

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Thursday, March 16, 1978 2:30 p.m.**

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

head: **PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. TESOLIN: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you, and to members of this Assembly, another representative of the true north strong and free. Mr. Speaker, in your gallery we have Dr. Paul Yewchuk, the Member of Parliament for Athabasca constituency. I would ask Dr. Yewchuk to stand and receive the welcome of this Assembly.

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table four returns. The first is an order in council made under the regulations respecting loans made pursuant to The Alberta Municipal Corporations Financing Act; the second is the Auditor's report of temporary loans during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1977; the third is copies of the Provincial Auditor's report of loans as of December 31, 1977; and the fourth is copies of the Provincial Auditor's statement of remissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1977.

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to file with the Legislature Sessional Paper No. 76, required under The Blind Persons Act. It's a nil report again, Mr. Speaker.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to the House a group of grade 9 students from Louis St. Laurent junior high school. They are accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Bonar. I ask them to rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege this afternoon to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, two classes from the Ellerslie Elementary & Junior High School in my constituency. They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Rice and Mrs. Smith. They are seated in both the public gallery and the members gallery, and I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of this House.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Legislative Assembly, 10 grade 12 students from the Social 30 class in Holden. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Burden. They are seated in the

members gallery, and I would ask that they rise and be recognized.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce a group of grade 6 elementary students from Collingwood school in Calgary Foothills. They are in the public gallery, Mr. Speaker, and they are accompanied by teachers Mr. Pat Sproule and Mr. John Drysdale, and parents Arnold Ingelson, Mrs. Rhea Dick, and Mrs. Kathy Arend. I'd ask that they rise and be greeted in the traditional fashion.

MR. SPEAKER: It's a very easy task to introduce someone who needs no introduction. I'm very pleased to have in my gallery today someone whom we all knew as Bill MacDonald: Mr. William MacDonald, the distinguished and highly respected former Clerk of this Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

**Farm Input Costs**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Agriculture. It's really the first of a series of questions we'll be directing to the Minister of Agriculture this afternoon.

To start off, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the minister if he has had recent discussions with his federal counterparts with regard to rising farm input costs, and whether he has been able to convince the federal government to take some action in this field.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I've had a number of discussions, not only with the federal Minister of Agriculture and his officials but with ministers of agriculture from right across Canada, most recently in mid-January at an agricultural ministers' conference in Winnipeg, and some brief discussions since that time as well, at the first ministers' conference in Ottawa.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, is the minister in a position to indicate what recommendations he has made to the federal government with regard to the upcoming federal budget, whether it's in May, June, or whenever it comes out?

MR. NOTLEY: Or November.

MR. MOORE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps initially I might indicate that we made representations on more than one occasion with respect to the 10 cent a gallon excise tax applied by the federal government on farm fuels in Alberta. We have made representations with respect to the removal of that tax from farm fuels. More specifically, we have suggested that that tax, which is refundable to the farmers on application, be in fact refunded in the same manner that our provincial farm fuel allowance is; that is, it's deducted at the source and the farmer is not required to make any payment at all.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is that the major recommendation Alberta made to the federal government in this particular area of farm input costs?

MR. MOORE: No, Mr. Speaker. I suppose we've made a variety of recommendations designed to improve net farm income. Certainly my remarks of last Friday, if the hon. member had had an opportunity to hear them, would indicate that that is not the major problem, in our belief, in trying to improve net farm incomes. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the effort we've been making in trying to improve the market price of grains, beef, and so on, is in our view a more important area for us to be spending our time in. But of course that doesn't preclude the fact that we're conscious of the difficulties farmers are faced with — increasing machinery costs and that kind of thing.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, the hon. member might be advised as well to review the document entitled the western position with regard to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade multilateral trade negotiations, submitted by our Premier on behalf of the four western governments to the Prime Minister of Canada — I believe it was in December 1976 — which also includes a number of recommendations regarding trade and tariff matters which would improve the Canadian farmer's position relative to a number of input costs.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, as a follow-up to the minister: I have reviewed the document and I saw nothing in there with regard to the question of farm input costs, and that's specifically where the question was placed.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry. I may have misled the hon. member a little, in that the major emphasis with respect to farm machinery cost is more likely contained in the document submitted on industrial tariffs later on, I believe in the early part of 1977, submitted once again by the Premier to the Prime Minister. My colleague the hon. Minister of Business Development and Tourism was responsible for the development of that document, along with the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might repute the question to the minister. Other than the request to the federal government with regard to the 10 cent excise tax and a new method of refunding there, what other major recommendation has the government of Alberta made to the federal government with regard to the specific question of farm input costs?

MR. MOORE: Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all I might say that some areas of farm input costs fall under provincial and some under federal jurisdiction. If we start at the beginning of any farmer's expense sheet, as he's filling out his income tax form he will say first of all: fuel costs. As I indicated last Friday in this House, this province has the lowest fuel costs for its farmers of any province in Canada. We've made direct recommendations to the federal government to ensure that in fact those fuel costs are lowered even further by the removal at the source of the 10 cent per gallon excise tax.

MR. CLARK: Why shouldn't we have?

MR. MOORE: You go from there, Mr. Speaker, to the area of taxes — land taxes, and income taxes too, for that matter. By way of our property tax reduction

plan, we have once again ensured that land taxes in this province are lower . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It would appear that the hon. minister is drifting away from the question, which was with regard to representations made to the federal government. I would have difficulty connecting that with a provincial or a municipal land tax.

DR. HORNER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition is going to do the kind of questioning he's doing now, because he wasn't here on Friday morning when the Minister of Agriculture outlined all these things in detail, then surely the minister is entitled to respond.

MR. SPEAKER: The minister is . . . [interjections] Order please. The minister is certainly entitled to refer the hon. Leader of the Opposition to the sources of the information, but that's quite different from introducing a topic which doesn't deal with representations to the federal government.

DR. BUCK: It looks like the Deputy Premier is starting to get ready for his hassle this afternoon. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, might we then deal directly with several matters, which will take several minutes, where we've made a direct representation over the course of the last six years to the federal government.

I'll refer first of all, Mr. Speaker, to the Barber commission report on farm machinery, which was done some years before this government came into office in 1971. At that time I understand nothing was done by the government of the day with respect to the . . . [interjections]

MR. CLARK: That's eight years ago.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. Leader of the Opposition is not entitled to ask about the actions of a former government, but he is entitled to ask about the actions of this minister.

MR. MOORE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I was coming to the point: that after having had considerable delay of several years in the action on that report, we did, by way of contact with the federal government and the other two provincial governments involved in the prairie region, have some discussions with regard to the establishment and development of an adequate farm machinery testing centre. At that time we were advised by the federal government that in fact they did not have the ability, the funds, or the desire to assist with that kind of centre in western Canada.

I had the pleasure two years ago next month of opening the main centre in Saskatchewan. A further centre was opened in Manitoba, and later this year a satellite station in Lethbridge, Alberta, will be opened. When the budget is brought down, members would be well advised to look in the Department of Agriculture estimates and see that we are spending in those three centres — in Alberta, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan — a considerable amount of money in testing

farm machinery, in assisting small manufacturers in this province to develop the kinds of machines needed in western Canadian agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, there are about five other areas I'd like to discuss at length where we have had discussions with the federal government that relate directly to costs our farmers face.

I go from there, Mr. Speaker, to the question of agricultural chemicals. In July 1976 I had the pleasure of attending a Canadian Agricultural Chemicals Association meeting in Jasper at the same time the Hon. Eugene Whelan, the federal Minister of Agriculture, was in attendance. At that time I discussed with him the benefits that could accrue to Canadian and Alberta farmers if in fact in Canada we were able to produce more of the very expensive chemicals we are using in agriculture to control various kinds of weeds — wild oats, a lot of our perennial weeds that are controlled by other chemicals. Mr. Speaker, every farmer in Alberta knows that the cost of importing those chemicals from across the line, the fact that some chemicals such as Carbyne are marketed by individual companies who have patents on them, is costing us money. I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, whether that discussion led to any action by the federal government, but there is no question that it put on record the concerns of this government and Alberta farmers with respect to the cost of chemicals.

I'll go, on Mr. Speaker — and I suppose I shouldn't mention the end result of that story. The end result is that in fact this government, as a result of any effective action on the part of the federal government, is moving very aggressively into the petrochemical field, in case the hon. Leader of the Opposition is not aware. That field is very directly connected with the development of agricultural chemicals, and very important to us.

Mr. Speaker, we have had a good number of discussions, I know, through the Provincial Treasurer with regard to all kinds of taxes that relate to the agriculture community. I'm sure there are other ministers in this government who have had various discussions in terms of warranty and licensing and that kind of thing that relate to farm input costs.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In light of the minister's answer that basically the province has been involved in farm testing centres, chemicals, and the change in the excise tax, I'd like to ask the minister: is he prepared to indicate to the Assembly today, in an area where the province does have complete jurisdiction to be able to do something right away — and that's the area of interest rates charged by the Ag. Development Corporation — and having regard for the fact that I believe that it's April 1 of each year when the Agricultural Development Corporation sets its interest rates for next year, is the minister prepared to announce or give an undertaking to the Assembly today that in light of the farm input cost problems the government is prepared to look favorably on a substantive reduction of interest rates?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, once again it's unfortunate the hon. Leader of the Opposition didn't have an opportunity to even read my remarks of last Friday. In fact the farmers in this province do have today, in total, the lowest interest costs on farm input dollars

of any farmers in Canada. There's no question about it. The reason is quite clear, Mr. Speaker. It is because our discussions with the federal government early in the life of this government indicated there was not any likelihood that the Farm Credit Corporation would move, number one, to ensure that young farmers in this province who have very little equity and not a great deal of experience would have the availability of credit in the same manner that it's been provided under the Agricultural Development Corporation for the last five years.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, there was only one type of loan available from the federal government for operating capital and purchase of machinery and that kind of thing, that being the farm improvement loans. The interest rate was quite reasonable, yes, but the criterion for borrowing was that if you were able to qualify under that program you didn't need government support, didn't need a government guarantee. We've lent over the course of the last couple of years, as I said on Friday, \$300 million through the Alberta farm development loan program, wherein the chartered banks are guaranteed a return on the dollars which they lend the farmers for operating costs.

I might advise as well, Mr. Speaker, that as a result of the programs put in place in Alberta through the Agricultural Development Corporation in terms of farm credit, the federal Farm Credit Corporation has made three or four significant changes in the last four years, the latest one being last week where they indicated that young farmers will not be required to have the same equity that they did under the previous program. And in fact, Mr. Speaker, we've been instrumental by way of the Agricultural Development Corporation operations in leading the way and showing how it would be done. We've been instrumental in getting the Farm Credit Corporation to move not only into a situation of providing higher risk capital, but also into a situation where they provided Alberta farmers, through that federal program, with more loans per capita than any other province in Canada during the last two years — I believe some \$70 million.

So this government, Mr. Speaker, in my view has done more and been more effective in farm credit costs than any government in Canada, and we're very proud of it.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, followed by a supplementary by the hon. Member for Athabasca.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I take it from that answer that the minister is not prepared to recommend to the government lowering of interest rates on loans through the Ag. Development Corporation. [interjections]

DR. BUCK: That is the question.

