technical people come to Alberta to involve themselves in some test trials with respect to the use of the flours which are produced not only from white wheat but wheat which is grown normally in Alberta and western Canada.

MR. BATIUK: A supplementary to the hon. minister. Could the minister advise the House of the reason for the request of the chemists coming to Alberta for this purpose, what the real purpose of this would be?

MR. MOORE: The reason was our Premier's visit to the Middle East, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister actually was whether the chemists' coming to Alberta would be of any further benefit to Canada as a whole.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking for an expression of opinion, and perhaps a little research. Perhaps he could do that in some other way.

#### Harvesting Progress

MR. KIDD: Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Minister of Agriculture, again in recognition of Agriculture Week. Maybe it would be timely to give us a brief update on the status of the harvest, if he would.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I can be very brief and say that with the excellent weather we've had in the last two weeks, and the outlook for the next three or four days, I think we should be able to say by the end of this week that our harvest is complete.

#### Imports from South Africa

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Solicitor General in his capacity as chairman of the Alberta Liquor Control Board. In light of recent events in South Africa, has the Solicitor General given any consideration to an official statement, such as instructions to the Alberta Liquor Control Board to stop buying wines from South Africa?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I don't purport to be the minister for foreign affairs.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, appreciating how humble the minister is, perhaps I might rephrase the question. Is the government giving consideration to that kind of instruction to the ALCB, or has the minister had discussions with the chairman with regard to stopping the buying of wine from South Africa?

MR. FARRAN: No, Mr. Speaker, it wouldn't be part of Alberta's policy. We don't restrict the importation of vodka because some people may not like the political

climate in Russia; we don't stop rice wine from the People's Republic of China; and I don't believe we would have any arbitrary restriction, for political motives, on importation of wines from South Africa.

#### Racial Policy — South Africa

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. In light of the Alberta Human Rights Commission calling upon the Prime Minister to protest officially the treatment of blacks in South Africa, will the Premier be making some representation on this matter to the Prime Minister?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think it's certainly appropriate for a commission such as the Alberta Human Rights Commission to make those statements and call upon the Prime Minister, and within the jurisdiction of the federal government. We should, of course, abide by the jurisdiction and respect whatever decisions the Prime Minister may make in regard to a response.

#### Mental Health Facilities

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Could the minister advise the Assembly as to the number of cutbacks in special hospital programs at Alberta Hospital, Ponoka and Alberta Hospital, Edmonton?

MISS HUNLEY: I'm not aware of the allegations of the hon. member, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps he could be more explicit.

MR. R. SPEAKER: To reword the question and be a little more specific, Mr. Speaker, could the minister comment on the cutback in funding for the Apollo project, a special unit in Alberta Hospital?

MISS HUNLEY: I think the wording the hon. member is using is inappropriate. There's been a change in programming in Alberta Hospital, Edmonton. The Apollo unit and personnel from that are working in other areas. It's an evaluation and a changing process that goes on within the hospital, so that personnel and funds can best be utilized.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. Could the minister enumerate the hospital beds presently available in special treatment units designed specifically to serve the needs of mentally disturbed adolescents and children?

AN HON. MEMBER: Order Paper.

MR. R. SPEAKER: No, the answer's easy.

MISS HUNLEY: That question is eminently suitable for the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Supplementary to the minister. Has the minister future plans for accommodation of this type; for example, by utilizing Wood's Christian Home for the mentally disturbed adolescents and children?

MISS HUNLEY: Yes. Wood's Christian Home has been announced, Mr. Speaker. It's been undergoing discussion for some time with the group in Calgary, and I was very happy when we were able to advise them that that facility could go ahead. We expect it will deal primarily with that specific location, although that doesn't mean we can't use it for adolescents across the province.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the minister. Is the minister planning for centres similar to this one for that group of people, in places other than Calgary?

MISS HUNLEY: Not at the present time, Mr. Speaker. We would like to take a look at the use that's made, and the need of course in the various areas — whether or not other facilities are available. That's not an impossibility in the future, but we'd like to get Wood's Christian Home under way first.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I have received a certain message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor which I now transmit to you.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order!

[Members of the House stood]

MR. SPEAKER: His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor transmits estimates of certain sums required from the Alberta heritage savings trust fund for the 12 months ending March 31, 1979, for the purpose of making investments pursuant to Section 6(1)(a) of The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act in projects which will provide long-term economic or social benefits to the people of Alberta but which will not by their nature yield a return to the trust fund, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

Please be seated.

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

#### Bill 15 The Planning Act, 1977

[Adjourned debate October 21: Mr. Notley]

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, rising to take part in discussion of the general principles contained in Bill 15, I'd like to make a number of comments: first of all, to look at the question of some of the protests that have been received about Bill 15; to take a look at the overall question of land use; to examine the question of ministerial discretion contained within this act; to examine the role of the special planning areas and the authority that will be given the government as a result of this legislation in those special planning areas; and then to reflect for a few moments on the concept of public participation, both contained in this legislation and as a general principle.

Without rehashing much of the debate that took place for a few minutes on Friday of last week, I must confess that I took strong exception to one comment made by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo suggesting that in the boondocks almost anything can be said. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that any part of rural Alberta is not the boondocks. The fact of the matter, too, is that when one meets with local municipal or county councils you'll find a group of people who are well aware that land use does affect them, that the whole question of planning involves the resolution of land-use conflicts.

So much of the concern that has been expressed, not only with respect to the right-of-entry provision but the whole thrust of Bill 15, has to be examined not from the perspective of those who are opposed to any kind of planning. Very few people in rural Alberta are in that category. It comes as a result of people who ask themselves the question, who's going to do the planning, and for what purpose? That really is what is at the root of much of the concern expressed in the municipalities and by individual citizens throughout this province as they read over Bill 15.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that projected amendments go some distance to clearing up the right-of-entry concern. Let me just say this, because we're now talking about the general principle: I don't believe that the proposed changes, which I believe will strengthen the bill, are in opposition to long-term planning. I don't think that easy right of entry for inspectors of one kind or another and planning are synonymous at all. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if planning is done properly there will be no problem in gaining permission from the landholder or, if permission cannot be obtained, going through some court procedure.

Therefore, while the amendments have not been formally placed in the House as yet, it seems to me that that change will go some distance to allay the fears of many people. I say, Mr. Speaker, that those fears are not unreasonable, because it is far too easy for people to simply short-circuit the rights of others if that latitude is granted in legislation. So I'm glad to see at least that some thought is given to clarifying the right-of-entry provisions of Bill 15.

But, Mr. Speaker, the whole point I want to leave in discussing my assessment of the concern people have expressed throughout the province is that they realize that with the vast projects being undertaken in this province — whether it be petrochemical development, coal gasification, power projects, utility corridors, what have you — there is going to be almost an incredible array of potential land-use conflicts. Rural people know that planning is going to take place. They know that when the petrochemical industry decides to expand there will be planning. They know that when a third oil sands plant proceeds there will be planning. We may very well see the energy corridor of 1974 resurrected, and that will have land-use implications. They are fully aware of the complicated world that the Member for Calgary Buffalo was talking about on Friday. And to suggest that the concerns expressed by rural people show a lack of appreciation of the complexities of modern life is completely inaccurate.

Mr. Speaker, while these people in rural Alberta who have voiced their objections acknowledge the complexities of planning, at the same time I've found in travelling the province and meeting with them a

pretty sophisticated appreciation of the shortcomings of Bill 15. We're talking about a provincial planning act that to a very large extent is going to be our land-use guide in Alberta. But, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the recommendations contained in the Land Use Forum report of 1976, there is no overall statement of the government's philosophy of land use contained in this legislation.

I've had many local councillors — whether in municipalities, towns, counties, or what have you — say to me: before we get into the question of who has subdivision authority, before we get into the whole array of the development of plans for the town of Spirit River, the city of Grande Prairie, or what have you, what we want from the government of this province is a clear statement of what the land-use philosophy of the now government is.

You can understand why that concern has been expressed, Mr. Speaker. Because in the last year we have seen some pretty amazing turnabouts. Last summer when the government made its decision on Dodds-Round Hill, rural people almost without exception applauded that decision. The provincial farm organization Unifarm applauded that decision. But then this summer, after many rural people had concluded that Dodds-Round Hill was an important land-use precedent, we had the decision on Site 6. Now I don't intend to get into that debate again; we've already had that debate in the House. I only use it to illustrate a point: rural people see a government that does not appear to have a consistent philosophy toward land use.

Mr. Speaker, that raises a number of concerns: the whole issue of the definition of a farmer. As I talked to local municipal councillors, people who have to try to make ends meet at the local level, they raised the question of how we're going to define who is a farmer and who isn't. We have all sorts of examples of second homes. There's no question. I don't think there's any objection among rural municipal authorities to the idea of a father who has built the farm staying there and having the tax benefits that should properly exist for that individual. But there is concern about an individual who may lease a second or third home on a parcel of land and because of the fuzziness of present regulations — either a lease-back arrangement or what have you — not pay his fair share of the freight.

Well, Mr. Speaker, how are we going to handle this? We need a land-use policy, and we need — and this is going to be extremely difficult to achieve — a definition of what a farmer is. I noticed this morning that Unifarm has issued some pretty definitive guidelines, in my judgment, on how the government might define a farmer for tax purposes. It seems to me that is something which is needed.

I recall meeting with the council of one county in central Alberta, which asked me about the government's philosophy toward acreage development. What is the government's philosophy? In this particular county the feeling that it discouraged acreage development was quite strongly held by the councillors. On the other hand, in the county next door, which happened to be in a different planning region, there was an open approach to acreage development. Mr. Speaker, again there are no guidelines on the part of the province setting out what our land-use objectives should be. As I read Bill 15, we're going to

see that acreage development will occur even more rapidly.

One of the members in this particular county council pointed out that as a consequence of one provision in this act, which will allow separate titles for any parcel divided by a river, we're going to see a whole series of acreages developing regardless of the subdivision process; and that even though some rural municipalities have said, no more subdivision for acreage development, as long as the river or stream meanders through the countryside you're going to have a whole series of parcels now with separate titles. And that's going to mean back-door subdivision that is going to cost the municipality money, because people build homes, and they're going to have to have roads and may have to have bridges. All these are some of the things which concern local government officials, Mr. Speaker.

So we don't have any overall philosophy. No one I've talked to, either in the farm organizations or at the local level, has argued that we want a land-use bible that is going to nail down every point, cross every "t", or dot every "i", Mr. Minister. Nobody's saying that. But we need to know at least what the general rules of the game are; what the philosophy of this government is with respect to land use — the use of agricultural land for industrial, commercial, or residential purposes; the question of how we define a farm; the question of acreage development on what types of land; a whole series of land-use issues where, at this stage, Mr. Speaker, Bill 15 is rather silent.

Let me move on from making that observation to look at the question of ministerial discretion which is contained in Bill 15. As I read Bill 15, I see that there is very substantial ministerial discretion. For example, the minister will decide who will be the subdivision authority. It's not spelled out in the act. As members will know, formerly subdivision authority was granted the two major cities or the regional planning commissions. Now the minister can extend that subdivision authority to any community.

I might just point out, Mr. Speaker, that some of the smaller municipalities have made the point to me that having the ability to subdivide is not something which frankly they want. They're interested in setting out the general plan for their municipality — no question about that — but the actual question of subdivision authority troubles them because they do not have the budget to hire people with the expertise, either private consultants or qualified planners, so they can handle that job. Now I notice that in this catch-22 provision in this act the minister's going to decide who will have subdivision authority. That's up to him. So presumably the smaller centres won't get it. But it's an example of power which is given to the minister.

The minister determines which municipalities will appoint members of the regional planning commissions, and how many from each municipality. After they are prepared, regional plans have to be approved by the minister. The cabinet establishes the special planning areas. I'm going to say a little more about that in a moment. But the power to regulate the special planning areas may be delegated to the minister. The minister may enact regulations on a variety of matters, including land-use regulations in default of a by-law where a by-law has been passed, subdivi-

sion regulations, innovative residential development areas, and the special planning areas I've already commented on.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the act doesn't specify the composition of the Alberta planning board, or the powers or duties. That's going to be left up to regulation. Presumably the cabinet, on the advice of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, will be determining the rules of the game for the provincial planning board.

So contained in this legislation, Mr. Speaker, is a lot of ministerial discretion. Now when the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo speaks he can say, there's no more ministerial discretion in this act than there was in the former Planning Act. And he may have a point. But in 1971 it was the Conservative Party that crisscrossed this province and told everyone: far too much order-in-council government; we've got to take government out from behind closed doors, have it debated in the Legislature, lay the cards on the table, let the public have something to say.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. NOTLEY: Instead, Mr. Speaker, what we find, if anything, is a piece of legislation where the minister has more discretion, more authority than he had in the former act. Well how things have changed. Or might one say, when looking at the practice of the government today compared to the practice of six or seven years ago, the more things change, the more they remain the same. In any event, Mr. Speaker, the concern of people about too much ministerial discretion is a valid one.

Let's move on from there to special planning areas. I'd just like to begin my comments on this provision of the act by saying — and I'm going to be dealing with this when the act comes up — that I find it a rather sad commentary that we're going to have to deal once again with retroactive legislation in this Legislature to undo something where an individual quite properly went through a court of law, the government lost the case, then we changed the rules in mid-game. Mr. Speaker, I just say that retroactive legislation is wrong in principle, whether it deals with the legal mechanism for natives in northern Alberta or whether it deals with the sad example of the Heppner case and the restricted development area around the city of Edmonton.