MR. CLARK: Then let me rephrase it, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, will you give your assurance to the House that you're prepared to recommend to the government that the interest rates on Ag. Development Corporation loans be lowered?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I'll answer that, and I'd like to answer it very briefly. Once again I'd refer the hon. member, and he was here that day, to the Speech from the Throne of March 2, 1978, the section dealing with new announcements with respect to Agricultural Development Corporation programs in this province. Mr. Speaker, before this session of the Legislature adjourns I'll be in a position to make further announcements that put Alberta's young farmers, and farmers who require credit in this province, in an even better position than they're in today.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I think all rural members, in fact all government members, are well aware of the in-farm inputs the Minister of Agriculture has outlined, which are important. But I would like to ask a question of the Deputy Premier and Minister of Transportation. As far as farm input costs are concerned, have there been ongoing discussions with the federal government and other provincial governments regarding trying to obtain more favorable transportation rates for western farmers?

DR. HORNER: The short answer is that there have been innumerable meetings, Mr. Speaker, and innumerable representations to the federal government relative to a variety of transportation costs involved. Those meetings are continuing, and hopefully in the budget speech I'll be able to bring the House up to date relative to that position.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture with respect to farm input costs, with particular reference to farm machinery. In view of the fact that a large percentage of farm machinery is imported from the United States, and as a consequence of the lower value of the Canadian dollar, that means a . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. member is indulging in a fairly lengthy preamble, and of course even a short preamble isn't in order.

MR. NOTLEY: Let me put the question directly to the minister, then. What representation has been made to the federal government with respect to proposals by the Alberta government to increase the manufacture of farm machinery in Canada, in light of the problems of importing machinery from another country because of the lower value of the dollar?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I think I dealt at fair length with the kind of co-operation we've had between the three prairie provinces in assisting farm machinery manufacturers in Alberta, and for that matter in Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the matter is one of our being involved in federal/provincial discussions or discussions with individual equipment builders. I've had conversations with a major builder of grain dryers in this province and with the only combine manufacturer in Canada west of Winnipeg, relative to all the difficulties they face in manufacturing machines. Many of them have requested and discussed the possibility of obtaining operating capital, or development capital, with or without government guarantees. I've had discussions with regard to DREE grants and a

great variety of other things. My colleagues the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs and the Minister of Business Development and Tourism have been extensively involved in discussions with the federal government regarding the possibility of DREE assistance in a variety of these areas.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what the hon. member is after, but that's a broad overview of some of the things we've been doing.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

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

MR. NOTLEY: Have there been any discussions with the major farm implement companies, specifically with respect to shifting or expanding Canadian production of farm machinery? The bulk of the machinery from the line companies is produced outside Canada. My question is: has the minister sought out the top officials of these major farm implement companies to discuss with them ways and means to increase the percentage of their production in this country?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, since last November, at meetings either in Toronto or here in Edmonton, I have met and talked with either the president or the vice-president of, I believe, every major manufacturer in Canada and the United States.

Most recently, Mr. Speaker, on Thursday afternoon last, I had discussions here in my office with the president of John Deere Canada Ltd. Those subjects were discussed, along with a great variety of other subjects that are important to Alberta farmers, including the provisions of warranty, parts supply, dealerships, and on and on and on.

#### **Lamb Processing Plant**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct quite a brief second question, I hope, to the same minister. It's with regard to the lamb co-op plant at Innisfail. Is the minister in a position to indicate what progress is being made in the government's selling this plant? The minister will recall the discussion he had earlier in the House about negotiations that were going on last fall.

MR. MOORE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can indicate. We've had discussions in a fairly extensive way, it runs in my mind, with about five different firms or individuals who were interested in the possible purchase of the plant. At the present time my knowledge is that perhaps two or three are still investigating the feasibility of purchasing the plant and, in addition to slaughtering lambs, doing either some other livestock killing and slaughtering there, or packaging or boxed beef operations or something of that nature. Of course, Mr. Speaker, until we've finalized discussions, I'm not at liberty to disclose the names of those individuals we have been dealing with.

However, Mr. Speaker, I can say that in the meantime I've had a very effective management team in the lamb plant at Innisfail. The monthly cash operating losses, which were running in the order of

\$50,000 a month when we took over the plant last June, have been reduced. Over the last three months, which is not the best time of the year in terms of the supply of lamb, our operating losses have been reduced to about \$18,000 a month.

Mr. Speaker, probably this fall I will be providing, with the audited annual statement of the Agricultural Development Corporation, an audited statement of the government's operation of the plant since its takeover. But those figures, which are round figures really, indicate the situation to date.

DR. BUCK: Another Horner white elephant.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In light of the fact the government took over this venture close to a year ago, is the minister in a position to indicate to the House that before long he expects to finalize an arrangement? Because the minister's answer was very much the same last fall: that discussions were going on with one or two or three companies. Have we progressed since then, or is it still at that kind of stalemate?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, that's a rather hypothetical question. Of course, I can say we're quite sincere about trying to move the plant into the private sector and have someone take it over and operate it. It's not our policy position to continue in the meat packing business. However, we do know that the continued operation of the plant has resulted in good profits to lamb producers in this province and at least the maintenance of our lamb population.

I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, if that goes against the advice of the government in 1970. But we think it's important to lamb producers to have a plant, and my conversations with them across this province are that they're pleased the government is keeping the operation going.

DR. BUCK: Just the facts, Marv, just list the facts.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, one last supplementary question. Having been a shareholder who has seen my money go down the tube, too, in that particular venture . . . [interjections] How much has been lost? How much has the government had to put into that operation since it took it over almost a year ago?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I'm aware that there are some shareholders who didn't take a great deal of interest in the operation of the plant. But to answer the question, Mr. Speaker, it's a detail that would have to be put on the Order Paper. I don't have the exact figures with me.

DR. BUCK: Sell it to Horner.

#### School Construction

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Education. Has the minister had an opportunity to respond to the petition of some 3,000 residents of the Mill Woods area concerning the request for a new junior high school there to alleviate the rather critical pressures on the sole existing junior high school?

MR. KOZIAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister able to advise the Assembly whether or not he was able to accede to the requests of the parents in their petition, as well as the submissions made by the Edmonton Public School Board, or precisely what position did the government of Alberta take with respect to the petition?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, on approximately March 3 this year a letter was sent under my signature to each of those who signed the petition. I was subsequently able to meet, I believe it was at the beginning of last week, with a representative group of the petitioners who had initially sought a meeting with their MLAs, the hon. Messrs. Schmid and Schmidt, who presently represent the constituency. In the letter and in the subsequent hour-and-a-half meeting I had with representatives of the petitioners, we were able to discuss their concerns and relate to them the contents of the regulations and the circumstances surrounding school facilities in the city of Edmonton and in their zone in particular.

The petitioners were advised that in the last five or six years, since 1971, we have built approximately 13,200 new student spaces in the city of Edmonton, and at the same time the overall student enrolment in Edmonton has dropped by over 10,000 students. I was also able to bring to the attention of the petitioners the fact that the zone in which Mill Woods is found has a present utilization rate of school facilities of about 65 per cent, and that projections for the Edmonton Public School Board indicate that in the next three years the junior high school population would drop by approximately 3,000 students. So unless some other use were made of the vacant facilities, our regulations — although those provide for the building of elementary schools notwithstanding a low utilization rate in new subdivisions — at this time indicate and provide that no junior high school could be built.

At the same time I also advised them that we were presently looking at the whole manner in which we as a provincial government provide support to school boards in the construction of school facilities.

The Woods Gordon study is the subject of discussion by boards all around the province, and I expect shortly to receive a report from the task force that has been receiving submissions from school boards in this area. No changes in regulations would be made until this task force report had been studied. However, I did not hold out any hope that changes might necessarily result in a school in the area.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Beyond the task force studying the Woods Gordon report, what consideration is being given by the government at this time to looking at those particular subdivisions in urban areas that are growing very rapidly? Mill Woods is a case in point; it's growing much more rapidly than the zone as a whole, and therefore you have pressures within that subdivision. My question is: has the government specifically committed itself to the petitioners to examine the possibility of exempting rapid areas of growth from the zones that have already been established?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, the difficulty in taking that approach is that it would mean building a school wherever the demand occurred. I would find it difficult to support the construction of new facilities in the city of Edmonton, and then not support the construction of new facilities in the constituency of Spirit River-Fairview, where busing also takes place.

In the rural sections of this province, students are bused; it's a fact of life. Our approaches toward the building of school facilities should be fair. The rules and regulations should generally provide a fair distribution of capital funds across the province. In the circumstances we find ourselves in in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary, we do in fact accommodate the needs of elementary students in the new subdivisions. That is in fact an exclusion from the normal zoning requirements. However, when we get into the junior high school and high school levels, when there is unused capacity within those cities within one, two, three, or four miles of the child's residence, I don't think it's too much hardship for the parents to consider busing.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister, in light of the various proposals.

MR. CLARK: Most enthusiastic.

MR. NOTLEY: I see the hon. Member for Edmonton Avonmore was not among the people applauding.

Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister: what steps is the government taking to pursue this matter with the Edmonton Public School Board, with respect to both the junior high school, where a number of applications have been made, as well as a submission earlier this year, I believe, for a senior high school? Is it subject to ongoing discussions by the minister with the Edmonton Public School Board?

MR. KOZIAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, a reading of The School Act will indicate, first of all, that the responsibility for the provision of school facilities is that of the local school board. The involvement of the provincial government is only in terms of providing capital support. Members of course should be aware of the recommendations of the Woods Gordon study, which include that support would be provided to school boards on the basis of their wealth and on the basis of their utilization of existing space, rather than the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I regret interrupting the hon. minister, but I have difficulty in connecting the answer with the question. We're running short of time. A considerable number of members would still like to ask their first question.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a question very directly, then, to the hon. minister. Is it subject to ongoing discussions?

MR. KOZIAK: I believe I answered that, Mr. Speaker, when I indicated that we would be looking at the whole business of our provision of support to school boards once the task force has reported.

MR. APPLEBY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if I could ask the Minister of Education if they've had any studies that indicate different psychological effects of busing on urban and rural students.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I don't have that type of study at hand. However, I should point out that in choosing a bilingual education for their children, many parents bus them to a school that provides those types of services. The results seem to be very positive in terms of the achievement of those children.

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

MR. KUSHNER: A supplementary question to the Minister of Education. Has he had any discussions with the Calgary Board of Education on the need for a vocational school in southeast Calgary?

MR. SPEAKER: Except for the word "school", which covers a multitude of topics, I have difficulty connecting the supplementary with the original question.

MR. KUSHNER: I'm referring, Mr. Speaker, to a vocational school. A junior high school, sir.

MR. SPEAKER: That's what I understood.

MR. KUSHNER: It's only one school.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Clover Bar . . .

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, for your information, we haven't got a school there, period, right now.

AN HON. MEMBER: What's the minister responsible for Calgary doing?

AN HON. MEMBER: Nothing, again.

DR. BUCK: He's just picking up his pay cheque.

#### Farm Loans

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and I hope the former Minister of Agriculture has provided him with the information. Can the minister indicate what consultation goes on between the lending agents at ADC and the people who are responsible for the Farm Credit Corporation? What liaison and what communication goes on when a farmer goes to take out a loan?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, there is consultation in a number of areas between the Farm Credit Corporation and the Ag. Development Corporation. First of all, the western region manager of FCC, who is located in Edmonton, is in fairly constant contact with the chairman and the general manager of the board of the Agricultural Development Corporation. Those conversations and contacts are largely in policy areas with respect to developing programs. We think it's important that we work closely with the Farm Credit Corporation, and as I indicated earlier we've been able to get them to move a good deal in the way of providing programs similar to ADC's.

Out in the field, Mr. Speaker, we have more Agricultural Development Corporation loans officers than FCC have. There are usually about three of our loans officers to one of FCC's. The reason for that, Mr. Speaker, is that about 80 per cent of the time of the Agricultural Development Corporation loans officers is spent on credit counselling and assisting farmers in obtaining loans elsewhere than through the Agricultural Development Corporation; for example, through FCC. The FCC area manager is invited to and does sit from time to time on our local agricultural development committee meetings when they are discussing Agricultural Development Corporation programs or FCC programs, or hearing appeals with respect to the loans that have been turned down, or that kind of thing. It's not mandatory for the FCC person to attend, but they are invited to attend, and from time to time are involved in those discussions on a confidential basis.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of course the Agricultural Development Corporation loans officers and the FCC loans officers out in the field are in contact with one another from time to time. Far be it for me to say how often; I suppose it depends to a large extent on what area of the province they're in, or how many times their dealings, by their nature, have to bring them together.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary to the hon. minister. The problem brought to my attention is that the farmer seemed to have the feeling that the information obtained from the federal corporation was the information the ADC loans officer used. The farmer felt this was why his loan was turned down.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member a question?

DR. BUCK: Yes. Can the minister indicate if in fact this does happen, Mr. Speaker; and, secondly, are the loans made entirely on the information obtained by the ADC loans officer?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I'd probably have to look at an individual case and check on it. But the understanding I have of the manner in which they are operating out in the field is that if an individual farmer does have a Farm Credit Corporation loan in place, he's gone to the Farm Credit Corporation for additional funds and been turned down, and then come to the Agricultural Development Corporation. As a matter of course we ask the Farm Credit Corporation for information, just as we would ask a chartered bank, treasury branch, or credit union for information, if in fact the farmer had large and extensive loans from one of those institutions.

So there is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that in the case of an individual who had borrowed from FCC and had an outstanding loan with FCC, our loans officers in Ag. Development Corporation would likely have that information. It's likely it would form the basis of some of the opinions they provide to the corporation. But that, Mr. Speaker, is why the appeal procedure exists, wherein if staff of the Agricultural Development Corporation turn down a loan that in fact should have been approved in terms of the principles of how that corporation operates — which in fact does happen; on occasion too often, I might add, but I'm dealing with that — then the individual has the right

to appeal to the local Agricultural Development Corporation, which is a group composed of local farmers, one member of the municipal district, and so on. The results of that appeal, the views of the Agricultural Development local committee, then are forwarded directly to the board of directors of the corporation in Camrose, which once again is composed of 12 individuals, one of whom is full time, and some farmers, businessmen, and so on.

So what I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, is that there is a route to get around the possibility that a local loans officer may have received information that is incorrect or passed incorrect judgment on an individual loan application.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say that the preamble was necessary.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair always welcomes the assistance of the hon. Member for Clover Bar, but is of the opinion that such assistance should be subject to prior consultation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Score 1-1.

#### Propane Prices

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question was to the Attorney General, but I understand he is away for a good reason, so I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Under the farm transportation allowance there is an 8 cents a gallon allowance. I wonder if the minister could indicate whether the government is considering providing an 8 cents a gallon allowance for transportation on propane, in a similar manner.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, that has been under consideration. The deregulation of the producer price of propane will occur on April 1, I believe, of 1978. Deregulation of the distributor price occurred some months ago. It is important to know that the deregulation both of the distributor and the producer price by the Public Utilities Board occurred as a result of requests by the producers and the distributors.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we will be monitoring the price increases that may or may not occur after April 1 in terms of producer prices and the ultimate price paid by the consumer, and not until we've had an opportunity to monitor for some length of time what effect that deregulation has on consumer prices of propane in this province will we be in a position to give further consideration to whether or not the farm fuel allowance should be applied to propane.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Would the minister consider making this part of his announcement toward the latter part of this session when he makes some announcements with regard to input costs to agriculture?

MR. MOORE: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Supplementary to the minister then. Is the minister saying no, the answer is no to

this proposal, or no, he's not going to say anything about propane subsidy?

MR. MOORE: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is no, I will not make a commitment today to make an announcement later on about a program that's not yet been developed.

#### **Satellite Crash**

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Premier. Was the Premier or any member of the government of Alberta given notice that a Russian satellite might fall in this part of the country prior to its fall in the Northwest Territories?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, no, we were not.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary. Has the government of Alberta been involved in any way with the clean-up of the satellite?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, no. I checked out that matter with the Deputy Premier involved in disaster services, and the advice we received [was that] it was entirely a matter in terms of the area they were involved in; it was outside the province of Alberta.

#### **Irrigation — Cost Sharing**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is also to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Could the minister indicate whether the government is considering any changes in the present formula where the province pays 86 per cent and the irrigation district 14 per cent of capital works in irrigation districts?

MR. MOORE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that's been under consideration. I indicated in this Legislature during the heritage savings trust fund committee debate some months ago that the formula, which was developed as a result of a study in the eastern irrigation district in 1966, may or may not be valid today, and I would like to take under consideration whether it was valid in 1977. Recently I had extensive discussions, Mr. Speaker, with the Irrigation Council, the Irrigation Projects Association, many of the management people and the chairmen of the 13 irrigation districts throughout Alberta, and the irrigation caucus in the government caucus.

I am not in a position to indicate whether or not there will be any changes in that formula. But I can indicate that as a result of the Department of the Environment paying 100 per cent of the costs of a good many structures through the \$110 million made available through the heritage savings trust fund, as a result of the agreement that was concluded by the former Minister of the Environment and Minister of Agriculture with the federal government regarding the Brooks aqueduct and the Bassano Dam, and those kinds of things where 100 per cent payment is provided by government, that has substantially altered the results of the 1966 study in the eastern irrigation district.

I just conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying there is one other thing hon. members should keep in mind in reviewing that formula: the 86/14 formula for pay-

ment came out of policy recommendations dated in 1967, and does not represent the results of the actual study made in 1966 in the eastern irrigation district. There is a great deal of difference as well between benefits by way of irrigation that might be provided to an individual farmer or the balance of the community, depending on the irrigation district that you are a part of.

MR. SPEAKER: I regret that some seven or eight members have not had an opportunity to ask their first questions. In that regard I should say that it's impossible for the Chair to anticipate how much information a minister may consider necessary for the proper answering of a question, and that by well-established parliamentary precedent the onus is on the minister to assess the situation, and if the answer is of such length that it will unduly intrude into the question period the minister has the right to direct that the question be put on the Order Paper.

#### **head: ORDERS OF THE DAY**

#### **head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the following motions for returns do stand: 111, 113, and 116.

[Motion carried]

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw Motion 101, with the view of resubmitting it later.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw Motion 112 standing in my name on the Order Paper, in light of some of the information that I've already got from the minister.

118. Dr. Buck moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

- (1) the name of every deputy minister and head of a government of Alberta board, agency, or commission in possession of a government automobile;
- (2) the make, model, year, and original cost of each automobile referred to in (1);
- (3) the regulations pertaining to the use, for personal purposes, of each automobile referred to in (1).

[Motion carried]

#### **head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

207. Moved by Mr. Clark:

Be it resolved that the Assembly adjourn at the earliest convenient opportunity and that upon the adjournment the Standing Committee on Public Affairs meet to receive the representations of concerned Albertans with respect to the building of a dam on the Red Deer River.

[Adjourned debate March 9: Dr. Horner]



DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to put forward a view that is held not only by me but by a great number of people in this province, relative to certain matters that have gone on in this province in the past year or two, and indeed before that.

I did want to open, Mr. Speaker, by making a few remarks with regard to the absolutely essential problem of management of water. The conservation, the practical uses, have been going on in this world for centuries. Surely we can come to the conclusion that the efficient and indeed crucial management of such a valuable asset has to be an overriding concern for all governments. I can't help but agree with the hon. Member for Bow Valley when he suggests he'd like to see water taken out of politics. I suggest he's in an admirable position to do just that, and should do so. [interjections]

When we talk about the management of water, let us not forget there are a variety of ways in which water can be managed, and that a clear policy needs to be set out by government relative to that water management. We did that in 1971, Mr. Speaker. We set out a clear policy relative to water management on our river systems in this province, and we've been going forward with that policy.

Notwithstanding the editorial in the *Edmonton Journal*, in which they picked up number nine — they forgot the other eight points in the New Directions. Number nine, of course, referred to a diversion scheme which the former government was very hot on. They were buying up land in the Evansburg area to build a dam and divert the Pembina River into Lake Wabamun and subsequently into the North Saskatchewan River. In those days they called those great and noble schemes PRIME. We said publicly that PRIME in fact was a crime, and that we would bring a new direction to water management in this province.

One direction, very ably set out by the former Minister of the Environment, relative to river basin management: we said there would be priority for the Red Deer, the Bow, and the Oldman, and that we would get on with doing those things. But out of our experience on the Bighorn — and I want to touch on that just briefly, having been there. The hon. leader of the NDP/Social Credit Party — he seems to have acquired additional strength in the last day or two [interjections] — talked about the hearings on the Bighorn and how that occasion was somehow the same as it is today. But there was no similarity whatsoever. Absolute difference.

No public hearings were done on the Bighorn Dam until such time as we put an innocuous question on the Order Paper suggesting they produce a cost/benefit analysis. At first they said they didn't have one, and turned it down on that basis. Subsequently, because of pressure, they found it. But we had to have a public hearing to find it. So that was quite a bit different, Mr. Speaker. [interjections]

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, the dam we were then considering on the Bighorn was in fact a private dam, to which the government of the province of Alberta was making a gift of \$20 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame.

DR. HORNER: Now that's entirely different than when we're ... They maybe rightly suggested that that

\$20 million was for flood control. And at the time also I think they sold it by saying it was for pollution control in the city of Edmonton, by increasing the flow in the North Saskatchewan River. [interjections] You know, there is no comparison [between] the situation on the Red Deer now and the Bighorn. None whatsoever. [interjections]

My colleague the Minister of the Environment has identified the major extent to which this government has gone to put in the hands of people right across the province all the information relative to the dam on the Red Deer. I find it rather interesting; you know, I have a little problem with my friends in the press too. They don't seem to understand this proposition either. [interjections] I have never said there was any dissension amongst the ECA, relative to their recommendations on the Red Deer River Dam. What I did say was that the ECA was an environmental advisory body, and that the technical committee of the Department of the Environment, who are the engineers, decided that Site 6 was best for a whole variety of reasons, which are well known. [interjections] Economy, well it just ... [interjections]

I'm sure the hon. Member for Clover Bar can get up and make a speech.

DR. BUCK: He will.

DR. HORNER: Good.

AN HON. MEMBER: First time this session.

DR. HORNER: And that in fact is what happened, Mr. Speaker. My colleague outlined in great detail the other day the great amount of money that was spent, the literally hundreds of meetings that were held and listened to ...

AN HON. MEMBER: Listened to?

DR. HORNER: Of course.