As I look at the provisions dealing with the special planning area, first of all there are no specified criteria. Now we all know what the proclamation of a special planning area can do to the value of property. No specified criteria. If this sort of legislation is required, Mr. Speaker, at the very least this Legislature should be clearly setting down the guidelines. But those guidelines aren't there. We have again this flexibility, which is another way of saying that the cabinet can exercise power by whim, whither and thither as they choose. We have a rather interesting provision: no appeal. There can be an appeal on the basis of law, some legal implication, but no appeal on the basis of the special planning area itself. Here we are talking about legislation that is going to alter completely the ability of people who've owned their land — change the ground rules completely — and we don't have any appeal procedure.

I remember that three or four years ago when the former government in British Columbia brought in

legislation dealing with their land act, we had all sorts of Tory members rising and saying, confiscation, et cetera, et cetera. Mr. Speaker, no matter how much one may be troubled by the Land Commission Act in British Columbia, there is one very important feature. There is an appeal procedure. But in Tory Alberta as far as the special planning area is concerned, well, we're not going to worry about the appeal. As a matter of fact, we've seen already what happens. When somebody goes to court and wins, then we're going to change the rules afterwards in any event. Small wonder you have concern in rural Alberta.

I'd like to move on from there and say the concern about the provisions of The Planning Act is not just something that is vested in the country communities of this province. A lot of people in urban Alberta are troubled by provisions in The Planning Act too. We have — and I think it's a fair comment — more provision in this act for participation by the public. But, Mr. Speaker — and the important but is this: at what point does the participation take place, and in what way is the participation channeled?

In this particular act it is still a reactive form of participation. People are going to react to plans, not share in the formation of plans. When he introduced the act, the minister talked about quadrants in the city. What are we going to do in the city of Edmonton? Talk about 150,000 people in a quadrant? Under the terms of Bill 15, one of the good things is that communities of 1,000 people are now going to be able to make their own plan, and that's fair ball. But if the town of Spirit River, with 1,080 people, can draft its own plan — and I think that's a good thing — why then do we not consider the same approach in the city of Edmonton? Why can't we have the communities — why can't Garneau, why can't Oliver — draft the plans instead of these huge quadrants where in fact we know what the name of the game is, where the professional planners and the bureaucrats are going to be drawing up the land-use program and people will be reacting to it?

It will be the same old business that always involves public participation after the proposal has been made. What the Edmonton planning council, the Garneau Community League, the Oliver community group, and all the rest of them are saying is, we want the planning process to begin at the local level, from the grass roots up instead of from the top down. And rightly so. We've seen examples of planning all over North America where the redevelopment of our cities has been equated with the bulldozer coming in and knocking down older homes, where we see high-rises replacing communities that have existed for many years. We've seen what happened to North Garneau in Edmonton, which was one of the most beautiful urban areas in this province. We had the expansion of the university and the expropriation of much of North Garneau. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm not arguing that from time to time that sort of thing may not have to happen. I'm saying, at what point in the planning process are people going to be involved, and where will the planning occur?

The submissions I've received from community organizations in the city are, let the planning begin at the community level — not this business of quadrants, which inevitably means that the planning process falls into a sort of unholy combination of

bureaucrats on one hand, influenced frequently by large developers.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to conclude my remarks in discussing Bill 15 by saying I don't believe the opposition we've heard to this act stems from people who are blindly opposed to planning. Far from it. Most of the people I've talked to who have very severe reservations about Bill 15 support the concept of planning. No question about that. But it is the context of planning. It is the quality of planning. It is who does the planning, and what relationship that planning process will have to the individual citizen.

I see my time is almost past. As I read over Bill 15, I submit it is not a step forward. Indeed in some important ways I don't think it's as good a document as the present Planning Act we have before us. In some ways obviously it contains improvements. Nevertheless it fails to grasp the concern we see throughout the province. How do we meet the challenge of planning, but planning within a democratic context? I say, Mr. Speaker, this act is the old style of planning, planning that will too often in the urban areas lead to the bulldozer as opposed to the preservation of neighborhood communities; planning that in the rural areas is confused as to whether we have industrial development or the preservation of land; the old style of planning in that too often it is the bureaucrats and the rather powerful interests that are setting out the objectives, and the public comes in at the last minute and has to react to plans already made by someone else.

The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo said, we've had too much discussion by the public. It's interesting to say that at least in the city of Edmonton I don't think that's correct, hon. member, because in this province 93 per cent of the minor applications are approved within 60 days, 85 per cent of the major development applications within 60 days. So I think public participation frankly has taken a beating from a lot of people when it doesn't deserve that kind of criticism.

The point I want to leave is that the concern of these Edmonton groups that approach me is not public participation at the end of the road, at the end of the trail after the plans are laid out, but public participation at the beginning. Planning, yes, Mr. Speaker, but within the context of democratic participation. That should be our objective. I submit Bill 15 fails to meet that objective.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few remarks on second reading of Bill 15. I would have to say I think I have had more representation in the form of letters and personal contact on this bill than any bill I've seen before the Legislature in the last number of years. One particular constituent said to me that the bill made really good reading. Now I'm thinking that with all these amendments in here, possibly he'll be able to assimilate it into a puzzle. I certainly think we should send the bill back. I think it should be redrafted. It would be a lot easier to comprehend if we had . . . There are almost as many amendments as there are sections in the bill. Before the amendments came in, Mr. Speaker, I certainly think the present bill overlegislated. However, if a person can get the amendments in place, they certainly are going to solve a lot of problems as far as Bill 15 is concerned. However, it's certainly going to be

hard to sell to some of the people who are so adamantly against the bill, especially in rural Alberta. Many areas are covered in the bill and, as I say, [there is] overlegislation; and what is not covered by legislation is going to be covered by regulation.

What I thought this new bill would do — I was in favor of rewriting the bill, because I certainly wasn't completely in favor of our old act. It was too complicated and caused too many problems, and I thought possibly this new act would simplify. However, as I see it, it's certainly not simplifying as far as land use and subdivision are concerned. I think one of the problems with the act is of more concern to our people in rural Alberta. I appreciate that for our property owners in the city their house is their bedroom. However, the rural areas are where our farmers make a living, and I certainly don't like to see encumbrances so that they can't subdivide their land, and controlling them in so many areas. One letter I got indicated that we should possibly have two acts; one for rural Alberta and one for our major cities. Possibly this would cause too much confusion. However, I think it's something certainly worth while looking at.

When I read this act in its present form, Mr. Speaker, it reminded me of a development by-law I saw drafted by, I think, a regional planning commission for a county. It was certainly a very restrictive development by-law. However, as a result of the procedure they went through, the by-law was never enforced. As I say, in the old act subdivisions and planning were very complicated, and I see it more so in our new act.

What concerns me more than anything is the number of areas where there are powers. The minister can delegate powers. We've got the board. We've got the planning commission, municipal planning, and the appeal board. The big concern many people I talked to had was the fact that all these bodies can delegate powers to certain individuals. I am going to be the first to say that we certainly need orderly control as far as development is concerned, but I don't like to see us go too far in some of these areas. I am confident our minister and our government now can possibly administer this act as it's written, but governments don't stay in power forever. We can have changes in ministers and changes in governments, and when we have these powers in the statutes, they certainly can be misused down the road in some areas. Right now the board can put summons for oath in the courts; they have provisions for warrants. It looks to me like this is not the type of legislation we need in planning.

One of the areas that concerns me and many others is that an authority can sign a plan. I haven't seen if there has been an amendment to that, but I certainly think the property owner should be the only one who can sign a plan of development. The act did indicate that an authority could sign the plan. And as far as we're concerned, we certainly do have too many authorities in this particular act.

The area of subdivisions also is going to be quite complicated, because there can be compulsory subdivisions, which we all appreciate are costly, especially in some of our irrigated areas where there is a subdivision that could be put onto a particular property owner, and in our irrigation districts where we have to compute water rates — which can run up as

high as \$150 an acre on a subdivision — along with the reserves.

Another area in the new act — and I think was probably in the old act as well — is environmental reserves. I think this is an area that we should spell out. There should be some maximum amount of reserves they can take in this area. The act indicates that they can take land under water or land with willows or coulees. Now possibly there are some amendments that should take care of this. However, I think it should be spelled out so that some farmer or rural property owner who has water on his land or has this type of land — it shouldn't be taken away from him for environmental purposes.

Also if one wants to subdivide four acres on a quarter section, for example, the authorities can have a complete plan for the balance of a parcel of land. With costs as they are for subdivisions, I don't think this should be in the act.

Right of entry: I'll agree that the amendments have certainly taken care of that area — and taken care of it well, as I understand the amendments. I was very concerned about that area as far as development permits, when they can tell you what the height of your fence is, your landscaping, trimming of hedges, and removal of soil. Here again in the irrigation districts, if you want to move soil to land level, it's got words in there that the removal of soil can be controlled. I can just see somebody coming in and telling the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen how high he can put his fences. I see the minister shaking his head. I agree that this possibly won't happen. But if we have an act that this can get into, and if we delegate powers to authorities, I'm afraid it could happen in some of these areas.

Land use is a very ticklish area, I think, especially in the rural areas. This is something we have to be very careful about as far as our land use is concerned, especially where we're not going to concern anyone else. Sometimes there are dwellings out in the middle of a parcel of land. Well it's not going to affect anyone else if another dwelling comes on the property, or if it's not subdivided. It's not affecting anyone else as far as the farming area is concerned.

I was really pleased when in second reading the minister did explain special planning areas. That certainly relieved my suspicion in that area, because I thought the minister possibly would be designating special planning areas. However, here again, this is the way our present minister reads it, and the way it's explained; but if our government changes or if there is another minister in charge, it certainly could cause problems.

What does concern me, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the fines are going to be so severe: up to \$5,000 — this is a pretty severe fine — or else 12 months in jail. That's a maximum, of course.

What I'd certainly like to see happen with this act, Mr. Speaker, and I think it would be much more acceptable — I agree that the amendments are going to make this act much more acceptable to our rural people. If it were sent back, redrafted, and had our people put some more input into it, I am certain the minister would have fewer problems as far as this act is concerned.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on second reading of Bill 15 with a great deal of

pleasure. Having represented the town of Nanton on the Oldman River Regional Planning Commission, I have quite an interest in planning. The Oldman River Regional Planning Commission is one of the foremost planning commissions in Alberta, if not in Canada. I'd just like to read an excerpt from their brief to the minister on what they think about this Bill 15:

The first thing that is noticed when reading Bill 15 is the ease with which it can be read. This is a tribute to the skill of the person who wrote it and something for which everyone who must deal with Bill 15 will be very grateful.

Regarding the concern of some of the hon. members of the opposition about the term "boondocks", the definition is that it's wasteland where no one lives. To me it would hardly seem feasible that the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo could have identified any particular segment of society.

I'd like to continue, Mr. Speaker, with a little discourse on the evolution of planning. It seems there is a lot of misunderstanding about the need for it, and the process of evolution. The evolution of planning in Alberta is a homegrown product of necessity rather than desire; accident rather than design; mental rather than maintaining a status quo — such experimentalism being dictated by the necessity of extraordinary rapid development of land and builders by design keeping up with the latest trends in western thinking as regards land utilization and administration.

By 1913 the wildly speculative land boom had to be stopped. The first Alberta act, The Town Planning Act, was introduced, which amongst other things [contained] provisions relating to the preparation of town planning schemes. Perhaps one of the most surprising provisions was one which related to compensation and betterment, a concept borrowed from the British housing and town planning act of 1909.

Then the First World War intervened. Around 1922 the United Farmers government, the first government in Alberta to enact practical planning legislation, was in power. A revision of the act occurred in 1922.

The Canadian planning policy has its basis in the more recent history of Great Britain. In 1929 the 1922 and 1928 acts were repealed, and the title The Town Planning Act was reintroduced. This new act partly consolidated provisions of the two earlier acts and, in a complete rewrite, the act received a new format, being broken down into parts. Part 1 repeated the 1928 act. Part 2 was devoted to town planning commissions, regional planning commissions, official town plans and schemes, zoning by-laws, and appeals. Part 3 dealt with damages and enforcement, and Part 4 was devoted to the control of subdivisions. As a result Edmonton, Calgary, and thirty-odd smaller urban municipalities adopted zoning by-laws in 1930, '31, '34, and '37.

In 1946 and '48 minor amendments were made, essentially of an administrative nature. Meanwhile, in 1947 Imperial No. 1 well blew up at Leduc. Few were to realize this momentous event was to herald a decade and a half of the most rapid development expansion this province has ever witnessed.

In the 1948 amendment the word "interim" made its first appearance in these statutes. By the end of 1949 Edmonton was expanding to such a degree that the city was persuaded to advertise for its first full-time, permanent, professional town planner. This individual was appointed in 1949.

Provision was made in 1950 for the establishment of district planning commissions. After two years' experience with the new technique of interim development control, during which different interpretations of these particular provisions were made and used — not without error — in 1953 the whole act was reorganized and rewritten in the name of clarity.

At the end of 1961 the minister ordered that the complete act be revised and reviewed. The new Planning Act took 16 months to prepare and was effective August 1, 1963. There were seven regional and two metropolitan planning commissions established: the Edmonton Regional Planning Commission, 1950; the Calgary Regional Planning Commission, 1951; the Oldman Regional Planning Commission, 1955; the Medicine Hat Planning Commission, 1954; the Red Deer Regional Planning Commission, 1952; the Peace River Regional Planning Commission, 1958; and the Battle River Regional Planning Commission in 1960.

Thus the regional level of planning is often the last to come into existence; for example, in Alberta in 1950 and British Columbia in 1965. Regional planning received growing recognition in many parts of the world as a comparative newcomer, as an established discipline, and its functions are still imperfectly defined and understood.

There have been many attempts to protect good agricultural land from being used for building or any zoning areas for different types of development so as to keep industrial plants and residential units segregated from the usual disharmonious confusion. There was hardly any attempt to avoid traffic congestion by meaningful planning. All around urban centres, and along the highways serving them, urban and ribbon kinds of development were allowed to proceed unchecked. Pollution — particularly air pollution — control was almost unknown. Large urban centres, natural draining areas, paid little heed to arbitrary local government boundaries. Reciprocity of urban movement with rural movement of people and goods was imperfectly realized. Many other ills of lack of planned development existed, without the cause of such — often obscured — being analyzed and remedial measures taken. This was roughly the situation in Alberta a short 20 years ago.

From this muddle was born the first desire to adapt such town planning measures as were known at the time; first in the larger, then the small urban centres. Experience in Alberta over the last 20 years — 30 years or so in the United Kingdom — seems to show that it is a waste of time to expect contiguous local authorities, which really share a common problem, to co-operate voluntarily and plan to solve such problems.

In the United Kingdom, for instance, 30 years of planning under a voluntary co-operative system produced negligible positive results. However, five years under a statutory system has produced realistic development plans which are being implemented, covering practically the whole country. We are in a similar situation in Alberta, where the value of regional planning has yet to be understood and realized by many local authorities.

The trend to urban living of the erstwhile rural population is illustrated by population changes in some of our urban centres where the growth in the last decade equals or exceeds the growth of the

entire previous century. When traffic becomes locally congested, we see the shopping centre with innovations in merchandising and parking, located outside the urban area, create traffic problems on country roads, while the old main street shopping area lingers and slowly dies if it isn't rejuvenated.

As urban centres grow, limitations on water supply, plant capacity, and sewage disposal become apparent. Use of water is making crucial demands on lakes, rivers, and ground water supplies. The bogey of water pollution rears its ugly head. Often adjoining municipalities compete for the same inadequate source of water. Then the question arises whether it would be better to operate public control of land through a decentralized provincial authority, which would be largely dependent on government supervision and work on bureaucratic lines, or through some form of regional machinery more directly related to the inhabitants of the various areas included in the region. Surely there is something to be said in favor of the latter.

The regional role in economic planning is bound to be mainly that of interpreter and adapter of provincial and national policy and also, of course, that of protestant when such policies fail to take added account of regional needs and conditions.

Land use, because of its unique nature and the crucial role it plays in human settlements, cannot be treated as an ordinary asset, controlled by individuals and subject to the pressures and inefficiencies of the market. Private land ownership is also a principal instrument of accumulation and concentration of wealth, and therefore contributes to social injustice. If unchecked, it may become a major obstacle in the planning and implementation of development schemes. Social justice, urban renewal, development, provision of decent dwellings and healthy conditions for the people can only be achieved if land is used in the interests of society as a whole.

Every effort must be made to remove barriers at all levels of government which preclude active participation of women in the planning, design, and execution of all aspects of human settlements. In the last resort, the most valuable resource of all human beings, the channelling of human initiative and the management of human skills for the achievement of the goals of national planning, is a task which has received insufficient attention so far, both at national and local levels.

I have a few concerns about the act, but I'll discuss those later when it gets to committee stage. It must be understood that if a municipality wishes to do something and it does not contravene the act, the staff of a regional planning commission act only in an advisory capacity; the elected representatives on the commission have the final say, subject of course to appeal.

I have had communications from some constituents objecting to Bill 15. When I ask for specific concerns, very few have replied. I hope they understand when they tell me Bill 15 shouldn't pass that if it doesn't pass we're stuck with the old Planning Act, which is still in force, a much more severe act than Bill 15. I'm very pleased with the dramatic changes the hon. minister has made to quite a few sections of Bill 15. A little bit of philosophy on town planning. It's not something which can be done from above on easily laid down general principles, which can be learned in

one place and imitated in another. It is the development of a local life, a regional character, a civic spirit, a unique individuality capable of growth and expansion, of improvements and developments.

To sum up, Mr. Speaker, planning activities should promote and guide development rather than restrict or simply control it. Imaginative planning should be stimulative and anticipatory. In many cases it may have to remain open-ended, and in all cases it should consider the options and be based on the best available information and democratic, social, economic, and technological trends. All persons have the right and duty to participate, individually and collectively, in the elaboration and implementation of policies and programs of human settlements.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on the second reading of Bill 15. I have made a pretty careful check of the act, as the hon. members will see if they look at the markings on my act. I did this because I have been concerned with the old act and the way it was administered, and so were many of the people I have the honor to represent.

I think the two largest objections I have had to the present Planning Act are: number one, there was too much unnecessary interference with the public lives of citizens in regard to lands they own when the things they were doing did not affect anybody else in any way, shape, or form. The second major objection was the long delays in the administration of the present act. I think those two items would include practically all the complaints I have had over the years in regard to the present Planning Act.

In connection with planning, I pretty well adhere to the premise that a planning act is necessary, but planning should be involved only when what a person is doing on his land affects other people in some way, shape, or form. If it does not affect anybody else, then I can see no reason for a planning commission or a government to be concerned. It's his business, it's his land. If that premise is adhered to, I think you'd find that at least 90 per cent of our people would be prepared to go along with The Planning Act, and feel that a planning act is necessary.

The other one that I think has caused an increase in the cost of housing in the province is the long delays some regional planning commissions have seen fit to insist on. I have known some developers, who want to spend their money to develop lots, put on houses, to be required to take a plan back to the regional planning commission two, three, and four times. And the commission is loath to say what is wrong with it; they just want another plan and some changes. This is very irritating. This costs money, it causes delays, and it increases the price of housing. I believe the planning commissions in the province are responsible for some of the increases in the prices of houses and of land, really because of bureaucracy. Instead of trying to help a developer to get the type of plan they will agree too, they simply tell him to draw up another plan.

One municipality told me they had taken three plans to the Calgary Regional Planning Commission. Each time, they sent it back not approved, but they didn't say why. Finally the mayor and the councillors of the town asked me if I'd come and see them. They wanted to know why. When it was possible to get to

the director of the Calgary Regional Planning Commission, he told us why and they were able to fix up that plan in no time flat and get approval. Why is that necessary?

The attitude of some planners is that they're not there to help, and I think that's the wrong attitude. If the planners would say to the people who are developing, there's something radically wrong with your plan — either your alley is not wide enough, or you're jutting onto a street where there is going to be an accident hazard, or the trees you're planning are going to block visibility, or whatever — and say, will you fix this up, I think there would be less dissatisfaction. So much of the dissatisfaction with the present act is the administration of that act, and it will be the same with this act if our planners aren't realistic enough to know that they're there to help the planning, not simply to reject. They're there to keep the price of housing and land down, not simply to use their authority to have X number of plans brought to them so they can see the plans from every point of view. When one plan is submitted, they should say definitely what's wrong with that plan, if they can't approve it, so that the architect or engineer can then correct it immediately, and not go on month after month after month.

In my constituency, in the vicinity of Carseland, one subdivision took over three years before approval was secured. We had ridiculous things coming up, such as somebody from the planning office going into the town and counting all the vacant lots. They counted the lots, and where a man owned three lots and had his house on one, or had his house spread over two, they'd count two lots as being vacant.

Now who's going to start using their authority to tell a man he can't have three lots in this country. If he has three lots, that's his business. If he has his house spread over one of them and uses the other two for gardens or garages, that's his business. This is what irritates people. As a matter of fact, when we appeared before the Calgary Regional Planning Commission to discuss this, we were told that the hamlet had 46 empty lots. You've got all these lots, why do you want a new subdivision? That was challenged, and the man who made the count was called by the chairman to come and account for 46 lots. He couldn't do it. He said, now this lot with an old shack on it . . . He didn't get any further than that because one of the delegation jumped up and said, just a minute, that old shack is my home. He was counting that as an empty lot. That isn't right. There was only a handful of empty lots, not 46.

So the planning commission was being accused of wrong information because the staff were not doing their job. When you're talking about empty lots in a hamlet, surely I think you have to say, this lot is available for a house if somebody wants to buy it, it's available for title if somebody builds a house on it, and not take a lot where somebody owns three lots and saying, well, we have two lots with nothing on them, so those are available for the public. They aren't.

Take the Veterans' Land Act. Many of the Veterans' Land Act requirements are that they have a certain number of lots. They're given those. Those are part of the conditions under which they get that land. They can't dispose of two of those without losing their benefits under the Veterans' Land Act.



Consequently, the commission was given misinformation, and following that meeting the commission corrected much of that particular thing. It took a meeting, after a year and a half, almost two years. We did not have a very pleasant meeting at all. But then the Calgary Regional Planning Commission said, we'll sit down and help you draw up a plan we can approve. Well, that's what they were trying to do for two years. Why did we have to have a fight about it before that happened? The ultimate result was that the housing subdivision was delayed to the point where people working in the plants out there got tired of waiting, and went and bought homes elsewhere. I hope the subdivision will still be successful. It is now approved. Surely three years isn't necessary for the approval of a subdivision.

There's one other principle I think very important in regard to The Planning Act, a principle I've objected to throughout the years; that is, appointed officials making a decision for elected officials, then the elected officials having to take responsibility for that decision.

On numerous occasions the mayor of Drumheller has told me, I want to approve a subdivision in that area, but the planning commission says I can't do it. The council wanted to do it, but the regional planning commission says, you can't do it.

So I'm glad to see a section in this act in which, if the elected officials in some of our municipalities — certainly the cities — meet certain parameters, they will have the authority to subdivide within their boundaries. I hope the minister will outline those parameters, as I believe he has already done at a municipal convention. Surely a city council is responsible enough to be trusted with subdivision within their area, because they have to live there. If they make a mistake, they have to live with it. They can't be 100 or 150 miles away. So I think that section of this act is a tremendous improvement. The present act says that only Calgary and Edmonton may have their own planning commissions. I want to commend the minister for putting that section in. I see the possibility now that cities like Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, Red Deer, Drumheller, Wetaskiwin, Lloydminster, and Grande Prairie will be their own subdivision authorities, if they meet the necessary parameters to show they can administer this properly. This is right. I hope someday that can even be extended, but let's start with the major cities first, where the big problems are. That's a tremendous advance, as far as subdivision authority is concerned.

Again I want to emphasize that in the administration of this act — and I see a section here, where in some areas the minister has final approval in some of these items. I think that is good. Because before, we almost reached a blank wall. You would apply to a regional planning commission, and if they didn't make a decision, didn't reject it, you couldn't go any further. You were stumped. Under this act you may go further, and that's another tremendous improvement.

I'm going to outline some of the things in the act where I think there has been a lot of misunderstanding. For instance, I've made a pretty careful check of the act and there are at least 49 sections that are similar or identical to the present act. A great number are similar, with extensions and some expansions. There are probably 30 to 40 sections that are brand new. So when we start comparing this

act with the other, I think we have to realize that much of this act, more than 49 sections, is similar or identical to the present act. The new sections are the ones we may have concern about, but I certainly couldn't vote for the defeat of this bill.

As a matter of fact, during the summer months I went to considerable trouble to find out what my people thought about the bill. Some hon. members are complaining that there are a lot of amendments. I'm not complaining about that. I'm commending the minister for bringing in a lot of amendments. The people were given the opportunity to review this bill and suggest changes. Now the minister has accepted a vast majority, if not all, of those changes, and has brought in amendments.

Why should we complain about that? I'm happy the government is prepared to say, we'll bring in amendments. If we weren't going to do that, we would have been hypocritical in saying we'd leave this on the books for three or four months so people would have a chance to study it and make recommendations. I'm commending the minister for bringing in a lot of amendments. I'm glad to see them. They can be discussed in Committee of the Whole.

I want to discuss the principle of some of these, because I believe some of the amendments don't go far enough yet. I think the points I'm going to raise are at least points that have come from people who are concerned, some from municipal councillors.

I'm going to deal first with the amendments to Section 41; I'm not dealing with the actual section. The right of entry section is struck out and a new section is brought in. A lot of misinformation about this section was spread by some people in this province, either because of ignorance or because they had ulterior purposes. Some people said, well I heard that any MLA, minister, or government official can just come and walk into my house any hour of the day or night without even knocking at the door. That's ridiculous. There's no such section in the act. The note I made on this section, when I was studying the bill, was that this was similar to a provision in the old act that was there for 20 years. But even that act didn't permit that. It didn't do away with the sanctity of your own home. If people want to enter, a policeman and so on, they must get a warrant.

One man said to me, "That gives to a municipal councillor or a regional planning officer greater authority than a policeman". I said, "No, that's not right at all". I said to him, "If you were buying a house in a new subdivision and that house was required to meet certain plumbing conditions, electrical requirements, and water requirements, would you like to know whether it has met those standards before you bought it or wouldn't you?" He said, "I'd want to know". I said, "Well, how would they find out?" He said, "They'd have somebody inspect it". I said, "Exactly".

You have to have the right to inspect if you're going to carry out the public thinking. But even those inspectors aren't going to walk in at any hour of the day or night, or walk in without knocking at a door. It gives them the right to go in to inspect, an essential requirement. The people know we're not going to take away the sanctity of their home. That's a different matter altogether. I think the wording in the amendment is a big improvement, and I commend the minister for that.

I also believe that where a person has some reason to object to a government official coming into his home or onto his land to inspect something, then a court should decide whether or not it's in the public interest to go onto that land. That provision is in the bill. When I've explained this to people, they've been reasonably satisfied that it's a different thing altogether. And so it is.

I want to deal for a moment or so with the section dealing with one dwelling, Section 73. I'm not discussing the section; I'm discussing the principle of it. There's been a lot of concern. The amendment — and I have to deal with this in order that the minister may have some idea of the principle I'm trying to get at — is that the person has to be employed full time for at least six months each year.