I'm going to have an interesting discussion in a moment, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the participation in water management of the hon. Member for Little Bow, and whether or not the Social Credit candidate in Innisfail is representing Social Credit Party policy when he's down in the Oldman River basin telling the people not to co-operate. [interjections]

AN HON. MEMBER: You've got them on the run, Hugh.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate they're sensitive, but I think ... [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. [interjections] Order please.

DR. HORNER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I know they're sensitive. I'll come back to the matter, because I think it's important that we find out what their policy is and who's speaking for them. Is it the Leader of the Opposition? Is it the hon. Member for Bow Valley, who says he'd like to get water right out of politics? Is it the member ...

DR. BUCK: Oh, come on now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. [interjections] Order please.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

The hon. member will have, if he wishes, as have all other hon. members, the opportunity to reply in the ordinary parliamentary fashion, in a manner which can be understood, heard, and recorded by *Hansard*.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

AN HON. MEMBER: Grow up.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not aware of the hon. Deputy Premier having used any unparliamentary expressions. If he had, I wouldn't have been able to hear them. [laughter]

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. It's in record in *Hansard* that the hon. member Mr. Mandeville has not ever made that statement in this Legislature. It's in *Hansard* . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

DR. BUCK: . . . and he cannot say that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

With regard to what is in *Hansard* or in any other regard, it is well established that a disagreement among members as to facts does not constitute a point of order. It's a matter of debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Get up, Fred.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I'm awfully sorry the hon. Member for Clover Bar is getting so excited. I refer him to page 142 of *Hansard*, the top paragraph, and his hon. colleague's remarks. If he had stayed in the House and listened to his hon. colleague, he might have known what he said.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, I was trying to point out that we were trying to find out the Social Credit policy on the management of water. Was it, as I said, get water out of politics? Was it the hon. Member for Little Bow, who says down in Picture Butte: well, what are you wasting your time for; get out there and build a dam; start in three months. [He] doesn't want any studies, doesn't want any hearings on that one. Oh no.

So we have this kind of lack of credibility of leadership on behalf of the Social Credit Party, who say, yes, we want to do something about water, but we're not really sure what we want to do. [interjections]

Then we have the other part of that new alliance over there, the leader of the NDP, who seems to be supported by those in this province who wouldn't do anything: who wouldn't build any dam, who are right there to stop every development and are associated with the development of the activities of the Sierra Club in this province, supporting them and providing confrontation in communities for no good reason, aided and abetted and, indeed, goaded on by the leadership of the NDP in this province. [interjections]

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege. The hon. Deputy Premier is of course perfectly entitled to debate. But he is not entitled to assign, either to me as leader of the New Democratic Party or to my colleagues in the party, such things as we have not in any way, shape, or form been involved in or participated in. [interjections]

Mr. Speaker, on the point of privilege I would say there have been absolutely no discussions between me, as leader of the party, and the Sierra Club on either the Three Rivers Dam or, for that matter, the Paddle River. Now that may upset the hon. Deputy Premier because of course he's looking for a bogey man, but unfortunately in this case the bogey man does not exist. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It would appear that again there is some disagreement as to facts. I acknowledge that perhaps the situation is slightly different if it involves the actions or conduct of a member. But I'm sure the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, if he wishes, will have an opportunity to deal with those facts, according to his knowledge, when the time comes.

DR. HORNER: I'm always interested, Mr. Speaker: the hon. leader of the NDP can wander around making all kinds of distorted statements anytime at all, and then when somebody else makes a statement which is a fact . . . [interjections].

I appreciate the hon. gentleman doesn't know very much about these things in rural Alberta, but I'm trying to give him an education. [interjections] The complications of river basin management are more than just the question of the people who are in the so-called bottom of the valley.

The complications, and the reasons for increased flooding throughout this province during the past 50 years, are because our forefathers came and settled this land and turned it into a prosperous agricultural community. When they did that, they increased the run-off. Every road my predecessors and I have built increases the rapidity of the run-off, increases the necessity for river basin management. Therefore, when the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview suggests that the headwaters group on the Paddle is anywhere near correct — they're all members of his party. [interjections] Maybe he wants to disown them; that's okay.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I wouldn't want the hon. Deputy Premier to mislead the House. Certainly some of the members in the Paddle River protective organization are members of the NDP. There are also a number of Tories . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Chair does not wish to be driven to the necessity of saying that hon. members who intervene in the debate have had their turn to speak. [interjections]

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker . . . [interjections] Mr. Speaker, I just want a ruling . . . [interjections] I would like to know from you, Mr. Speaker, what protects us, as members, against innuendo by the Deputy Premier. [interjections] Mr. Speaker, if a member is sworn to tell the truth in this Legislature,

he must tell the truth, and the Deputy Premier is not doing that. [interjections]

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I'd like to know what protection the people of Drumheller have had against the innuendoes and false statements made by the Social Crediters. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. Member for Clover Bar will probably know that it's not open to the Chair to make general rulings about general situations; they must deal with specific instances.

If the hon. Deputy Premier is noticeably infringing on any parliamentary rule as to speech or otherwise, and I happen to overlook it, I'll be glad to have my attention drawn to it. But otherwise, I say again, any difference as to facts, regardless of how strongly that difference may be felt, may be expressed in the ordinary course in debate.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I hope we still have in this Legislature the ability to give our opinions and to put forward the facts as we see them. I would always want to give that to the hon. Member for Clover Bar. Quite frankly I hope he's done his homework before he gets up on this particular subject, because he should do so.

Mr. Speaker, let's come right down to the situation as purported by the Leader of the Opposition. I said that in my opinion there were distortions in his remarks. I think there have been a great number of distortions with regard to the group that is fighting to prevent a dam being built at Site 6. I would always say they certainly should have the right to express their views and fight as hard as they can within our society to make those views known. But to suggest that those are the only views is not correct by a long shot.

I have telegrams here from 14, and a letter which I intend to read in a moment, backing up what I am going to say with regard to the distortions and misinformation on Site 6.

I don't know whether the Leader of the Opposition — I would take it for granted that in fact he has visited the site. I hope he has. I have. Before I made any decision relative to the site, I took the opportunity to visit the site. I might also add that I am responsible for some of the land there. The department owns a small campground in the area, and I had good reason to go and look at it and look at the site generally.

One of the major distortions is the loss of agricultural land, 4,500 acres of the finest agricultural land in Alberta. A gross distortion, Mr. Speaker. No more than 2,200 acres — and that is giving a lot — of good agricultural land — and that also is giving quite a lot — will be flooded. What is the balance? The balance is a small island in a river, eroded hillsides. By the way, I wouldn't quarrel with my colleague the Minister of the Environment, but I would suggest that his estimate of preserving the topsoil at that particular damsite is substantially high. These other 2,200 acres don't have any black soil left on them because of the erosion that's already taken place.

At the same time, we keep hearing about this. Nobody likes to see the loss of good agricultural land. But I think the hon. Member for Drumheller made the point very clearly: it's an exchange of 2,000 acres of agricultural land for many hundreds of thousands of

improved acres down the road in east-central Alberta. Surely that's what government leadership is all about. Where is the credibility of the Leader of the Opposition relative to that? [interjections]

MR. CLARK: Where's the 100,000 acres . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. [interjections]

Hon. member, if the member who is speaking wishes to accept a question in the course of his speech, he may do so. Any hon. member who wishes to ask such a question has the right to get up on his feet in his place, and put it. But to direct a series of questions simultaneously from several different positions in the House really doesn't conform to that practice.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should appreciate that before any water management on the Red Deer River can be done, and that management stretched out to east-central Alberta, the first step is that we have to have a reservoir on the headwaters of the Red Deer River. Taking that into consideration with the other benefits and the engineering, you decide where the site should be.

MR. CLARK: When did you think that up?

DR. HORNER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's part of William Pearce's original scheme that has been around since 1898, if the hon. member would like to read some history. [interjections]

He talked about the environment, an environmental standpoint. I've already mentioned that if you go down there and see what the uncontrolled river has done to the environment in that particular area, you will have to agree that a dam is going to be a major improvement in the environment in the area, and not anything that's going to take away from it. They make a big point — and my hon. friend from Spirit River-Fairview is a past master at this also — they love to have public hearings, and then get each of their members to make an individual presentation to the ECA, or whatever body, so that by numbers of briefs they can get their point across. [interjections] It happened on the Red Deer, it happened on the Paddle, and more directly . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

DR. HORNER: I'm very much aware of what happened on the Paddle. There, 125 farmers banded together to make an excellent brief to the ECA. It was swept aside in the final analysis because it was outnumbered by 100 university professors who had never been on the river. [interjections] Saying you can decide whether a recommendation is valid or otherwise by the number of briefs supporting it — you'd better have a look behind and see who's making the briefs, who they represent, and what it is all about. Is it all about a handful of people trying to force their views upon the majority? Is it all about a handful of people trying to disrupt, to confront, to upset communities in a major way? Is that leadership? Is that credibility? Is that helping rural Alberta? Not for a minute.

Mr. Speaker, let me put on the record a letter I received today, along with the telegrams I mentioned from the 16 people:

A group of interested people would like to inform the public that Site Six Association does not represent all people west of Innisfail involved in and around the Red Deer . . . Dam site. Latest demonstrations held in Edmonton, seem nothing more than a political football. Did you know that the chairman of Site Six Association is the Social Credit candidate for the Innisfail Constituency?

[interjections]

Is leading a mob of protestors what we want for . . . aspiring political leader[s]?

[interjections]

DR. HORNER: I'm quoting from a letter which I will table.

MR. NOTLEY: A mob? Is that what they call them?  
[interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. [interjections] Would the hon. Leader of the Opposition please come to order? I regret to have to say that we simply can't have this sort of thing continuing. And it's not going to.

DR. HORNER: I'm quoting from a letter which I intend to table, Mr. Speaker. I know the leader of the NDP is a little bit upset, because the president of the AFL was on the steps with this demonstration. [interjections] For what reason, I don't know, because he must not want any jobs created in Alberta. [interjections] He must not want . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview please come to order.

DR. WARRACK: Grow up.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I'm prepared to come to order. When heckling takes place, fair ball. But we just had the comment from the hon. Member for Three Hills, and it seems to me that if you're going to call the Leader of the Opposition and me to order, then at the same time we should have something done with the heckling from the hon. Member for Three Hills. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is perfectly right, the only difference being that this was the first heckle I heard from that member. [interjections]

DR. HORNER:

Studies and proposals were originally done for a dam on the Red Deer River by the Social Credit Government. If it had been built then, would it have caused as much furore in those days as it does now?

A regulated flow of the Red Deer River would insure enough water for industry to develop which in turn would create . . . jobs for our young people. These jobs would keep our youth in the area instead of [them] having to leave for larger centres.

It would create better roads and [create an] access across the river . . .

Mr. Speaker, that is an important point, if I might just go away from the letter for a moment. If anybody would like to take a drive in the area, they can confirm what I found, and what I'm sure the hon. Member for Innisfail could tell us very quickly: in fact in this particular area there is need of an additional crossing of the Red Deer River to give some harmony to that community, to expand it and make it much more viable as a community. In that matter I agree very substantially with the people who have written this letter. It would be a benefit for both merchants and farmers, increasing recreation opportunities, and it would benefit all the people in the surrounding area.

Is it right that such a small group of people can interfere with a project that will benefit all of Alta? We're tired of hearing only one side of this argument. Let us hear from others who wish to stand up and be counted.

We accept the expert consultants' reports on control of seepage, and reject any imaginary scare tactics of a Nuclear Plant.