I'm going to ask the hon. minister to check cases like where a farmer and his wife have a son, the son marries and wants to continue farming. They have certain things done on the area, like heating arrangements and so on. They want to build a house. They want to live side by side and use the same equipment. So the son marries and builds a new home on the farm, and the farmer retires and lives in the old house. I just don't see the authority for that in this particular section without getting permission from someone. That certainly should be permitted. Surely a man should continue to live in his farmhouse until his dying day if he wishes to do so. And if his son is now farming the land, surely he has a right to be on that area too.

There's also the point of how this will affect farms that presently have two homes on them. A lot of people are in this category, where they got the permission. But I don't really think it should have to stop, when there's a logical reason for a second or third house, to be confined even to two houses. If there's a logical reason for a third house — there might be a daughter who marries and the son-in-law is going to come and work on that farm — there's not a subdivision being carried out. Now I realize that maybe some time down the road someone will want to buy or sell that house and so on. If that comes into the picture, of course it's subdivision through the back door. I think that's the thing you have to watch. You don't want a hamlet building up in a farmyard. There have to be some reasonable restrictions.

There was a little meeting in the hamlet of Nightingale where I was mainstreting. So many people arrived there at 8 o'clock in the morning, that they decided they'd open the hall and have a meeting inside. The Planning Act was the major thing they wanted to discuss, and it was this municipal by-law and the matter of the dwelling that was worrying them. There was even a prominent municipal councillor there, who is highly respected, and the point he raised was that surely when a father wants his son, who's helping him farm, to build another house on that land, we shouldn't have to go to get permission.

I think this section needs a little more looking into, so we cover a number of eventualities without making it necessary to get a permit. By the same token, I think we have to watch the point that we're not wanting a subdivision to come in the back door. We don't want a ribbon development on each farm. That would be defeating the purpose too. But I think there is a good case sometimes for more than one dwelling or more than two dwellings.

I'd also like to deal with the situation where a parcel would be 25 acres of land. The hon. Member for Bow Valley spoke about situations in irrigation districts. I would like to refer to some situations in mining camps. For many years in the mining industry of this province, the coal mines had the land around the mine. They had what they called a closed shop. They owned the land, and either they built the houses and sold them by biweekly payments to the miners or they told the miners, you can have the land, go and build your house. The miners did this. Many of them built shacks. Many of them built good homes. But it was their home whatever way they built it.

Then we came to where coal couldn't compete, so the mines closed down. The mines sold the area, say 25 acres, to somebody who wanted to buy it. One such area — and I refer to one because it illustrates the principle — had 25 homes on it. They've been there ever since. It also happens to be in a flood zone. There were no restrictions in those days. They built there, spent their money in building their homes. They've lived there ever since. There's a parcel with 25 homes on it, owned by one person.

One most annoying case this last year was that the owner of this 25 acres permitted her daughter, who was married and with a child, to pull on a trailer and put it next door to her house. The municipal inspector came and told her she had to move off, she couldn't stay there. The lady got in touch with me. I got in touch with the Department of Municipal Affairs, outlined the situation, and in no time flat the thing was rectified. But you can imagine the furor created in that home for a few days, when they thought the daughter was not even going to be permitted by the government to live on her mother's land, where 25 other people are living — all kinds of land, 25 acres. I know you can't cover every eventuality in legislation, but I think we should try to make a type of omnibus clause that would deal with these particular situations.

The next point I would like to deal with is the delegation of powers. Some hon. members are objecting to the delegation of powers; I'm not. Some of the reasons for the delays in our regional planning commissions is that they have not delegated power. Sometimes you see it in ministries of government. The minister just doesn't delegate any power, and everything has to go over his desk.

With respect, this to a degree was one of the difficulties when a tremendous Canadian, the Rt. Hon. John Diefenbaker, was Prime Minister of Canada. Mr. Diefenbaker wanted to know what was going on in every department. One of his ministers said, well I can't make a decision on that until I can get clearance from the Prime Minister's office. It wasn't a serious matter. It was a road problem. But the Prime Minister wanted to know what was going on. Mr. Diefenbaker wanted to have his finger on everything in every department, which is excellent. But it was too much for one man, and it caused too many delays.

You can delegate and still hold people responsible. One of the difficulties in our planning is that there hasn't been enough delegation. Those to whom you delegate the authority are responsible to you. As long as the person who's doing the delegating is definitely accountable to the people of this province, I have no objection to delegation.

The bill establishes the accountability of the minis-

ter. This is excellent. This is similar to the old act but a little bit different. It does establish that the minister is responsible for what goes on; he is accountable. He must table the report in the Legislature. The regional commissions are not laws unto themselves. They're accountable to the minister. I commend the government for that. That is a principle I believe is sound, where a minister is responsible.

The hon. Speaker has given me the two-minute signal and I haven't even started to cover a number of these things, so I'm just going to cover some of the more important ones. One of the principles of this legislation is that it brings people into the picture — and this is what I like — in the early stages of the preparation of a plan. Many, many times before, the plans are all complete before anybody knew about it. Now the public must be advised. This is a tremendous improvement in this bill.

Another improvement is that membership on the regional planning commission is limited to elected officials. Now if that's not autonomy, I don't know what autonomy is. That's making elected officials responsible. I used to object to going to people on the planning commission who were saying no when they were accountable to nobody. They were appointees; they weren't elected. A municipal councillor must answer to the people who elected him. That's democracy. That's the type of system we want.

I can't deal with the other sections. In closing, I would like to suggest to the minister that he consider having an omnibus clause placed in the bill that makes it possible for people to do things on their own land, providing it does not interfere adversely or unfavorably with anybody else. I think that's the principle we have to establish.

I commend the minister for wiping out some of those sections in the municipal by-law. Those were eliminated, and properly so. One man said, I can't even put a new shingle roof on my house without getting somebody's permission. What's going on? Are we living in Moscow? I said, no we're not living in Moscow. We'll make the representation to the minister and I'm sure that will be corrected. That was never intended. A new shingle roof on the house didn't affect anybody adversely. You couldn't plant a hedge. These things have been taken out, and I commend the minister for that.

But I would like to see an omnibus clause that simply says that this Planning Act is for future planning. If it doesn't affect municipal government or other people unfavorably, then we don't have to bother with getting permission from anybody. It's his land, and he still owns his land in this country.

I'm going to support second reading of the bill.

#### Point of Privilege

MR. BUTLER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few remarks this afternoon on Bill 15, and some remarks on what some of the other hon. members have said.

First, I'd like to comment through you, sir, on the remarks made by my friend and colleague the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, who referred to the rural areas of this province as the boondocks. I looked up the meaning of boondocks, and it means wasteland, hinterland, and mountain area. I'd like to point out to the hon. member that the respectful and resourceful people of this province who have chosen agriculture

as their lifelong vocation don't live in the boondocks. They are resourceful businessmen who supply food to the non-farm population at less than any other part of the world when you calculate their cost on time spent and portion of take-home pay. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope in future the hon. member will think and speak more kindly of our rural people.

Thank you.

MR. GHITTER: Mr. Speaker, lest I burst my hon. colleague's balloon with the agricultural button I received today, I would merely like to state for the record, on a point of privilege, that my reference in *Hansard*, as reported on page 1625, relative to the boondocks merely referred to the ability of people to sell a particular philosophy in the boondocks where there is nobody. By definition that is the case. [interjections]

I would certainly suggest that rural and agricultural Alberta has people there, as evidenced by the comments by my friend. If he took that in any personal way I certainly want him to know that I, particularly after this past weekend, recognize what rural Alberta is doing and how much it's costing the rest of the taxpayers in the province. [interjections]

MR. BUTLER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe the hon. Member for Little Bow has some observations on this point of privilege.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I think it was very clear that the remarks by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo were made in reference to some of my statements and [he] was taking the name of farmers in vain. I was very concerned about that. Certainly it was demeaning to the role of farmers and certainly not acceptable in this Legislature and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It would seem to me that the hon. member has explained any barb that might have been concealed or obvious in his remarks. I don't think we should continue the discussion of the point of privilege in trying to . . .

DR. BUCK: He should apologize.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . put the barb back and saying he isn't sincere in his expression of regret.

DR. BUCK: Are you accepting his apology, Mr. Speaker?

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm very pleased to accept the apology and clarification from our good friend and colleague from Calgary Buffalo. [interjections]

#### Bill 15 The Planning Act, 1977 (continued)

MR. BUTLER: Mr. Speaker, I'll get back and deal more specifically with Bill 15. I agree with many of the comments made by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo — or Drumheller. You're getting me all balled

up herenow, Mr. Buffalo. [laughter]

Bill 15 has created more controversy, misunderstanding, and dissatisfaction with the rural people than any other legislation that has been dealt with in this House since I have been representing the people. Probably there are several reasons for it. Some of these reasons are that perhaps they didn't understand what was already in the act, because the people I represent were probably not affected by it very much.

Secondly, perhaps throughout the years they have not become accustomed to having input to legislation prior to its being passed. But now that they have been stirred up, and many of them do realize what was in the old act and what is in the new act — we have certainly drawn their attention — they're going to be watching this act closer than anything we've dealt with since I've been here. We can't afford to be wrong, gentlemen. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, when this legislation is completed the hon. members in this House will have to do their homework and they'll have to be right, because I don't think anything is going to be watched as closely as this.

The rural people have felt that in the past there were provisions to impose on their rights. They're afraid some of these wrongs are going to be consolidated and perpetuated. We as legislators must see this doesn't happen.

Mr. Speaker, I may have more to say on this bill when it comes up for committee stage and third reading, but I would only say to my hon. colleagues that in this case there has never been a piece of legislation before this House, within the two years I've been here, that has more potential to come back and haunt us at a later date if we're wrong. So let's do our homework and be right.

Thank you.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words on Bill 15 and the subsequent amendments. Perhaps I'll have a chance to express myself on specific areas. But I think it's important that especially the rural members . . .

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. [Inaudible] we can speak only on the principle of the bill that's before us, can we not? We are assuming there will be amendments, and we can't make that assumption.

MR. SPEAKER: I have the assurance of the hon. minister, since there hasn't been time to check the very extensive list of amendments, that none of the amendments affect the principle of the bill, and of course the amendments are not before the Assembly. So it would seem that it would be quite in order to discuss the bill quite freely on the basis of the copy which was given first reading. If hon. members wish to take into account that the principle of the bill may be achieved more effectively through the amendments, they can do that. But, of course, debating the amendments themselves before the Assembly at this stage would not be in order since they don't affect the principle of the bill, they haven't been introduced to the Assembly in the ordinary way, and if it turns out in committee that they do affect the principle of the bill when they're being examined clause by clause, that matter can be dealt with at that time.

MR. COOKSON: [Inaudible] whether the hon. Member for Clover Bar accepts the explanation or not. But perhaps it will work its way through the system.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like at this time to congratulate the Minister of Municipal Affairs for the patience, the time, and the effort he has put forth since Bill 15, The Planning Act, was introduced in the spring. I think it takes a lot of patience and tolerance because he has to go through a tremendous raft of presentations, hearings throughout the province; the member has to struggle his way through caucus, which is no small feat in itself. I would just like to take this opportunity to commend him on the way he has handled himself, in view of the extreme importance of The Planning Act.

I got the feeling from some of the open-line programs, and in particular this last month it seems to have heated up . . . I don't know whether there's some relation between that and the fall session and possibly the members of the opposition, suddenly realizing the strawberry harvest is over and it's time to get on with more important things, maybe inadvertently communicating in an indirect manner, and perhaps an incorrect manner in some instances, the full intent of The Planning Act. This really bothered me to some degree when I listened to some of the open-line programs and some of the communications, some of the meetings that were held. There was a great deal of misunderstanding about The Planning Act.

I've always supported The Planning Act. In fact, when I was on municipal council, I felt planning was of such great importance that I guess I was probably one of those responsible for getting our particular municipality into the Red Deer planning commission. Mr. Speaker, if we all reflect on how many problems could occur if we didn't have proper planning, in general I think everyone here would support good planning. One has only to reflect on his own personal or private operations to realize that over a long term good planning won't cost money, it will save money. That's the real intent of planning.

Then the question is: how can it be brought about in as simplified a manner as possible so we can get the benefits from it without too much obstruction, through all the gobbledygook you have to go through to get approval for certain things. The old Planning Act had deficiencies in this area. I'm certain the new Planning Act will have deficiencies. We have before us amendments that involve 40 or 50 pages, if you can imagine, that have occurred since the spring. So already the paper war has begun as to ways of changing, correcting, or improving the original intent of the act.

But I really believe any kind of filibustering or delay tactics on the part of the opposition at this time would be of discredit to them, because the homework has been done, as someone has suggested. [interjections] The effort has been put into it. I think it's important, Mr. Speaker, that the opposition, in reviewing this in the Legislature, be positive in their thinking; that wherever they come to an area they totally disagree with, they provide a constructive amendment which, I'm sure, will be well considered by the members of the government.

Having said that, I would like to touch, perhaps, on a few areas in which I have found some concern expressed. First of all, in the act we have tried to

underline the importance of municipalities in decision-making. Now there are good things and bad things about this. The good thing is that it gives local autonomy. The danger is that a municipality may misuse the kind of power which is provided in a document such as this. Now that is a balance. We presume that municipal people are good, responsible people and that they will not misuse any freedoms written into The Planning Act in areas in which some interpretation may be required.

So I think that's a positive principle in the bill, providing it's used properly, and providing we don't get into the squabble which I often run across at the municipal level. You know, you come in and they fault the provincial government. When you're there they forget about faulting the provincial government and blame it on some other government, perhaps the federal. So you get this three-way dialogue between federal, provincial, and municipal, with no one taking proper responsibility at that point.

So, based on my experience in being a part of the old Planning Act and a member on a commission, I think we will find responsible people administering the act. And don't forget that there always is an appeal at different levels; an appeal to the minister or, in the case of subdivisions, to an appeal board which is set up specifically to deal with areas where there are such extreme differences of opinion that someone has to arbitrate and come down with a ruling.