You can't imagine, Mr. Speaker, the kind of rumors that go on down there. If my hon. friends would settle down, I would suggest that they . . . Well, I wouldn't suggest that they are part of those rumors, but . . . [interjections]

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me summarize very briefly. A great majority of the people in central Alberta appreciate and support the dam at Site 6. They not only support the dam at Site 6, but they appreciate the fact they have been able to have input, and to have had engineering studies made available to them much before any construction went ahead; an absolutely new concept in river management and public information, not comparable to the Bighorn situation whatsoever.

It's perfectly all right for the hon. Leader of the Opposition to make some distortions and then get upset if I call them that. But surely the people of Alberta should understand that this particular dam has been researched more, has had more input from the public, and has had more engineering studies done than any dam that's ever been built in western Canada. Surely, Mr. Speaker, to suggest now that we go over the harangue again and come out with the same decision that has been made . . .

DR. BUCK: Let the Legislature decide that.

DR. HORNER: The information . . . The Legislature always has the final say, and the hon. member should appreciate that. He's been here long enough, he should have picked up a little bit of knowledge about the parliamentary system.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not likely.

DR. BUCK: It's a dictatorship.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

DR. HORNER: Well, the hon. member can mumble away, Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to be very long. He'll then be able to get up and do his thing.

And I'm sure he won't expect anybody to interrupt him, because that wouldn't be very decorous. [interjections]

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, to suggest, as the Leader of the Opposition did — if you'll move the problem out of my constituency, or away from me, or move it into Sylvan Lake — and the hon. Member for Drumheller also dealt with that matter very effectively. That was not a good solution, and everyone in central Alberta knows it wasn't. [interjections]

DR. HORNER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll conclude very briefly. I quote from *Hansard*, 113, the hon. Leader of the Opposition talking:

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that either the off-stream storage at Buffalo Lake or Sylvan Lake . . . could go ahead with a fair degree of haste . . .

So he wants to dump the problem onto the people of Sylvan Lake.

MR. CLARK: You don't want to read the rest of it.

DR. HORNER: Well, Mr. Speaker, leadership demands having a broader aspect of the situation than he's shown today. I think leadership demands credibility. I think leadership demands responsibility. I see none of those things in the present course of the Leader of the Opposition, even aided and abetted by his new alliance with the NDP. [interjections]

You know, Mr. Speaker, over the past year or two I have been taking it relatively easy on my friends in the opposition, having regard for their small number and so on. But I quit that when they had their little performance the other day and walked out of the Legislature. Mr. Speaker, we were only six. We didn't win very much when we were in opposition. But we always stayed and fought.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and privileged to take part in this debate this afternoon. It's always an indication that this government's in trouble when the hon. Deputy Premier gets up to speak in this House.

MR. NOTLEY: They're in more trouble after he speaks.

DR. BUCK: Because the Deputy Premier's exhibition this afternoon was no more than an indication that this government will not listen to people. Mr. Speaker, the thrust of my remarks this afternoon will be entirely in the direction of bringing the people before their own elected people in this Legislature so they can make their representations.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read from the Conservative manifesto of 1966, about what government's supposed to be all about. We have a smiling picture of the now Premier, Mr. Lougheed. Meeting of November 25, 1967. Mr. Speaker, I think it's only right that we remind the hon. puppets — I beg your pardon, the hon. members across the way. [interjections]

Mr. Speaker, when the members of this Assembly who are sitting on the government side are so instrumented and so regulated that they come to the opening of this Legislature in white shirts because somebody has told them, they are not representing themselves, they are representing their party. [interjections] It's all a symptom of the disease. It's all a symptom of the disease.

AN HON. MEMBER: How about the color of the suits?

DR. BUCK: The manifesto says:

The following are the twelve guideposts which have been approved for the Alberta Progressive Conservative Party.

We believe that public laws should be made in public.

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we are asking this government to do.

MR. DIACHUK: That's exactly what we're doing.

DR. BUCK: This is why we are asking this government to have a sitting of the Public Affairs Committee so the experts who have supposedly given the government the information to make the decision can be brought to this Assembly. [interjections] The hon. Deputy Premier can drag all the red herrings across the floor of this Legislature he'd like to, because all he is trying to do is defuse the issue that the people cannot come to their own Legislature.

The hon. cousin of the Conservative Party, the hon. Member for Drumheller, tried to compare the Gardiner Dam with this project. All I would like to ask the hon. member is: were there alternative sites where the Gardiner Dam went? If there were, I would like to have that information as much as I would like to have the information about what the alternate sites are in this Legislature. The thrust of my debate is not should it be 11 or 6 or 5 or 10 or 12. The thrust of my remarks is that the decision should be made in this Legislature, not by the cabinet. The information should be laid out on the floor of this Legislature. Then let the people of Alberta decide if the government made the right decision or not, Mr. Speaker. That's what I would like to have this honored Assembly do, bring it to the floor of the Legislature.

I have not seen in all the reports I have read, I have not heard from the Minister of the Environment, from the Premier, or the Deputy Premier, why Site 6 is the only site it can be built on. I want that information. I don't think I'm asking too much as an elected representative, a guardian of the people's money. What other sites are available?

It's fine for the Deputy Premier to say: if you question, it's un-Albertan; if you want studies, it's un-Canadian; and if you press too much, you'd practically be a communist. Is that what legislation's all about?

We read further from the manifesto:

But, as Conservatives, we feel strongly that the role of government should be such as to protect the individual citizen as much as improving the public good.

Apparently the hon. government members don't seem to understand that principle. They don't seem to understand that principle. Certainly it's the role of government to serve the wishes of the majority. But it's just as important, Mr. Speaker, that the rights of the minority be protected, at least listened to.

I would like to ask hon. government members, why only Site 6? Where are the studies on Site 11? Why are there studies only on Site 6? Can anybody tell me? No. Will anybody tell this Legislature? No. Will they tell the people of Alberta? No. Basically what we're talking about, Mr. Speaker, is why this information is not available to us so that we as legislators will

make the decision, not the cabinet. As was laid out by the now Premier's speech: "... public laws should be made in public." I agree. Well let's not only talk about it, let's do it.

The hon. Deputy Premier talks about erosion control. Certainly we are interested in erosion control. All hon. members — the hon. Member for Drumheller is interested in erosion control. I appreciate that the hon. Member for Drumheller is concerned about his community, which he should be. Rightfully so. But the reports also indicate that regardless of where the dam goes, there is the possibility of a once in a hundred year flood. Diking will be required regardless of whether the dam goes in Site 6, hon. member, or Site 11.

The hon. member shakes his head. That's why we want the experts to come to the floor of this Legislature and lay it on the table so we all know.

MR. TAYLOR: You can read it in the evidence.

DR. BUCK: You can read it in the evidence. But I want to hear from these experts. Because there are different views and different opinions on the flooding problem downstream. From the reports I have looked at, Mr. Speaker, it appears — unfortunately the Deputy Premier isn't here; he's made his speech, he's dragged the red herring across the floor so the other government backbenchers say, well, that's the only answer so we don't even bother listening or discussing it. But as far as I can understand, 80 per cent of the erosion takes place above Site 6. Now is that right, or is it not right? Maybe the Department of the Environment can tell us.

MR. TAYLOR: It's wrong.

DR. BUCK: The hon. Member for Drumheller says it's wrong. Studies say it's right. Now who is right? Which information is right? And where is the information on Site 11?

I don't think it's responsible on the part of the Deputy Premier to be coming in here and saying: because we question something, we are against it. We are not against the conservation of water in this province. As a matter of fact, the hon. Member for Bow Valley, Mr. Mandeville, is vitally concerned about the conservation of water in this province, as are all members of our caucus. But that's not the point. The point is, Mr. Speaker, on what grounds the decision was made to pick Site 6. I hope the hon. government backbenchers have the answers, because up to now in all the reports I've tried to look at and study as carefully as I could, there was no indication that Site 6 was the only site. And that was the one that was picked.

Now I hope the government backbenchers can go home and tell their people, this is why Site 6 was picked, based on the facts, not on what the Executive Council tells them. Because I say, Mr. Speaker, they are shirking their responsibility in this Legislature.

I don't like to be too hard on the hon. Member for Innisfail, because I'm sure the hon. member has had many pressures from his constituents and his party. But, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say to the hon. Member for Innisfail, it's always a lot easier to answer to your people than it is to your party. If you really believe in participatory democracy, they're the

people you must answer to, not your party.

So, Mr. Speaker, there are many, many details in these voluminous reports that make it more and more important that we have a debate in this Legislature. The hon. Deputy Premier can drag across the floor of this Legislature as many red herrings as he wishes, trying to say that this is not the same thing. I agree with the Deputy Premier when he says there was not sufficient public input. I agree with him one hundred per cent. I agree with him that we didn't have the ECA and functions such as that. But at the same time I say that ...

Mr. Speaker, let's just have a look and see what the ECA said about that site. I'm sure that's probably one of the reasons that led to its demise. Flow Regulation of the Red Deer River: Report and Recommendations, June 1977, page 109, the last two lines, the recommendations, the crunch of the whole report:

(1) That Site 6 and 7 no longer be given consideration as potential damsites, now or for the foreseeable future.

(2) That planning and design for a dam upstream of Sundre be undertaken so that the lead time necessary for its installation at a later date can be reduced.

The Authority wishes respectfully, to place these recommendations before you.

Now, Mr. Speaker, was that the recommendation the government chose, to pick dam Site 6? It couldn't have been, because that's not what the ECA recommended.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm appalled. I'm appalled that the members of the government caucus don't seem to have the freedom to express their views on the floor of this Legislature, that they don't question, they don't ask in this House, why Site 6 is the only one. Maybe it is the best site. I am not in a position to say it is the best site. But right now, looking at the recommendations and some of the other studies, I would say that Site 11 should be given serious consideration by the members of this Legislature. Because if we believe the Conservative manifesto, the decision should be made right here in this Legislature. Because the people of this province will not have the opportunity to make representation before this Legislature, I know we are going to be missing one of the basic facts of democracy: that people of this province should be able to appear before their own Legislature.

It's not setting a precedent, Mr. Speaker. We shouldn't even have to worry about precedents. If we were to worry about precedents, the Bighorn Dam debate took place on the floor of this House, the royalty hearings took place in this House. But the government did that because they thought it might make them look good. The people of Alberta were happy that the royalties were going to go up, so we had a hearing in the House. Now an issue as important as this ...

Mr. Speaker, I would like to warn the hon. backbenchers: they and the government may be able to snow us on this job, they may be able to steamroller us into accepting just one site. But the people out there are starting to question. The people out there are starting to ask why. Why are the farmers protesting about the dam on Site 6? Why will it not come before the Legislature?