The problems I have run into . . . There's a note on my desk. Someone asking for the right to give a rebuttal, I suppose, before 5:30. But I'm not sure whether I'm going to be able to do that in the time I have.

One problem in planning that I have run into in the area which I represent is the poor way in which we require advertising in the local media. For example, if an area wants to be rezoned, you pick up the paper and it says that by-law number such-and-such dealing with section such-and-such of subsection such-and-such, reading the second part of the first part, requires that certain things be done. Now the general public has no idea what this is all about, and most of them scan it and just go on to the next item.

I think it's extremely important that we lay out very clearly all parts of this planning, so the public understands very clearly what the implications are in the case of rezoning, shifting, or changing of use of land. I'm not sure whether the act spells this out. Perhaps the minister might have something to say about this in his concluding remarks.

The other thing, and I think it ties it up a little in the new act, is the time lengths for decision-making. This is extremely important. The council meets once a month. Someone makes an application for rezoning or for a subdivision at the beginning of, we'll say, April. The council meets halfway through the month, and the item is at the bottom of the agenda so it's adjourned until the following month. The following month it goes past that stage. It has to go to the planning commission, and they meet perhaps once every two weeks. They miss it because of the mail service or something, or someone has to go for a game of golf, and two or three months down the road the item in question comes before the authorities.

Whatever we can do — and I believe it's being done in the . . . [inaudible] — we've got to lay out specific time limits or at least suggest to local authorities that

if they can't deal with it within a specific time, the province will have to deal with it for them. How they do this I'm not sure, but it should be an underlying principle to make sure that time limits and time constraints are placed on these services.

There's another area not clarified in the act that worries me; that is, even though we have given local autonomy more rights in this act than the original Planning Act, there is a danger here. If you have two bordering commissions, and municipalities within each of these commissions, and they all have their own ideas and concepts, I think we're going to run into some problems in philosophy. For example, one commission is in total agreement with subdivisions all over the place, another area bordering it has no desire for subdivisions throughout rural areas, and they draft regional plans accordingly. I'm afraid this will cause some problems down the road. There again, it's a balance between local autonomy and provincial government saying, this is the way it's going to be. If we as legislators see that this is going to be a problem, I hope we'll have the courage to bring in some amendments that will even out these differences throughout the province, because they're going to create some real problems down the road if this happens.

There is also a difficulty, where one commission borders another — a body of water, for example, involving the two commissions. One commission may pass by-laws, and so on, for a regional plan that would maintain its part of the body of water as a reserve for public use and, because of the problems of sewage and so on, the other commission, involving the other part of the body of water, may do the absolute opposite. In these general areas I would suggest to the minister that it's incumbent that the two commissions involved must agree on any kind of development where there is a commonality such as I've expressed.

The other area I worry about is, of course, the importance of agricultural land and agricultural use of land, and the right to rezone the land, perhaps to country residence or some other use. One must clearly remember that if this happens — we'll take for argument's sake, a country residence. Certain rights are granted to it as a consequence of it being a country residence. Then the agricultural land surrounding that residence must adhere to those rights. Those rights work both ways.

Let's take a specific. One has a feedlot close to a country residence. A farmer wishes to expand his feedlot, finds that without knowing it he has come into conflict with a country residence, and thereby is restricted, perhaps, in expanding his feedlot, thereby perhaps adding to the cost of the consumer's food. I think that in any planning it must be — I see that it's laid out in here — but it must be reinforced that everyone clearly understands the laws, rules, and regulations laid down when we change land use. I think it just has to be hammered away at, because it involves people and it's important that they clearly understand the rules of the game before we get too far down the road.

The other thing that concerns me is that we seem to have two separate kinds of rules in the game. We know that as a city or urban centre expands, they have the right to acquire surrounding land. But at the present time our government insists — and rightly so

— that it be with cabinet approval. However, I'm not sure there is the same input to that, particularly by people concerned about agricultural use of land, as there is in other cases. For example, when Site 6 was selected, there was a considerable degree of input and considerable concern expressed about the use of agricultural land. Site 6, for those who are not familiar with it, involves a dam in the area of Red Deer. However, when the city of Red Deer acquired a quarter section of probably some of the highest assessed land in the whole general area, there wasn't even a whisper of concern about agricultural land. I think there is a problem in this area, and I think it is important that each of these issues have an opportunity to be aired by the proponents of protection of agricultural land vis-a-vis those who have other interests: storage of water, city expansion, or whatever.

I would like to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that we have to live with planning, that urban centres have had to face this all along — and perhaps this is the reason they've expressed perhaps a little less concern than have our rural friends. However, it is coming to the rural areas; it has to come. And this idea of saying, you know, I should have the right to do with my land totally what I wish, is perhaps a little naive in this day and age as our population increases, particularly in Alberta. I think if you point out to those very people the consequences of lack of planning, they will pretty shortly reassess their position. I've turned this thing around when people have come to me. I've said, well that's fine, we'll throw out The Planning Act, all sorts of planning — you've got a beautiful home there, and I've just got word that someone is building a 2,000-capacity feedlot just north of you, and I guess there's no problem. That changes the whole context of the argument.

Basically I know that people object, particularly rural people, because they are independent, free thinking, and they wish to do their own thing. And who doesn't? But we are constrained by population growth, and I think it's important that we have planning, and that we have it with as few obstacles as possible. I hope, Mr. Minister, that we'll be able to do that with the new Planning Act.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, in view of the hour, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, before we call it 5:30, may I have unanimous consent of the House to propose the following designated motion to the Assembly?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

#### head: **NOTICES OF MOTIONS**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I propose the following motion to this Assembly:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly of Alberta urge the government to conduct a full review of the activities of the Public Utilities Board with particular

reference to the method by which the rates for natural gas and electricity supplied by the utility companies are established, and

Be it further resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government, after such review, to introduce the legislative amendments necessary to ensure natural gas and electricity rates which are fair and reasonable to Alberta consumers and to investors in the regulated utility companies.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I suggest we call it 5:30. We'll be continuing with this debate at 8 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until 8 o'clock this evening.

[The House recessed at 5:25 p.m.]

[The House met at 8 p.m.]

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

##### **Bill 15** **The Planning Act, 1977** (continued)

[Adjourned debate: Mr. Stewart]

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, as I rise to take part in the debate on Bill 15, The Planning Act, 1977, I have to say at the outset that I don't think any piece of legislation has created as much controversy in rural Alberta since my time in office, partly because of the explanation that some of our hon. members have given of the bill. [interjections] The partial explanation sometimes leaves a lot to be desired. I think when people in rural Alberta realize the facts, as some of them have when I've taken the time and had the opportunity to explain them, they are going to take a little different attitude than they have at the beginning when only part of the facts of life about this bill were explained.

Many people in rural Alberta, in fact a large percentage of them, did not realize the implications involved in The Planning Act, which had been in existence since 1963 in almost identical form as today. I think rural people by nature are of the spirit that the more government control there is, the less they like it. I'm not entirely of a different viewpoint. But there comes a time when it's necessary, in an orderly society, to have certain rules and regulations that make it practical for us to extend our population and to create the right atmosphere and the right code of building, so we do have some semblance of order in the construction and development of this country.

Urban people and people closer to the urban centres felt the pressure of these problems and were asking for the legislation that has been brought in. In my mind there's no doubt that these people had a genuine need for improvement in our legislation.

Certainly the Member for Calgary Buffalo in his explanation of his interpretation of the problem, and many other members representing urban areas, will be quick to tell you that the people who have spent the time and effort to contact the minister and advise him of the need for amendments to this particular act have not been creating a lot of publicity about their problem. But if this act were set back for six months, I'm sure these people would be very disappointed and upset that the legislation would not go forward at this time.

I do not believe this act is perfect. As time goes on it will probably be amended many times. But certainly it's a far improvement over what we've got today.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I think the only way we can progress at this time is to take this act and its amendments which will be studied in committee, do the best job we can with it, enact the legislation, and change it when we need to. There is certainly a time and place to take responsible action, when there's a need for it. As a legislator, I have to believe that when we can see improvements, we have to be responsible, take a little flak, and enact legislation that is for the good of all. There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, as this act will be implemented there are going to be many times when we are going to find it does not completely cover the situation. I think if this is the case, we have to be responsible enough to recognize it when it happens and, if necessary, bring in amendments at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward to having the opportunity to discuss this further in committee. At this time I would like to say I am going to support the bill in its present form.

MR. JAMISON: Mr. Speaker, before getting into debate on Bill 15 for a new planning act, I would like to commend the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs who, after just over two years in office, had the courage to bite the bullet and get this legislation — very badly needed new legislation — under way. I say bite the bullet because Bill 15 is a people kind of bill. What we do in this Assembly with Bill 15 will affect nearly every Albertan in one way or another, either in the general directions that are taken or in a direct way which will personally affect people. So there is emotional involvement, and people will react strongly for or against many clauses of this bill. That's why the minister had to bite the bullet in introducing Bill 15, and he'll possibly have to bite it many, many more times in the years to come.

I don't know about all members of this House, but for me the number of letters, telephone calls, and visits I have had from people concerned about The Planning Act has been matched only once in my last six years in office. That was when I had the privilege of being the chairman of the censorship committee. So congratulations, Mr. Minister, on introducing the new Planning Act to this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, one thing stands out clearly about this new legislation. It is more understandable, readable, and clearly spelled out than the former act, and if there is one thing we should all strive for in formulating new legislation, it is clarity. Ambiguity is one thing certain to head any piece of legislation into a

mess of problems.

More decisions will be made at the local level under this new Planning Act, and the appeal function will also be handled at the local level in many cases. This is a big improvement and change from the former act.

Section 41, dealing with the right of entry, was a part of the legislation which prompted many, many people to react. I believe it's fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that the opposition used this strong reaction to Section 41 as a red herring, trying to turn it to their advantage. The truth of the matter is that the right-of-entry provisions which were protested so strongly were put into the act by the former Social Credit government. That government did not see fit to put the legislation squarely before the public. The Social Credit government was apparently not much concerned with the people's right to know. On that subject, I would like to refer to the private member's bill the other day, Bill 224, where the hon. member thought the people's right to know was a very important subject. I believe with this section now spelled out in plain language, and the necessary protection put into it for individual property owners, the fears of the people have been largely put to rest.

The other section I would like to say a few words on, Mr. Speaker, is Section 73 dealing with rural land subdivision. In my constituency this section is of most interest to farmers and city dwellers, most of whom in both cases are concerned about preserving prime agricultural land for farming. I recall speaking on this very subject in my maiden speech in this Legislature back in 1972. Six years ago I was deeply concerned with the urban sprawl, promoted by large developers, which was gobbling up the best farmland in the Edmonton metropolitan area. That sprawl is continuing, and continuing fast.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the Minister of Municipal Affairs an addition to Section 73. I would recommend very strongly that the submission made by the Municipal District of Sturgeon No. 90 that a 3-acre building site at a suitable location be included in the Section 73 amendments.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to speak on second reading of this bill. Like many other people here, I have had more mail on Bill 15 than any other piece of legislation since I've been in the Legislature. So I feel I am pretty well qualified to talk on how the people in my constituency feel.

First, they feel that planning is a necessary evil, and I'll underline the necessary part. They realize it is necessary, but that doesn't mean to say they like it. I would say the part that bothers them the most in planning is the Oldman River Planning Commission. The hon. Member for Highwood this afternoon gave us an inside view on planning commissions, but from the outside it looks a little different. In the Oldman River Planning Commission you have over 40 appointed [and] elected officials, and you have a nucleus administrative staff of about 10 or 12 people. This looks democratic on the outside, but actually it's unwieldy. The fellow from Foremost isn't going up to Glenwood to check out what's happening there. In the long run your administrative staff makes the decisions, and all your elected officials do is assent to these decisions. I know that isn't the way some

people feel, but that's the way the people feel in my constituency.

I would urge the minister, and I have urged this on him before, to allow municipalities to drop out of these planning commissions. Now I know in the bill it says they can, and the big ones will. I honestly believe that if a municipality is allowed to drop out of the planning commission, one of two things will happen. Either within two years they're going to find out they can't get along without the planning commission, and they'll come back in; or, secondly, they're going to find out they don't need a planning commission, and the thing will wither and die away. For this reason I would like him really to look at giving municipalities more option in dropping out of these planning commissions.

Finally, I'd like to say that I'm going to support this bill. I think it is infinitely better than the one we're living under, and we seem to have got along with that, but I think the new one will be better. So I urge the members to support the bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take part in second reading of The Planning Act. As has been said by numerous other speakers, a great deal has been said in my area in the last few months about the new Planning Act. Many of the statements made in advertisements in the various media have not been exactly true, and they've not been exactly untrue. Many things can be said if you take a portion of a sentence, leave out the beginning and the end, and have just a few words in the middle. For years politicians have been accused of that, and I think there may have been a lot of that used on Bill 15.

Mr. Speaker, maybe it isn't all bad, because it has made people think. Something has come in front of them that they suddenly realized may affect them. Be the statements given them wrong or right, at least they have a feeling that this bill may affect their very way of life. I think this is very important because this is the first attempt at putting proposed legislation before the people to let them have a chance to have their input. The numerous amendments, some of them drafting, were because of points brought up by the public, where they felt the bill would be better. I think this is a true show of what can be done. The new bill has put much more power in local, elected people, which is where it should be. The civil servants at that level shouldn't be making the decisions.

The hon. Member for Cardston alluded to the very point of the paid people on commissions. I had a member from a commission come to one of the local councils that I represent. He sits there and gives them the feeling that he is much more special than them. So they get the attitude, well what's the use of going to the meeting and giving my two bits worth, because they will never listen to me anyway. Really, Mr. Speaker, this is not what it's all about. It's the local officials that should, and indeed with the new bill will, have the last say. The many appeals that have been built into the proposed bill, on many more levels than previously, I think are a great step forward.

As to the sections which much of the publicity was geared towards — the right of entry, which all other speakers have said has been in various acts for many, many years — I believe the Member for Highwood

gave a very good illustration this afternoon of the history of another Section 73. If you look at the corresponding section in the previous act, look at Section 73 in Bill 15, then look at the same proposal in the amendments, there is a great deal of difference, Mr. Speaker, as a result of public input. I think that's very important. It's a long step from the original bill to the proposal. These things are very important.

I have probably not had as many letters as some, but I've gone to a few meetings to explain the new bill. If you explain the main point of it, and where you feel it's an improvement over the previous bill, the people accept it. My constituency is a rural area, and they accept that, sure, there may be a lot of things where it seems odd there should be planning. But they also realize that without planning we will in many respects have an area that really none of us would like. When you go to improve it afterwards, you run into a great amount of trouble. You have to put more legislation through, maybe more stringent legislation, and it really isn't good for anybody.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say I do indeed support Bill 15 in principle. It's a great step forward in that it is giving the local, elected people many decisions they didn't have before. This is where they should be. These people have to answer to the people in their area, and many of them answered last week. Every X number of years we have to run for our office, and so do they. If they're not doing the job people think they should be doing, they see to it that maybe they're not there next time. Really, Mr. Speaker, this is the name of the game, and this is why I support this act. It does put the onus back on the elected officials.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make a few brief comments on this bill. I too would like to add my remarks to other members'. I'm pleased the hon. minister brought this bill forward. I think he's to be commended for doing it in a forthright way. It's a difficult bill. But I think by his speedy action he has shown he's certainly making a valuable contribution to this House, and will in the future.

There are a couple of areas, though, I'd like to touch on briefly. First of all, I'd like to make something that may be a little unpopular with many members of the House, and that is the defence of planners. We encourage our young people to go to universities to become professional people. We encourage them to go to our colleges to learn about environmental design and environmental control. Then when we hire them in government agencies to do the things we've trained or educated them for, we say they're bureaucrats with no concern for the people, no input of the needs of the community. In other words, they're almost like lepers in our midst.

Mr. Speaker, in no other area of our civilized life do we lambaste, deride, and lower in public esteem the professional person as we do planners. When I look at our own community of Alberta, we've experienced fantastic growth over the last 25 years and are the envy of many parts of North America because of our planning. We don't have tanneries sitting in the midst of fine neighborhoods. We don't have brothels beside liquor stores. We don't have our highways cluttered with unsightly signs, as in some parts of America. We have some order in our society.



I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that those members of the Legislature who say we have a bulldozer mentality are not aware of the situation within their own communities. In our cities many homes are 50, 60, 70 years old; many were built with the best materials available to the people at that time; many are in a sad state of disrepair; many are owned by elderly citizens who are having a very difficult time paying the taxes and maintaining these properties; and many are zoned for higher uses. I can't for the life of me understand these people who will say, we take a bulldozer and flatten four or five houses; at the same time we erect a 100-suite apartment that does keep people in it, does provide homes for people.

They talk about destroying neighborhoods. The city is a living, breathing organism that's changing all the time. Those who suggest that we should maintain the status quo are obviously flying in the face of reality. Worst of all, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, they are not representing the people as they should be.

I'd just like to touch on two items in the bill that I find very helpful, Mr. Speaker. One is Section 76. This gives a development officer an opportunity to stop a project; it even gives him the opportunity to have the project demolished. Regrettably in the city of Calgary, and probably in Edmonton and other areas, we find people who are taking homes in fine districts in older areas that are R-1, single-family residential. They've lived in the houses for 20, 30 years, then decide to move into perhaps a new home or a small apartment somewhere. But rather than recognize the fact that they've enjoyed living in a nice neighborhood for a good number of years, they decide to exploit the neighborhood. Then we see them building an illegal suite.

People will look on it with favor and say, well, they are providing a home for their daughter, son, son-in-law or whoever and helping them go to university. In actual fact, Mr. Speaker, they are contributing to the decline of the neighborhood. They're doubling the parking. In many instances, they are contributing to the decline of that neighborhood because they are generally not good managers of property. They let it decline, and then serious decay and blight set into some of our neighborhoods that have been built since the war and should be maintained.

The other difficulty we see is unscrupulous developers — and there are many of them — building fourplexes where duplexes are designed. Unfortunately under the present Planning Act the cities can do practically nothing. With this new amendment they will be able to have effective control. You can say it's bureaucrats at work. You can say it's ruthless planners. You can call it what you like, but what it really means is that people are being forced to obey the laws in our community, the same as everybody else who decides to obey the laws. They are being forced to maintain neighborhoods, and they are not to be allowed to exploit people like some unscrupulous people have. I say to the minister, I think he has done an excellent job in bringing this matter forward.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to comment on one other area, the Development Appeal Board. It has always been of particular concern to me that a group of citizens who have no responsibility to the people of the community, other than the fact they may know some people in city council and have got appointed to a particular board, have been able in the past to ignore the

planning decisions of the city council and the city planning commission and have allowed or disallowed developments that, in my opinion, should have been allowed to proceed. In instances where you have boards that act like these have in the past, I think they should be stopped. I'm glad to see the minister has done this.

The reason I say this is that if a council makes a bad decision, or several bad decisions, at least the people of the community have the opportunity every three years to throw them out. But too frequently in the past we've had a lot of people on these development appeal boards who have no concept of responsibility to the community in which they live. Many have used it simply as a stepping stone to enlarge their own political careers in some instances. I'm glad to see the last election in Calgary dealt very effectively with some of them. They weren't elected to office, thank heavens.

But, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this amendment will remove one of the glaring inadequacies in the previous Planning Act. I commend the minister very heartily for this change to the act, because I think it was long overdue. So, Mr. Minister, I agree that some changes could be made in the act, and I intend to speak on them further. But I would again like to say to the minister, I think you've done a fine job, and I just hope you keep up the good work.

Thank you.

DR. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, I don't like this Planning Act. I don't like The Liquor Control Act either. I don't like the vehicles act. I don't even like the gun laws, or jaywalking laws. If nobody ever did anything wrong, you wouldn't need all this garbage. But people do things wrong. They get in other peoples' way doing it. Therefore you've got to correct it some way or another for that 1 per cent or 0.1 per cent of the population that does it.

As the hon. Member for Highwood has said, this act has been in operation at least since 1953, but apart from the odd changes in wording it's been in force in this province since 1913. It's interesting that one of the members of the last government, who revamped it completely as Minister of Municipal Affairs, is one of the biggest opposers of this bill at the moment. I fail to understand why he didn't oppose it when he revamped it himself in 1953.

People have been shouting for this act for four or five years now. I know all I could hear for the first couple of years in here was, oh, why don't we have a planning act? Now we have one, and now everybody is yapping about it. When a politician stops talking and starts to do something, people get overanxious and a little upset and excited. Then whatever he does, they consider politically dangerous anyway.

The right-of-entry clause in this act exists in somewhere around 400 pieces of legislation in this province, by both the federal government and the provincial government. I believe in the Department of Agriculture alone there are six or seven pieces of legislation exactly similar to this.

On the residence clauses, I understand more buildings will be allowed. The hon. Member for Drumheller might take a little solace from this. I believe parents and grandparents will be allowed to retire in their home on the farm while the son carries on. As long as other people are engaged in agriculture, other

people can build houses on the farm as well.

This act also gives a lot more, not less, autonomy to the municipalities. They can create their own priorities in the new act and make their own plans. It's up to them how far they go with it. Some municipalities under the old act interpreted it completely differently from other municipalities, and put in all sorts of little by-laws. There are actually municipal by-laws that say you can't put up an outhouse on your farm. But that is not the fault of this act. This is enabling legislation only; it enables them to do it, and what they do is a municipal affair.

You know I've heard the hon. minister called "power hungry Johnston". [interjections] I don't think he's really very power hungry. But when you first read some of the statements in this, you think, gosh maybe they're right. But in actual fact where things are left to the discretion of the minister in the end, this is so a bureaucrat in a planning commission or some other bureaucrat along the line will not be able to make the final decision. The final decision will be made by an elected person in this Legislature. If you don't like it, you can throw him out. If they don't like this act, they should throw us out too, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you very much.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take a few minutes of members' time to discuss Bill 15. During Agriculture Week I think it's very appropriate; rural members generally sit back and listen very carefully and quietly while the slick big-city lawyers and so on, as they're called in here, get their names in the paper.

I enjoyed very much dealing with sections and working with people who were concerned about Bill 15. It was very interesting. I think I got into the homes of almost every Socred in my area, via either the telephone or the front door.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's about 20.

MR. LYSONS: I always thought that the member of the Legislature, regardless of what side of the House he or she might be sitting on, was to represent his or her constituency in a fair and honest way, help people when they had concerns, try to find proper answers, and inform in a truthful, honest manner. Well, my version of that has changed somewhat. It almost seems that certain members sitting in certain positions in this House feel they should upset people. In this particular debate it's interesting to me that the Socreds and the NDP coach each other on what to say, when to laugh, when to bang on the table, and so on. I never gave the Socreds that light before, but I'm afraid that maybe Socred means something else now.

Certainly, The Planning Act has been around a long time. It's been in force for decades. Changes had to be made. The action by our minister, who I think the world of, was to bring out the wisdom of everyone in the province, not the wisdom of a few fellows sitting over there who try to distort the facts. [interjections]

I understand there are going to be about 96 amendments to the original bill. I think that's great. This is the way the democratic process is supposed to work. This is what they call open government. We have opened the act to our people in Alberta to show them what was there, and what needs to be changed.

Certainly Dick Johnston isn't the wisest man in Alberta.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed. True.

AN HON. MEMBER: He's the second one.

MR. LYSONS: But, Mr. Speaker, our minister is at least smart enough to ask for assistance when he needs it.

The Planning Act will be settled by the democratic process. It won't be easy. We knew that. The government members certainly knew that. I would like to suggest that we intend to end up with legislation we can deal with, so Alberta and Alberta's citizens can have a set of guidelines to follow, and we will know what we're looking at and what we're going to do in this province.

When I go home to my constituency every Friday, or whenever I happen to slip home, I'm very proud that we have places like Mannville, Innisfree, Viking, Vermilion, and Minburn that are bursting at the seams. They have no lots left. The towns aren't drying up and blowing away; they are being stuffed to their boundaries. We need a planning act to help this process along. I agree with the hon. Member for Macleod: I wish we didn't have to have so many acts. But I think it has been pointed out very clearly and well by the good doctor on the other side that we need it.

I would like personally to congratulate the minister, people from his office, other people who work with the minister, and many people in my constituency who talked to me and discussed openly what they didn't particularly understand in the act. I am sure we will have an act that we can all live with and be prepared to discuss.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two if I may. I thought we would hear from a few more of the urban members in this august body of legislators, but they don't seem to care. If they do, they don't seem to care about what this bill is doing, especially to the rural people in this province.

Mr. Speaker, listening to the debate, listening to the paranoid speeches of some of the government members, it sounds to me that if it's almost an opposition plot — Social Credit and the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview — to start this ground swell of opposition to this bill, well we thank them for the compliment.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Hear, hear. That's our job.

DR. BUCK: Because the people of this province, the ones who are concerned about what is happening to their rights and freedoms, are the ones who have initiated this ground swell of opinion against the government with this bill.

MR. NOTLEY: Agreed.

DR. BUCK: I would like to say to the hon. Member for Macleod: the hon. member says, if the people of the province don't like this kind of legislation they can do something about it. I'd like to say to that hon. member that the people of this province are going to

do something about that, because such legislation is just a symptom of the tokenism that this government places upon public input in matters as important as this.

The government members have been so complimentary to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I'm not going to be so complimentary, Mr. Speaker, because we have been waiting between 18 and 24 months for this bill. We thought it was really going to be something. We kept asking: when is it coming? Well it's coming soon; you know, it's an important bill; it takes a lot of work. Then the minister or somebody had the audacity to say that our legislative review committee went through this bill line by line, clause by clause. In spite of that, we get 96 amendments.

MR. NOTLEY: You can tell it was written by a committee; it's like a camel.

DR. BUCK: Some legislative committee that reviewed it.

Mr. Speaker, getting back to the minister's bill, the minister sort of reminds me of Big Bird in Sesame Street. You know — tall, struts around. Mr. Speaker, he reminds me more of Big Bird because he's laid a big egg with this bill. Surely the people of this province are entitled to a better piece of workmanship than what we have had laid upon us in Bill 15. [interjections] Now we can hide, and this government always hides behind blaming the former government.

MR. FARRAN: Give us some specifics.

DR. BUCK: This outfit's been in power for six years now, Mr. Speaker. Surely they can't hide behind that any more. How can they have the audacity to say that some of this was in the old act; it was lousy, but we've brought it back in here again? It's beyond my comprehension. If it's so bad, why did you put it in?

MR. NOTLEY: Wait till committee, Roy; you'll get your specifics in committee.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, we have waited for 24 months for this bill. What's the hurry to ram it through now? Why can't we hold it over till the spring session? I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, it is just recently that the people of the province have really come to realize what is in this bill. So why try to ram it through?

AN HON. MEMBER: You haven't even read it.

DR. BUCK: Who said I didn't read it? Which one of these backbenchers . . . I would like to say that probably many of the backbenchers in the governing party caucus haven't read this thing, you know.

And I appreciate the problem the rural members are having. Little by little they have admitted they are getting the same kind of information coming back to them, the same kind of unhappy reaction we've been getting the whole summer.

MR. NOTLEY: Agreed.