You know, there is a valuable lesson to be learned

in the province of Quebec. A premier in that province had one of the largest majorities ever held in the National Assembly in Quebec. That premier is now an ex-premier. You know, politics are very volatile now, hon. government gentlemen and ladies. Politics are very volatile. You know that large majority of 70 to five may not last. When a government that professes to listen to the people starts turning a deaf ear to that people, their days are numbered. So when we see the Deputy Premier really trying to dilute the importance of the resolution, this government is just leading itself astray.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say at this time that there certainly is something happening to our Legislature. When there is such complete control of a party that the people who come to this Legislature as representatives of the people cannot, without strings attached, come to this Legislature — either they won't or they can't — then I say democracy is in a sad state in the province of Alberta.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BUTLER: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise in my place this afternoon and speak to this motion, in spite of the fact that I may be one of these timid backbenchers who are led by the nose. Well, I'll tell you that nobody led me by the nose to run; nobody led me by the nose to get here. I was put here by the people to represent the people, and I intend to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to digress for a moment, with your permission. If I get too far off the track, please bring me back. [interjections] The hon. Member for Clover Bar reminds me of a little collie dog I had one time when we were out moving cattle on a cattle drive.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before the distance between the hon. member and the track gets any greater, it might be well if I were just to intervene briefly.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell him later.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you. I'll tell him later on. You know, anything that runs around, does a lot of barking, and really doesn't know what goes on isn't a lot of help.

The hon. members opposite say, study the Red Deer River, study Site 6. The Red Deer River has been studied and studied ever since the days of William Pearce. Nothing has been done. For 30 years they had their chance to do something about the Red Deer River. When I first moved out to that east-central area, this is what we heard: they're going to divert the Red Deer River and someday this area will be irrigated. People stayed there, grew old, and died. Some may have moved out in despair. And there's still no water there.

You see these hardy people, as they were doing last summer, pumping water for 10 miles with a series of pumps, and their source of supply growing low, and if that ran out they might have to go another 10 miles. It's time we did something. It's time we moved some water. It's time we held this water so it could be used when it was needed, instead of having it run out in the spring when it does no good. It's common knowledge that half of the water has to go on down through

to Saskatchewan. But it doesn't all have to go at once, because this is worked out in three-month intervals. Half of it has to go down in three-month intervals, and that can't always be. So we have to start holding this water when it is here so we can use it when it's needed.

I think it's high time we started moving water into Buffalo Lake, down into Sullivan Lake, and then into the headwaters of those three creeks that would cover a lot of that east-central area. The Bow pond, Sounding Creek, and Berry Creek all head within a small area, and water can be diverted into all three. Someday I hope it will be. This is definitely a start.

I was happy to hear the Deputy Premier refer to that study that was made, I believe, in 1970. I saw that, I agree with it. And if this is a start of that study, then I most heartily agree with it. And nobody told me to say that either.

Mr. Speaker, I had a lot more to say, that has been said by the hon. Deputy Premier about diverting water out into that area, and I know that he's very well versed in that field. I will say it's pretty hard to sit in your place here at times and be referred to as a puppet. Nobody ever told me what to do except my wife, and I don't think anybody ever will.

Thank you.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, in making just a few comments, I certainly have to say that I'm going to support the resolution.

I really appreciate that the hon. Deputy Premier realized I had made the comment that water is an important resource and shouldn't be in the political arena. When we get into the political arena, there is too much hot air and steam. One of the ways we could take it out of the political arena and deal with it in a sensible manner, Mr. Speaker, would be to have a public hearing. Let's not let the cabinet make decisions. Let's get all the facts and let the Legislature make the decision.

As far as I am concerned, before we can go ahead with the development of our water and the management of our water, Mr. Speaker, we have to put priorities. If we could determine what river to develop — we don't even know for sure what river is going to be of most benefit to this province, let alone what site we are going to take. I would like to see us come up with some policy in this area or set some priorities, have some cost/benefit studies on all our river basins in this province.

I'm certainly going to be the first one to realize and appreciate that no matter where we put dams, we're going to have complications; we are going to have people opposing dams anywhere we put them on any river basin or even if we're going to have internal storage. People who are directly affected are going to oppose them, and in some cases we're going to have to go against the grain of some of our people. However, I think it would be very important to make sure that when we are making this type of decision, we make the very best decision on any site on the river that we are going to put a dam on.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I've heard lots of comments as far as Site 6 is concerned. I've heard many who have had opposition to the site, and I've heard a few who have supported the site. This has to be expected. But I've heard a lot more who opposed the site than who supported the site.

The Deputy Premier indicated that we had a concept one time that we called PRIME. I thought this was good. I thought that we should have continued with the concept of PRIME, diverting water from the northern part of the province to the southern part. After all, we've got 20 per cent of the people in the north and 90 per cent of the water in the north. Why shouldn't they look at diverting water? I think some time down the road we are certainly going to be diverting water.

I had an order for return on the Order Paper regarding interbasin studies. I see we don't have any interbasin studies as far as the province is concerned, and I think this is certainly an area where we should have some studies. Coming from an irrigation district, one of the things I can recall in the platform of the candidate who ran against me in 1971 was that the present government indicated that anytime we are developing a river basin, it should be an act of the Legislature. I don't think that's too far-fetched. Possibly we should have. If we don't have an act of the Legislature when we are developing or building a dam, I think it should be up to the Legislature to make these decisions, because water is a very important resource.

I have to agree that there is a lot of confusion as to Site 6 and the facts on Site 6 in regard to cost and to seepage, also as far as alternate sites are concerned. If we did have the hearing in here, as my hon. colleague mentioned, we could question everyone concerned and get all the information. We'd all be knowledgeable. I think the public in this province would be satisfied and would accept whatever decision this Legislature made after we have the public hearing.

As I have said before, I think this government puts too much emphasis on the development of gas and oil in the province. Every time I've got on this floor for a speech, I've always indicated that I think water is one of our most important resources because it affects every part of our lives. I'm sure that if we did have a hearing, even from my own area we would have concerned people from the irrigation districts, people concerned with water resource development. They would certainly get a lot out of coming up, possibly being witnesses. I'm sure some people would come up from the area of the Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff, who is interested in irrigation, and would be able to participate and listen to the hearing. We could get a lot of input from the people of the province, and I'm sure it would be a lot easier to make a decision on going ahead with Site 6.

At the present time, I understand 340 submissions were presented. About 2,000 people were involved in the hearings, and it cost \$233,000. I appreciate that this is quite a bit of money and quite a bit of effort that was spent. However, as I said, we still don't have all the facts, and I would certainly like us to be aware of all the facts when we're making this decision on Site 6. Maybe it should be Site 6, but the indication I get is that it should be moved farther up the river to Site 11. I've got to agree that I haven't inspected the site, Mr. Speaker. But I have had a lot of input from a lot of our people in regard to sites 6 and 11, and I think more people favor Site 11.

I want to make very clear, Mr. Speaker, that I am not opposing the development of a dam on any river. I think we have to develop dams on all our rivers. I

would say we spent a lot of money and a lot of manpower on hearings. If we've done this and haven't come up with a decision everyone's going to accept, I would certainly think we should be able to have a hearing, to be able to improve our knowledge and be more aware of the facts involved as far as building the dam on Site 6 is concerned.

The flooding of the farmland: maybe we're not flooding all that much land; maybe we're not flooding too much land. As I say, every time we put in a dam, we're going to be faced with this. However, I could look down at Eyremore. We could put a dam down there, a multipurpose dam, and we're not going to take any agricultural land whatsoever out of production. We could put 200,000 acres into production. I'm sure we have the same situation on many of our river basins.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see us have a free vote on this so we could determine the best place to put a dam, as far as the Red Deer River is concerned, and have input from everyone concerned.

Thank you.

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm very interested in making some contribution to the debate this afternoon, because from time to time my constituency happened to be mentioned. I'm ever watchful to see what people are suggesting might happen in my constituency, and I would hope that is only reasonable and proper.

But perhaps I could add a little bit to the discourse about the Bighorn Dam, since that seems to be a topic of debate here. I admit, Mr. Speaker, I too was involved in a lobby on the Bighorn Dam. A number of other people who lived in Rocky Mountain House and in that vicinity lobbied the then government quite seriously about the Bighorn Dam. Maybe we were kind of dull types, and not sensational, because we talked to our MLA and probably wrote to the Premier. We didn't burn the Premier in effigy; we didn't go around and rabble-rouse, and create rows, and so on. We were very reasoned, and I think we accomplished our goal. Hon. members over there will say, and I'm pleased and said so at the time, that we succeeded in persuading the government — or maybe they did it out of their own good judgment, I don't know — that they should clear the basin of the Bighorn reservoir. And that has resulted in the beautiful Lake Abraham.

I agree with the hon. Member for Bow Valley when he said, let's take it out of the political arena. We didn't put dam 6 in the political arena. There's somebody down there running for office in the Social Credit Party. That's where it got into the political arena. We didn't do that when we talked about the Bighorn Dam, and I don't think we needed to. I think we dealt with it in a quiet and rational way, and that's how I'll try to deal with the things I have to say this afternoon.

The hon. Member for Clover Bar says, listen to the people. I'd like to say to him that we do. I'd also like to say to you, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Member for Clover Bar, that we sat here and listened to him. And if we'll listen to him, we'll listen to anybody.

The Bighorn Dam is still not a comfortable issue with some of the constituents, particularly the Stoney Indians, who fear that someday the dam may break. This is the way with dams. This does occur. There's always an uneasiness. But the same thing happens



with whatever one attempts to do in regard to public improvements, whether it's a highway . . . The hon. Member for Drumheller was Minister of Highways in the Social Credit government when they went to build a highway in my constituency. A lot of ill will and heat were generated there. As it happened, I wasn't too keen on the Social Credit government then; I'm not too keen on the Social Credit Party now. But the fact remains that he had a courteous hearing at which he presented his case, and the road was built. I, as mayor of the town of Rocky Mountain House, agreed with him. When the next election was called, it didn't do me any good with some people who still thought he was wrong. But the fact remains that enough people realized that maybe it was a sensible thing to do and supported not only the hon. Member for Drumheller, who was then Minister of Highways, but also me.

Any development affects people. I think this is the sad part of what's happened today about Site 6 and has happened in the past. It doesn't matter . . . [interjections]

Do you want to get . . . [interjections] Well, why don't you stand up?

Any development affects people, Mr. Speaker. That's not a very dramatic statement. Whether it happens to be a group home in some area where the residents don't want them, whether it happens to be a housing development, a fourplex, or an apartment block and the neighbors don't want them, this will develop. We know that, and it's a fact of life.

I didn't run for public office to do nothing. When I ran for public office, Mr. Speaker, I didn't think it was always going to be easy. I knew there would be times when difficult decisions would be called upon to be made. I wanted to be part of a government that would make the decisions and would do it in a reasonable and fair way. I believe we have made a decision based on reason and good financial analysis.

If the hon. members want some more information, I'm sure they could get that by calling on the Minister of the Environment and meeting with his officials. I know they've offered on many occasions to meet with anyone who wished to. I suggest to them that if they're still wondering, why don't they find out? I think they could if they wanted to. But no, they prefer to sit here, meanmouth some of the speakers, and get all excited and torn up if someone says anything they don't like. But we listen quietly and courteously to them. I think it's a good example they might well follow.

So let us talk about people. Let us talk about what happens to people. I'd like to reinforce the type of fairness I believe this government is prepared to offer, and has indeed offered, those people who are involved in Site 6. Of the 22 farms affected, not all of them will have to move. In most cases, not entire farms are required, and it would be possible to consolidate fragments and allow about half the families to remain on reconsolidated farms if they wish. If they wish to stay in their area, I'm sympathetic to that. People love the land on which they grew up. Often they love land whether they grew up there or were happy enough to go and live there, and I well know that.

Those people who sell will be paid cash, and I feel sure we will be more than fair. They will be paid cash at the time of the sale. However, they will not have to

give up possession for two to four years. That will give them a good time to relocate, and they can then achieve the equivalent of double crops for a short while. Mr. Speaker, I think that's more than fair.