DR. BUCK: Now if that isn't reason enough to hold the bill till spring, I don't know what the reason can be. Why does the government want to ram this bill

through? When the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo says the opposition is holding this up just to make brownie points on the boondocks — Mr. Speaker, I would certainly say that any member of this Legislature who looks down upon the rural population of this province as being out in the boondocks should apologize to the rural people of this province in a more direct manner than the hon. member did. Because their concerns are genuine. They are concerned that the right of entry may be a real loss of privilege and power to the private property they now own. And if it is no good, why was it put back in the act?

MR. FARRAN: I thought you wanted a new name for the act.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member yipping away, the hon. Solicitor General, has an opportunity to speak. I ask the urban members to say something.

MR. NOTLEY: We should get down to business and talk to the Attorney General.

DR. BUCK: We would like to know the stand of the urban members of the government caucus.

Mr. Speaker, the question of prime agricultural land. As the hon. Member for St. Albert said, he favors Section 73, where we are trying to protect prime agricultural land. But it seems to me that the only criterion we use for prime agricultural land is: if it's going to be a big project, it's no longer prime agricultural land; but if it's some little man who wants to divide his quarter into four forties, then that's prime agricultural land, you can't do that. But when we want to rezone many, many acres of land for Turbo Resources — prime agricultural land, No. 1 soil, just east of Edmonton, in my constituency — then it's not prime agricultural land anymore. So that seems to be the criterion: if it's big enough, give it to the big guy; if it's the little fellow, it's prime agricultural land, leave it that way.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for St. Albert agrees with the section where the right of entry doesn't cause him any concern. Fine. I guess that's what the hon. member is here for, to express his own views. If he went out in the rural areas, the rural part of his constituency, he certainly wouldn't get that kind of message. So either the letters haven't been coming to the hon. member, or else he has disregarded the message he's getting.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's just another example of a government that says, we want to listen. Then they go through the token approach of appearing to listen but in reality not listening.

That's just the way it is. You may not like to hear that, but that's just the way it is. That is exactly how this government is appearing in the eyes of the people of this province now — this tokenism about public input and public hearings. I'm sure that all the people who have attended ECA hearings are disillusioned. Many people who attend . . . Well, they didn't get a chance to attend the RDA hearings because there are no such things. The big green hand comes along and puts its imprint on a map and zap, as the headline in one of the editorials said, zap you're frozen. When we look at some of the sections of the special areas where you give up 10 per cent for the — what do you call that, Mr. Minister?

AN HON. MEMBER: Environmental reserve.

DR. BUCK: Environmental reserve. Then you can include many, many more acres, Mr. Speaker, practically take away half a man's farm. No, the minister says. Well, all I can do is read the act. That minister may not be here the next go-around, and we're going to do everything we can to make sure he isn't back.

These are the things concerning Albertans, and the nonsense about the opposition being responsible for holding this bill up — when we see the total vote count, when we asked for the six-month hoist — 59 to 3. We are flattered that we are responsible for holding up the act. Some manoeuvre to hold up the act. The reason we are trying to hold this bill up, Mr. Speaker, is to prove to us if the government is genuine or not in its concern to have public input. I compliment the government in holding it over between the spring session and the fall session, but you know there wasn't very much action in the newspapers or any of the other media about Bill 15.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's your fault. That's not our fault.

DR. BUCK: We don't hold the purse strings to put all those big, glossy ads in. When the government wanted to tell us about the heritage savings trust fund we had it in Tory blue in many papers.

MR. NOTLEY: Full page ads.

DR. BUCK: A full page. It cost us a lot of money, but money is no object when you want to tell your story. When you have legislation that may not be so friendly toward you, just try to sneak it through. Just try to sneak it through, because you know by the next election we will have some issue created . . .

MR. HORSMAN: Humbug, Walter. Humbug.

DR. BUCK: We will have some issue created that everybody will forget about these things. Looking at the Government House Leader and the hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly you know they are on their last leg, and that's just the same way this government is, Mr. Speaker. [laughter] This big arrogant government has to remember the lessons of history. As I've said in this House previously, they must not forget what happened to Bourassa, Barrett, and Schreyer.

AN HON. MEMBER: And Strom.

DR. BUCK: And Strom. Yes, yes, and Strom. Right.

AN HON. MEMBER: And Buck.

DR. BUCK: Well, you boys tried your best last time and, you know, nobody's infallible. None of us may be back next time. Nobody is infallible, but I'll leave that up to the voters. They have a go at it every three years, and I say probably next spring will be a nice time. We've looked at the timing of this election, and it would be nice to have a big mandate just before the Commonwealth Games. If we hold it in the fall, there may be a bad crop and a few things like that, and if we go with it next spring . . . Next spring might be a pretty nice time. When the Premier flies around

dropping a park here and a nursing home there, you must be on your guard, Mr. Speaker. I've already ordered the buttons, boys, and I'm ready. I'm ready. [interjections]

DR. BUCK: While we're talking about the realities of wasting taxpayer's money, Mr. Speaker, I know you have twenty-twenty vision even with correction, but I challenge you to read that from there. You can't even tell what that button is. What a waste of the taxpayer's money. Whoever the minister had to create those should be thrown out, even if he's getting \$40,000 a year.

MR. NOTLEY: Must have been designed by a lawyer from Calgary.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, what concerns me most is the attempt, knowing or unknowing, to centralize power. I know the government members say we are trying to decentralize in this act. But I can't see that, because practically every other section comes back to the minister having the power. I know the minister has to have the power. We've been waiting for annexation decisions for months and months. The stack is getting bigger and bigger and bigger. If we're going to decentralize this power, it's fine to make it appear that we're going through the motions of giving some of that power back to local bodies. That's where it should go, because as some of the hon. members said, I can't understand how some of the large regional planning commissions should have something to say [about something] that's 110 miles down the road. It shouldn't be. We're not saying this bill is all bad.

MR. DIACHUK: Oh good.

DR. BUCK: Of course not. You know, even the hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly should be able to understand that. I realize he has a little trouble, but we're not arguing that the bill is all bad. Of course it's not.

MR. CRAWFORD: Your speech is all bad.

DR. BUCK: Well, my speech may be bad too, hon. Mr. Crawford. That's true. But we're not all lawyers. Some of us try. We try to do the best we can with what little we've got. We get along. I don't get 45 grand, so I don't get that much chance to practise. The minister should have all these answers, and he usually has most of them.

The man on the street finds he can't believe it when somebody is going to tell him how high his hedge should be or how low it should be trimmed. That may never happen. But the layman going through this act says, Walt, do they really mean that? I say, well I don't think so but, you know, it's there. And the guy says yeah, it's there. Well, what do they put it in there for? He said, I didn't think that had anything to do with planning.

Mr. Speaker, we know we have to have planning — nobody can argue with that — but planning that will be orderly, planning that will be of benefit to the people it is going to serve. The thing that concerns me more than anything, Mr. Speaker, the thing that concerns my people and the people who have written

to us, is that they feel their rights are being infringed upon. This is why I will oppose this bill, because I feel people's rights are being infringed upon.

I would like to say to the hon. minister that this bill can certainly be held over another four months. Let's have a look at it in the spring if we really believe that local people, the people of this province, should have some input.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, to say a few words on Bill 15, first of all I'd just like to comment on some of the remarks by the hon. Member for Clover Bar. He spoke for 20 minutes and didn't say anything. Round and round and round, and no concrete proposals regarding this act or anything else. His opening comment was, what's it doing to rural people? He went from there and didn't say a thing for 20 minutes.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's research.

MR. PURDY: That's research. He mentioned the Minister of Labour getting a grand salary of \$45,000 a year. I'd just like to remind the opposition that they also get a pretty hefty grant in the spring of every year in our appropriation for research assistants. I think it's about time they started using them so they can bring some concrete debate into this House. [interjections]

As far as I'm concerned, the bill is helping rural Alberta. I have had good comments from municipal councils I have met with. They have responded positively to this bill. The opposition is trying to take credit for bringing the bill to the forefront of the people of Alberta. I think it's the people of Alberta who read the bill who brought it to the opposition's attention, and more so I can give the news media the credit for bringing it to the opposition's attention. [interjections] We are also listening. We have had public input in this bill. We have had working documents out. Because of the response, we have about 96 amendment proposals before us now.

The opposition talks about the loss of private property by the right of entry. I don't know what the hon. Member for Clover Bar means by that remark, because I think the right-of-entry clause has to be there to protect maybe the individual next door who may have an illegal development going on next to him.

I've held many meetings with my constituents, Mr. Speaker, and I think I've got the principle of the bill across to them. We've sent many copies into the Stony Plain constituency. I've had no repercussion or feedback from there either. I'm quite confident the people of Stony Plain constituency understand the principle of the bill. If they didn't they would get back to me, because I know the people I represent.

I'd just like to outline to the members here this evening some of the concerns there may be in the Stony Plain constituency, not with the bill itself but with planning. We have an area that's a rural and metropolitan mix. The subdivision of land west of Edmonton concerns me, agricultural land that is going into subdivisions, industrial parks, and so on. The hon. Member for St. Albert put it quite well. The one that concerns me right now is an industrial park along Highway 16. A half section of land has been

taken out of agricultural production and put under cement for industrial buildings. These buildings could just as well have been situated in one of our rural towns instead of along Highway 16. Another concept of poor planning — I put this back to the advice probably of the Edmonton Regional Planning Commission, and I discussed this with the Minister of the Environment this morning — is a development within the town of Stony Plain where we now have a de-watering problem. Some decisions have to be made on that.

I'm a bit concerned about the structure of the regional planning commissions. If you look at the Edmonton Regional Planning Commission, which takes in the area around Edmonton, St. Albert, down to Drayton Valley, I cannot understand how you can have a region this large and have an elected representative in the city of Edmonton saying what will happen in the Drayton Valley area.

The make-up of the planning commission is wrong too. You have an elected representative from the urban and rural areas. In the Edmonton Regional Planning Commission, the urban members outnumber the rural members three to one. I think there is disparity there. The minister should look at changing that particular aspect of the act to make it more equitable, because most of the planning takes place in rural areas and not in urban areas, as has been said in this House.

During meetings in my constituency, right of entry was brought up a number of times. Through representation made to the minister, I'm happy to see the clause is going to be added where a development control officer or other person has to have permission before he can go onto that land.

I also concur with the Member for St. Albert when he discussed the second home concept on a parcel of land. I think 80 acres is too large and we should look at a 3-acre site, because there are many family farm situations and these should be allowed. The act does say that if it's used for agricultural purposes six months of the year it can be used that way. But a young boy starting out in life may, before he can afford a house in an urban area, want to move into the father's yard in a mobile home and start out from there.

I have one other concern with the proposed amendments, and maybe the minister can comment on it when he closes the debate. It says that the regional planning commissions will be asked to give suggestions with regard to annexation proposals. I'm wondering what that means, because I think annexation proposals are now done by the Local Authorities Board and the affected municipalities. I'm just wondering why the regional planning commission should be involved in that.

I also have the same concern as the Member for MacLeod, I think, who indicated that a municipality should have the option to opt out of a commission, if they do so by resolution. Then we can see in a year or two if it's going to work.

Mr. Speaker, my final comment on the bill is that at one meeting I held, on October 11, there were a couple of questions I couldn't answer. I sent a letter to the department, to the Deputy Minister Mr. Isbister, on October 14. On October 18 I had the answer back on the five or six questions I asked. I think that's really good response from the minister's department,

and I would like to congratulate him and his staff. Any of the questions I had from my constituents were answered in due time.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words concerning The Planning Act. I heard the remarks of the hon. Member for Stony Plain. He very ably brought forth some of the inadequacies in the remarks made by the Member for Fort Saskatchewan. I was a little amused at his first remark, when he referred here in the last week of October to this august body.

Mr. Speaker, he thinks he and his cohorts in this Legislature can take credit for the fact that The Planning Act — and I congratulate the minister for having brought it forth — has created so much interest in this province. It has brought forth more public reaction, I think, than any other piece of legislation that I recollect in the six years I have served here. Certainly the methods used to achieve this public reaction have been mainly to the credit of the Department of Municipal Affairs and to the government members of this Legislature who have gone forth and requested the individuals and local governments in their constituencies to let them know what they thought about this act. I know this is the method used by all the government members, and it's been very effective.

The minister refers to the fact that the legislation has been studied in detail by legislative review committee — section by section, clause by clause, down to comma by comma. I think that's very apt, because now we see before us that from the original draft of this legislation we are going to have 97 amendments, perhaps more, when we get into committee stage. A lot of that result is from this very, very detailed study done in the legislative review process that this government originated and used very effectively. I think that's something the hon. Member for Clover Bar should realize has been brought about by the fact that we have requested this public input. We have received it, and are now prepared to act. I think that is a very apt and demonstrable way of showing that we believe the public of Alberta should have some very direct say in what their members in this House are doing, and should be able to tell them what they want done. Then we should come back here, put those things into effect, and try to achieve the best possible result.

The Member for Clover Bar has not seen these amendments. He will have ample opportunity, of course, to examine them and bring forth a hundred or so of his own if he so wishes. We'll be pleased to look at those too. If they're no more effective than the speech he made tonight, I doubt if they would be worth considering. However, that's his privilege in this Assembly. It's the privilege in all the assemblies in the British Commonwealth. I think that's a wonderful state of affairs for us to be working under. We're not ramming through this legislation. If we had wanted to ram it through, it would have gone through last spring. But it has gone out to the public of Alberta, and the reaction has been strong and effective.

I would like to see some things in the act clarified. I hope that as we consider these in the committee stage we will be able to achieve something effective. As has been mentioned by members in this Assembly tonight, I think one of the most timely and important

things is the matter of the second dwelling on the farm where retired people wish to live and other members of the family have taken over the farming, or perhaps even where the farm has been sold but the retired people still wish to live there. I think that really requires our careful attention. I hope we'll be able to reach some sort of amicable solution to that when we consider it in committee stage.

But I have to emphasize once again, Mr. Speaker, that this has been brought before the public of Alberta in a way that no other act has. The reaction has been greater than that to any other act, I would say. I hope, and I'm sure, the result will be just as effective as the reaction we have received.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to express a few comments. Bill 15 brought more concerns to my constituency than many other bills in the past. I felt that maybe I should react to them in the House.

First of all, I think Bill 15 was necessary. The present bill has maybe served its purpose, or hasn't served it and is replaced. There's been a change in the province. There's been a change every place. A new bill was actually a necessity.

The biggest part was that some joker put a piece in the local paper — and no such person even exists in the constituency; somebody had changed the name — [saying] be careful, write to your Premier, write to your MLA, it's going to be worse than in Russia, right of entry, anybody can come in. I had several letters that weren't the most pleasant. But I did get in contact with each of these. Unfortunately some political party would have its members go out and mislead the people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, shame.

DR. BUCK: Would you like to name it?

MR. BATIUK: I do. I do.

Every person who contacted me, whether by phone or letter, I got in contact with, and I sent them a copy of the new act, the present act, and asked them if there was anything you don't see right, I'd be willing to hear. I haven't heard from one yet.

However, I think this act may be even too lenient. I agree that provision must be made, but in no place in the new act is there provision that anyone can go into anyone's house at night, or anything. Another thing, I think this will protect the people. If an employee of the council cannot go to assess the land, if the electrical inspector cannot go to inspect the home, the plumbing inspector, the police, the fire department, the ambulance — what kind of society would we be living in today? This spring I knew of one developer who builds homes for sale; it was just fortunate that an inspector from the Alberta Housing Corporation came up and said, I wasn't called, I would like to examine the place for weeping tile. He had to open up one section and sure enough they weren't there. Had the inspector not come, or had he not been allowed to come, the person who was going to pay the money inside would be cheated. I think these provisions for people to go in, whether it's the building development officer or anybody else, are for the protection of the individual, and I think we have to accept it.

I'm going to support the bill. One area I think the

minister should look at is the number of homes on a parcel of land. I sort of concurred with the hon. Member for Drumheller when he said that if it's not going to interfere with anybody, we shouldn't be specifying just exactly how many homes there can be and so forth. At present, municipalities have that authority to tax. Whether there's going to be one home on a quarter section of land or 40 homes, if it's not going to be used for agricultural purposes, the local municipalities are well aware — better than anybody else — and they'll look after it. I know they're doing it at present. They have been doing it over the last number of years, and I trust they will be able to continue doing it in the future.

However, as I say, I give my real support to the minister. I know he took a lot of flak. Maybe he didn't deserve as much as he took, nevertheless I expect that this bill will go through without any problem.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. minister conclude the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it would certainly be an oversight if I missed this opportunity first of all to express some summaries on the fine comments which have been received tonight, and of course to speak to some of the comments from the Member for Clover Bar. I might just suggest that I think the comments which have been put forward in this Assembly this evening show an awful lot of work on behalf of elected officials and elected members of this province, people who have devoted a considerable amount of time and effort over the summer to dealing with their constituents, meeting with them, addressing themselves to the misunderstandings and problems their constituents had. I agree with the general comments that this has been a very positive process, one which has been very fruitful in the sense that all aspects of the bill now have had an opportunity to be debated and the members have had an opportunity to explain some of the concerns to their respective constituents. I'm sure that this bill will be well understood by the time we have finished with our deliberations this fall.

Naturally, the comments of the Member for Clover Bar did not really surprise too many of us. When he indicated what his favorite TV show was not too many of us were surprised, and of course we would encourage him to watch it further. One of these days he may even be able to learn to read if he continues that pursuit. [laughter] But I am reminded, in terms of comparisons which he chose to make, of a pterodactyl and the hon. Member for Clover Bar. As all members know, the pterodactyl is now an extinct species. I would imagine that in terms of Clover Bar that extinction might be pursued there as well.

Let me touch just briefly on two or three of the broad issues which were talked about. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I did not clarify specifically enough some of the broader planning concepts. I want to be very brief on two of them. There have been a few concerns with respect to understanding the process of planning and the enforcement side — perhaps a misunderstanding. As I said in my introductory comments, the

planning process is essentially one where the goals and objectives of planning and people are put together in some form of agreed plan, a scheme of arrangements, whereby they could pursue a broad set of objectives to obtain land use control within their municipality. The enforcement side is one of subdivision and development control. It is through the enforcement process that the objectives are really pursued, and are reflected in activities. It shouldn't necessarily be considered that development control or subdivision is part of the planning process. It's part of the reflection of that process, a process which brings to fruition the plans and objectives of the municipality.

Several speakers today expanded and elaborated on the process of regional planning. There were a few criticisms of the way in which regional planning commissions were made up, some comments that municipalities have the right to get in and out. I think they did clarify that themselves in the debate that ensued, but certainly any municipality has the right, first of all, to be a member of a regional planning commission and contribute as well to the regional planning fund, which is the part of the funding for the regional planning fund which supports the budget for the seven regional planning commissions. However, there is perhaps some confusion as to how the membership of the regional planning commission is set up.

Every member of a region has a right to have membership on the regional planning commission, and annually they appoint a member to a broad base, a very large organization. From that organization they select an executive committee, which is the operational or policy arm of the regional planning commission. Of course, whenever an issue comes before the regional planning commission that affects that municipality, each member has a right to speak on that point.

The hon. Member for Stony Plain asked why we were including in the legislation a comment with respect to the regional planning commissions and annexation. Well, because of the complexities of annexation surrounding the metropolitan areas and other centres, there was no way the regional planning commissions could appear to present a regional concept or concern unless they were specifically invited. That is, if either municipality did not invite them to attend the Local Authorities Board hearing, they didn't feel they had any jurisdiction to enter and make their concerns known. For that reason we've allowed them to make representations on their own volition, but I think it's reasonable, in fulfilling the responsibility in the mandate they have, to see that regional planning goals and objectives are performed.

Let me restate that in The Planning Act the elected people control the processes at all levels. This principle is reflected first of all in the general plans, and land use plans are the ones that are passed by the elected representatives, not by administrative people or technocrats of any kind but by the elected people. They initiate the plan and pass it into statutory form. That is done only by elected people.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview made a comment I had some concern about, and was concerned about before. How do you get into the planning process? How do you get people into the planning process? We deliberated that point ourselves.

We attempted to initiate a system which would encourage people to do so, but it's very difficult for the people to have an opportunity for input unless you have some basic criteria to deal with. While we would like to encourage all participants in regional or municipal planning to get involved in the planning process, they have to have some initial stages given to them so they can debate it. Even though the hon. member calls that reaction, I think to a certain extent it is positive and synergistic, and adds to a collective position being struck on planning.

The regional plan is adopted and passed by elected representatives as well, not by the Provincial Planning Board in this case, not by the technical staff. It's done by the membership. The membership is elected directly by each municipality and they are therefore represented on the regional planning commission. They are the ones who set the policy.

Thirdly, although it has been seen as a control process, the endorsement by the minister is the final endorsement, not by an appointed person or in this case the Provincial Planning Board, but by an elected person in this Legislature, responsible to the people. I think this is a fundamental democratic principle that has been reflected in the Legislature. It provides for a fundamental responsibility by elected people. I think this should prevail in our legislation. I wanted to clarify that point so we understood that this really was a process of elected people.

I may not say much more with respect to the participation by Albertans in drafting this plan. I think a good deal has been said about it. Many of the comments, I agree, are justified, and I appreciate it. But I do have to add that I think we went through a very positive process. A very careful review of the context and the principles in the various sections was given to the people of Alberta, and I think they have reacted to it in a very positive manner.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there was a question as to delegation of the responsibility for subdivision approving authority. Again, the Member for Spirit River-Fairview indicated this was a ministerial, centralized tendency. I know of no other process that would perhaps pass through to the council the opportunity to form their own subdivision approving authority. I think this is a very important right they should have, and surely an elected minister should have that right to designate. Some of the criteria which may be important in determining which municipalities have that right would be whether the municipalities adopted a general municipal plan, as spelled out in the legislation, which would set out perhaps some criteria for direction of development; whether the municipality possesses a professional staff capable of providing information in dealing with these very complex matters; and obviously, whether the municipality has sufficient funds to afford perhaps a pretty substantial administrative structure to deal with the subdivision process.

Mr. Speaker, finally, I would again say that when we get into committee study, when we have an opportunity to bring forward amendments to the various sections, I will spend more time on a line-by-line and perhaps section-by-section study. We can deal with the questions and concerns then.

[Mr. Speaker declared the motion carried. Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Adair	Hansen	Musgreave
Appleby	Harle	Paproski
Ashton	Horner	Planche
Backus	Horsman	Purdy
Batiuk	Hunley	Russell
Bogle	Hyland	Schmidt
Bradley	Jamison	Shaben
Butler	Johnston	Stewart
Chambers	Kidd	Stromberg
Chichak	Koziaik	Taylor
Cookson	Kroeger	Tesolin
Crawford	Leitch	Thompson
Doan	Little	Walker
Donnelly	Lysons	Webber
Dowling	McCrae	Wolstenholme
Farran	McCrimmon	Young
Gogo	Moore	Yurko

Against the motion:

Buck	Notley	R. Speaker
Clark		

Totals:	Ayes - 51	Noes - 4
---------	-----------	----------

[Bill 15 read a second time]

**Bill 61  
The Farm Implement  
Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 61, The Farm Implement Amendment Act, 1977.

Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 61 contains a number of important changes in our farm implement legislation. Before elaborating on a few, let me make some general comments about farm machinery and farm implement legislation.

First of all, I want to say that our legislation is only effective with the co-operation we get from all those involved in the chain, including farmers, dealers, manufacturers, parts distributors, and those involved in transportation. In order to enhance that kind of co-operation the Farm Machinery Appeal Board, consisting of farmers, representatives of dealers and manufacturers, was formed in 1972 and was ably chaired for the first four years, until last January, by Mr. Steve Haley of Athabasca. At this time I want to thank him for his work and the very effective way in which he established the operation of the board and carried on until early this year. The major concerns in the farm implement area at that time and today remain the provision of good warranties and the honoring of those warranties, parts supply, service, and the provision of dealer premises in good locations with reasonable access by all farmers throughout Alberta.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that since 1972 and the establishment of the Farm Machinery Appeal Board we've generally had excellent co-operation from most segments involved in that chain. Many dealers have involved themselves in an upgrading program devel-



oped by the Farm Machinery Appeal Board to ensure that they have adequate service facilities, service personnel, and parts supply, so that after having sold a machine they will be able to service it and supply it with parts. On occasions, those dealers have been assisted by loans or guarantees from the Alberta Opportunity Company or the Agricultural Development Corporation.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, insofar as farm machinery manufacturers are concerned, we were instrumental in working with Saskatchewan and Manitoba in establishing the prairie farm machinery testing centre at Humboldt, Saskatchewan, with satellites in Manitoba and Lethbridge, Alberta. Although just getting into good operation, this centre will over the longer term establish a performance range for large and small manufacturers, so they will have a sort of official rating, something similar to the Nebraska tests that were famous, you might say, in years past. So farmers will have something by which to judge the machine they are able to purchase.

On the plus side of parts supply and warranty, I have to say that the major firms have taken on a responsibility of ensuring that across North America we have a computerized system of locating parts. Generally most major manufacturers now have a system where an individual farmer can phone a dealer, and the dealer, by phoning the head office or otherwise, can within a few minutes locate parts wherever they might be in North America.

On the minus side in terms of the parts situation, some manufacturers are selling machines in this province who, in my view, simply haven't taken the kind of recognition they should to ensure that there is a parts supply in Alberta. It's really not good enough for a manufacturer of equipment sold in this province to say, well our parts supply is in Winnipeg and it will be here just as quickly as the airplane gets here; or our parts supply in the main is in the United States or eastern Canada or somewhere else. There must be more attention paid by the major manufacturers to ensuring that we have an adequate parts supply in this province.

In addition to that, I think there needs to be a great deal of improvement in certain areas with respect to the warehouses which supply dealers with parts, in terms of taking orders on weekends and holidays. The last 10 days to two weeks, Mr. Speaker, are no exception. The combines don't stop because it's 6 o'clock; they don't stop because it's Saturday or Sunday or the Labour Day weekend. They keep rol-

ling. I find it rather inconsistent that a major farm-machinery manufacturer can put the kind of time and effort it does in manufacturing machines and supplying parts, then not be able to pay overtime or whatever is necessary to make sure that in busy seasons of the year, on weekends and so on, at least one staff member is in a parts warehouse in Edmonton, or somewhere else, to ensure that dealers and farmers are able to get parts. I would like that area to be improved substantially. In that regard, Mr. Speaker, it's not uncommon for farmers harvesting crop with a very large machine that cost them \$50,000 to have losses of \$2,500 to \$3,000 a day if they don't get that crop off. Those are the kinds of dollars that come in on a big combine while it's operating today, and the provision of parts is so important to ensure that it keeps operating.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments to Bill 61 contain certain changes with regard to warranty. Warranty provisions are increased from one year to two years with some limitation on hours, which members may want to discuss in committee study. Limitation on hours is really designed to provide some protection for commercial use of machines. Legislation provides that the sale agreement shall state horsepower, so individuals who are purchasing tractors and other farm equipment will have, in fact, stated horsepower in their sale agreement. In addition to providing that a stamp on the machine should show the year and date of manufacture, there are a number of more minor amendments that we think — if in fact the industry, farmers, and everyone else concerned co-operate well together — will provide some improvement in this very important area.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Motion carried; Bill 61 read a second time]

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Deputy Premier, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at half past 2.

[The House adjourned at 9:44 p.m.]