While we're talking about considering people, let us consider people. I too have mail. I too have talked to people. I would like to read an extract from a letter from a gentleman whom I've known a long time and for whom I have great respect.

He says, it is a bit frightening when people cannot have their own opinion, or even remain neutral in a free country. Possibly it is time that the government take time to respond to some of the intolerance and be aware of some of the intolerance that is being preached by these people. There must be some newspaper that has enough guts to present both sides of the matter.

When this starts to happen in a community, Mr. Speaker, I think it's very sad indeed.

When we talk about another area in my constituency, Sylvan Lake, I think it's a rather cavalier thing to say we can quickly dump the water in Sylvan Lake, and I appreciated the comments of the Deputy Premier. I went to look up what the Sylvan Lake people had said in their submission. They, once again, were very moderate people. They're concerned that the siltation caused by dumping the water into Sylvan Lake would destroy the quality of a very fine lake that provides a great deal of recreational facility for the people of Alberta. So they have the problem of siltation.

The hon. Member for Drumheller talked about the problem we have with the lake level rising, which it does. I don't think we should accelerate that problem. Those are a couple of small issues, but those issues are important and need to be considered.

So, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. members of the opposition are still in doubt — as the hon. Member for Clover Bar would like some more information; I'm sure he could get it. In his debate the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview says he has questions he would like answered. Has he tried? Has he gone to the Department of the Environment? I'm sure they will co-operate and give him the information, if he wants.

I would urge hon. members to defeat this resolution. I have to say I don't often agree now with the leader of the Social Credit Party, but I think it's time we settled this. The disturbance has gone on with the quiet people, the gentle people, of whom there are many who are very concerned about the turn this has taken and the issues created within their neighborhoods. So I would like to repeat, and I give due credit to the hon. Leader of the Opposition:

I think the longer this thing drags on the more difficult it's going to be, not only for people in the area. Whether they come from Sundre or west of Sundre, or whether they are in the area of Site 6, Drumheller, [or] Red Deer — the sooner the government makes a decision on this matter, the better off the government . . .

Note, he says, "The sooner the government makes a decision on this matter."

. . . the better off the government and everyone else affected is going to be. I welcome the minister's indication of an early decision, and certainly will remind him of those comments if no decision has been made come the fall session.

Mr. Speaker, I urge hon. members to defeat this motion, because I feel that no useful purpose will be served.

DR. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to enter this debate. I'm glad to see there are now two "dam" doctors instead of one.

You know, water has been, and is, a renewable resource to this province. We are putting the moneys that we get from our other resources into this absolutely renewable resource: it renews itself every year.

To me conservation is something that does the most good to the largest number with the very least harm. The Red Deer and the Oldman rivers . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

I apologize for interrupting the hon. member, but this may be a good point to draw the attention of hon. members to one of the *Standing Orders* which, until it is changed, the Chair is obliged to follow. I refer to Standing Order No. 12, which says, in paragraph four: ". . . When a member is speaking, no person shall pass between that member and the Chair . . ." Unless that's changed, I am obliged to follow that standing order. There have been a number of instances in which it hasn't been followed. I've refrained from saying anything about it. But unless the House wishes to change the standing order, I would respectfully ask hon. members to observe it.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

DR. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, when we're looking at rivers in this province, both the Red Deer and Oldman river systems start up in those mountains as little tiny trickles, then they become rivulets, then streams. But every spring they become raging torrents which rush down onto the flat prairies below. In southern Alberta, about every 11 years the Oldman River overflows its banks and wreaks havoc with the lands, the homes, and we have deaths almost certainly with each major flood.

The same happens with the Red Deer, and the chances of a very major flood every 100 years are that 77,000 cubic feet per second will run down that river. The maximum that river can contain is 36,000 cubic feet per second. It is obvious that that water has to go somewhere. This dam is an effort to try to hold that in check.

It's a funny thing, you know, we had a meeting in Picture Butte about a year ago. The hon. Member for Little Bow was there. We had about 600 or 700 people there, and he objected very strenuously to the great delays the hon. Minister of the Environment was causing by all these stupid studies we were having. I must say I was agreeing with him to quite a large extent. His remark then was, why don't we drop all this and get on with the dam? It's been studied and studied and studied *ad nauseam*.

When I see him then join with his group and walk out of this Legislature, objecting to a dam that's going to be built after a very great deal of study, and objecting because there aren't any more studies, it's a funny thing. He seems to have some sort of thing that he might personally benefit from irrigation on the Oldman River, but whenever it comes to the one a little further north, there is no personal involvement so he takes a remarkable change in attitude.

Last year I had a trip last year to Switzerland. They have a deal over there that every major project of government must go to a vote of the people. While I was there, they had a vote on a transit system through the city of Zurich. The people turned it down. But the government had already spent about \$9 million digging holes all over the place, and they were in a real quandary wondering what to do with it.

You know, it sounds very good to have everybody vote on a major project. But if we're having difficulties here in this House and in this Legislature making a decision and we have all the consultative opinions and technical advice we can possibly have, how can you then ask the general populace to come to a sensible, knowledgeable decision without that advice? If our decisions are wrong too often, we do have elections once in a while to change things. But I think we're making a pretty good deal of it so far. I don't think we can just switch around whenever it seems politically expedient to do that.

I think the hon. Member for Little Bow has a bit of a personality split there, a problem when he talks about the southern part of his split. When he wants them to have a dam, they don't, and then on the northern one, when he doesn't want a dam, they do.

By building a dam we are trying to avoid either a calamity or a disaster. I am never quite sure which is which. But if you took the hon. leader of the Social Credit Party and pushed him into the Red Deer River, I think it would be a calamity. But I think if somebody pulled him out again, it would be an absolute disaster.

We in the irrigation committee have had most exhaustive briefings on the Red Deer River sites, and we ultimately gave our approval to the employees of the Department of the Environment. We approved of their decision. We know why they made it. We've heard both sides of the story. It seems that our friends on this side only listen to the one side. But I feel sure the hon. Minister of the Environment would be happy to give them the same showing he gave us.

The South Saskatchewan and the Red Deer rivers were studied together. The important thing on all these rivers is that 50 per cent of the water that goes down there must go to the province of Saskatchewan. Are we going to allow that water to run on down and do no good to anybody? The only way we can save it at all for this province is to create dams, store it here and then let it out. The difference in flow on the Oldman River system — at its height it's about 200,000 feet per second, whereas in the middle of the summer it's barely a trickle of 200 cubic feet per second.

The only way progress has ever been made in this world was by restless and risk-taking people. I think this government is made up of those kinds of people, and I have every reason to believe we're certainly making some good progress. I think it is up to us as a government to go ahead and hire what expertise we need and what is necessary to make an educated, well-informed decision. I think in this case we have made a well-informed decision, and we are going to stick by it. I hope it will turn out to be the right one.

Thank you.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I thought I should say a word or two about the resolution we have before us. I didn't get an opportunity to participate in the earlier

debate. Since the Red Deer River closely borders my constituency, I think it would be only right to express some of my personal thoughts and some of the thoughts I've heard from my constituents.

I suppose it would be fair to say that I have to compliment the members of the opposition for continuing to create what one might consider a harangue over this particular issue. Although we'll likely be involved in many, many other issues before the coming provincial election, it probably would be fair to say that this is good political strategy on their part, providing they don't overdo it, Mr. Speaker. I've come to the conclusion that on this issue they're perhaps carrying it to the extreme.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if it would be fair to say too that if the social democratic party — or the new alliance, as the deputy minister has mentioned — could find social democratic candidates throughout the province who might be located at the bottom of a potential dam, in the middle of a potential petrochemical complex, in the middle of a large construction project, or anywhere where we're going to have growth and progress in the province, I suppose it would be fair to say that would be a good strategy. They've been successful in doing that in this particular case. Unfortunately the member for the new social democratic party in my own constituency has already been nominated. So I would suggest to the hon. members that unless you can make a shift there you're going to have some problems. But that would be a reasonable strategy. However, I suggest again that this particular issue really has been carried a little bit to the extreme.

Mr. Speaker, there's no question in my mind that we have to have control of water on our various rivers and streams that flow from the eastern slopes. As the deputy minister alluded, this is probably one of the most important issues we can face up to at this particular time. Water is going to be of extreme importance in the years to come, in both the areas of agriculture and industrial development. I would suggest that I have the support of most people in Alberta, certainly in my own constituency. They support orderly industrial growth, job opportunities for their young people, increased political strength in Alberta versus Canada. All these things are a positive direction this government has taken that's good for Alberta.

Therefore I stand here with extreme confidence and suggest that the approach to control and make use of the flow of water that eventually finds its way into the Hudson Bay, the Arctic, or wherever as it finds its way downstream, has to be an extremely important decision on the part of our government and an extremely important plus for the growth and development of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, at the present time the stream that flows in the Red Deer River basin has no controls. A very large number of tributaries flow into it. It has the development of the agricultural industry in Alberta. Because of the transformation — removal of trees, intensive cultivation, and drainage of natural water areas; that is, to preserve water — we have virtually a flood along these river basins every year. I know the Member for Drumheller has alluded to this and to the problems that they are faced [with] downstream because of it.

Mr. Speaker, it just seems a ridiculous position,

that the opposition wouldn't support the concept of water management and controlling of water as it flows toward the east. They'll argue that they support the concept. Fine and dandy. Let's have them stand up here in the Legislature and say that. Then they'll say it's not a matter of that; in the case of the Red Deer River it's a matter of the location. I've listened very carefully to my constituents with regard to where the location should be. I've had letters. Some have indicated they're concerned about the location, and I've corresponded with them. Many have indicated support for the location, and I've corresponded with them.

Because Site 6 happens to be located in an area that has considerable agricultural land, it's regretful that this is the choice. But it's not the end of the world. It's rather strange to me that, for example, in the last year or two the city of Red Deer has annexed upward of a half section or more — three quarters — of probably the highest assessed land in the whole constituency. Yet I don't think I heard a word of protest about that annexation either from the new social democratic party, from any members of the constituency, from Red Deer, or from the general area around Red Deer.

MR. CLARK: You just weren't listening.

MR. COOKSON: Well, it's unfortunate the members couldn't find a candidate — a Fischer — in the middle of that property. But they weren't able to do it. So they were fortunate in finding a Mr. Fischer in the bottom of the potential Red Deer dam. As I say, it's unfortunate that when you progress and have to make decisions, which this government or any responsible government has to do, it is not always going to be totally to the benefit of everyone. But it's certainly going to be to the long-term benefit of very, very large numbers of Albertans.

Then the opposition continually labor on a public hearing. When I think of this affair going on in Edmonton, this enquiry which reads and listens like a soap opera, perhaps we may have to replace all the actors before very long because I don't think they'll be around. Maybe that's the intent of the hon. members of the opposition. Is the intent to harangue about this issue until the next provincial election? Surely that's not so. I think that point should be clarified and laid to rest for good.

This issue has to be dealt with by a responsible government, and I think this government has done a responsible job. If you go back into the history of those hearings, the Environment Conservation Authority spent a very great deal of time holding hearings throughout the area and in that particular area. I don't know how thick the document is; I haven't been able to penetrate through the total thing.

It's rather interesting that one of the members of the Environment Conservation Authority, who is no longer with this organization, now is galloping around the province attending every new social democratic meeting with the new alliance, trying to drum up support for some kind of position that he holds. It'll be interesting, Mr. Speaker, to find out where he's going to settle in the next year. Is he going to settle for a nomination in the bottom of some other dam that's going to be built, or is he going to settle for a

location where he's in the middle of a growth area, petrochemical site, or whatever? That'll be an interesting thing. I'd just like to speculate on that with the hon. members of the opposition.

I simply say, Mr. Speaker, that we've had the hearings, we've had submissions, we've had all the engineering studies, and they're public information. It's no problem to get this material; it's available. If the members of the opposition or any other public members wish to scan or study this, I think the Minister of the Environment has done a tremendous job in presenting this information from his department to the people concerned. I'd just like to commend the minister, because I know the kind of political and public pressures that are exerted on ministers on issues such as this.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not very proud to be associated in any way with some of the Fischer clan who went down and made quite a demonstration of themselves and burned the effigy of the Premier. I believe the Hon. Dave Russell got burned up in the process too. But surely this is not the way our system works.

May I give the members of the opposition a little bit of advice? If I read my people correctly, they're not very proud of this kind of thing. I'd suggest to the hon. leader of the new social democratic party that he's getting his advice from the wrong people. Perhaps he should just reassess where he's getting his advice, and reassess the kind of communication he's getting from, presumably, the mass of people he represents out there.

MR. GHITTER: He's not getting advice. That's his trouble.

MR. COOKSON: Well, maybe he's flying by the seat of his pants. I don't know.

I was interested, by the way, in the statistics the hon. Deputy [Premier] presented to us. It's interesting to note that it isn't by any means the total area of the dam that is top agricultural land. It's really not much more than about half of it. This then takes away some of the thunder, too, of those proponents of another location.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, without holding up debate, I think it's important that we deal with the motion by the opposition. I regret very much that they haven't gone about it in a little more disciplined manner as we're accustomed to here. I think it's perhaps a good attempt on their part to prolong the debate on the issue. But I think we should really deal with it, and hopefully lay the problem to rest for the coming years.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I don't think anybody in this Legislature is against dams or accumulating water. Nobody's against that. But there's something just a little more serious involved in this Legislature at the present time; that is, a government — Conservative MLAs — standing up and saying that the people of this province can't come in the Legislature.

MR. CLARK: That's the issue.

MR. R. SPEAKER: That's the issue being discussed. We have talked for the afternoon about the merits of Site 6, Site 11, and others. That's fine. It's nice to see that the backbenchers do read a little of the litera-

ture that is put out. It's nice to see that kind of thing happen. Really that wasn't the initial thought in the debate: to debate Site 6 over Site 11, or do that kind of thing. It was to say that there are a lot of questions to be answered about Site 6, about Site 11. Which has the best merits? To review the studies, to ask people who were directly involved in the process what they think about it, so that as legislators and as the people of this province we are able to work together and make the final decision: that's what it's all about.

I think that hasn't been cleared in this debate during this Assembly. It's fine to talk about politics, the things people say, things like that. But the fact is, there are many questions to be answered, questions that were not answered by the hon. Minister of the Environment. I listened very carefully to his remarks, because I'm very interested not only in the dam on the Red Deer River but in one on the Oldman River. I have publicly stated that. I've publicly stated that I was pleased with the decision of the minister. That was last summer. I was pleased with it, because I felt public evidence would be provided which showed that it was the right site.

Since that time I've had a lot of constituents talk to me, a lot of people in southern Alberta. Reports have come available. This large compilation here, January 1978, has been made available to us. I find at this time there are more questions that require answering, and that the people of this province want answered. There is a Site 6 dam committee, I understand, but what their concern is or how they make their presentations, that's their business. My position is from what I read in the reports, what I've heard in public, what I see in these reports, what I've heard in this Legislature. My alliance with any group is non-existent. But that doesn't exclude me from listening to any group and allowing them to make presentations.

But this Legislature is not allowing that particular democratic process to take place. We know that in a few minutes when we stop this debate, and hopefully we're able to take a vote today, the government is going to stand up and say unanimously, we've listened, and the answer is no.

AN HON. MEMBER: Go home, boys.

MR. R. SPEAKER: And that's the end of it. We know that's what's going to happen. We can see the trend, and we know from precedent that when one member, the Deputy Premier or one of the ministers says, you don't vote for that resolution, well, we know for a fact that there's nobody going to stand up and vote against that.

MR. NOTLEY: It hasn't happened yet.

MR. R. SPEAKER: There are a lot of reasons for that. Seven years of precedent show that. And I'll take this quote from the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. I remember him sitting here for a number of years, and saying to us as we sat there, "rubber stamps, rubber stamps, rubber stamps".

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Here I am, sitting on this side of the House and I can say, "rubber stamps, rubber stamps, rubber stamps".

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I was right and he's wrong. [laughter]

MR. R. SPEAKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to give the hon. member just a little benefit of the doubt. I think we're both right. We were wrong at that time.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of questions that have to be asked. I find in this study an assessment of alternatives to a dam on the Red Deer River, outlined in a very brief form; areas where the questions can be raised with regard to the merits of Site 6 and Site 11. We talk about water supply. It outlines here very clearly, and indicates Site 6 versus Site 11: "Water Supply for Red Deer, Drumheller, Coal Industry, Petrochemical, Red Deer Regional Pipeline, Fish Habitat". Both sites can do the job. We look at water quality. We find "yes, yes." Both sites can do the job.

We look at flood control. We note that on Site 11 there would be a percentage effect on flood control for Sundre, and it would reduce the costs of diking and various structures there. And I ask myself, well, that seems a saving if we go to Site 11. Maybe we should consider that as a merit.

Going down the line: flood control at Drumheller. We find that Site 6 has partial effect; Site 11 small effect. But when we researched this a little further, we found that an increase in the size of the dikes will take care of the problem at Drumheller. So I see at least an equal situation there.

Erosion control: we note that Site 11 controls a larger length of river, and Site 11 has more merits. Other considerations: hydro power — fairly comparable in output. Recreation: both create lakes that can be used for recreational possibilities. Social impact: Site 6, 22 families are affected, 3 home sites flooded; Site 11, there is some disturbance of Indian burial grounds but, in following that a little further, I find that they don't really know where those sites are, and there is some question about it. I'd like to ask more about that. I'd like to find some good witnesses who could tell me more about that type of thing, Mr. Speaker.

Environment — fish: Site 6, it says, "significant benefit"; Site 11, "detrimental". I'm not sure what that means, Mr. Speaker, and I'd like to ask some of the biologists. Won't the lake at Site 11 provide a living place for fish of some types? Won't that water be of good quality? It says the water's of good quality. So I'm not sure I understand that, and I'd like to ask further questions. Water quality: it just follows. It says both are a major benefit, Site 6 and Site 11.

Archaeology: Site 6, "Eleven minor sites"; Site 11, "No known major sites". So we don't affect anything at Site 11. Groundwater: "No identified problems" for both. Seepage: Site 6, we note that there is a seepage problem; we note from the studies that there isn't any conclusive evidence that all of the seepage will be controlled as well as we want it controlled. I'd like to ask some further questions about that of some of the experts, the engineers, so that I could find out what we do about the seepage and are we convinced that it's Site 6 . . . [interjections] Sure I'm available to do that, but the public wants to know the answers.

DR. BUCK: Right here in the Legislature, Hugh. What are you hiding?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Fine, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the audience.

DR. BUCK: Right here, Hugh, in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Area of seepage: it indicates there will be land that will be water-logged. There's a possibility of alkali, although the salts are at a lower level of soil. But at Site 11, the indications and the best material I have at this time is that water-logging, alkali, seepage doesn't exist or there isn't any evidence, the material before us doesn't indicate that it is that way. So, why not Site 11 — another reason for it? Why not?

An indication about topsoil. Now there was a question about that today so I'll leave that as a benefit of doubt, but I understand removing the topsoil, or there isn't any there — I noticed that in the studies too, there wasn't very much — so that really isn't a question. But there was a figure thrown around at an earlier date by a group that said it was going to cost \$14 million to remove the topsoil, and I'd like to find out where that really is. Maybe it's a figure with no basis; hopefully that's true.

Utilities, power lines. The other one has pipe lines. Well, that's it. Costing: certainly there's a difference of something like \$20 million in the difference of costing of one to the other. Well, why don't we ask some questions about the difference? I'm not sure that costing is accurate when we consider the possible effects of seepage, the loss of land that can possibly occur. It isn't clear on either side as to how far the seepage can travel to the upper or lower side of the dam.

So, Mr. Speaker, those are questions that must be answered and I feel are necessary. Not only for myself, but I think for the general public of this province, we must find those kinds of answers before we make the final decision. A dam at Site 6 isn't going to be there just for the length of any of our lives in this Legislature; not for the length of any one of us. It'll be here for 100 years or even more. Certainly there's only one hon. member in the Legislature who will live that long, and I certainly hope he does. It would be an awful loss to the political system if that didn't occur.

Mr. Speaker, it's a long-term decision. Next week, one or two days, or right after the Easter break, two or three days in this Legislature is certainly not going to delay the decision-making process with regard to Site 6. We can still be on target, make the decision just as quickly, but not only are we as legislators going to be more informed but the direct information communicated from us to the media that sits with us in this Assembly will go to the people of this province, all across the province.

Many people ask me about the difference. The biggest question, and it's been raised by two or three members, is the land question. Why over 2,000 acres, I believe it is, why are those 2,000 acres going to be flooded? Why can't you go up to the other site?

I remember after my little discussion with the hon. Minister of the Environment, I said very publicly, I'm glad you're building a dam because I felt it was great to see some action. But I remember being chastised by some of my constituents, particularly some of my constituents at the high school level who came to me and said, how in the world can you allow all those good agricultural acres to be flooded? So I'd better ask that question just a little further.

Maybe I've put a little too much confidence in the decision that was made. I must say, Mr. Speaker, I've re-examined that particular decision, and at this point in time I think we should be looking at both, re-examining. I'd like to make this public at this time; re-examine it on the basis that that was my right as a legislator and an individual in this province. Re-examine it in the light that within this party of ours, the Social Credit party, we have the right to stand on our own point of view, and not go back and always have to check with the leader what our point of view is. If it differs, we're willing to stand on that and the public. So what's wrong with that? There are different reasons to take a position in different places in this province. If we haven't that right as individuals in any political party, maybe we shouldn't belong to that party.

I think it's unfortunate when in modern times a party disciplines its members to a point of suppression of attitudes; that's very unfortunate. I hope when we're in government we recall that, and understand that our members can speak up. We are going to have some free votes, not votes that are decided in caucus before we come out into the public display of things. That's the way democracy should have been.

A number of us came into an old system a few years ago, where that kind of thing happened by default. Hopefully we have learned a lesson, that it doesn't have to happen in a new government that can take over in this province, Mr. Speaker. I think there is good reason at this point in time for us to support the resolution, bring whoever we need in this Legislature to question, get good public information out, and at that time we as individuals — as legislators — can either support the minister, or a free vote can be taken in the House as my hon. colleague has said, and we can decide on Site 6. For a long period of time, we will have another good decision in this province, Mr. Speaker.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I wonder if the hon. Member for Little Bow would permit a question?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Well?

DR. PAPROSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the hon. member from the social and new democratic party permits a question. Did the hon. member indicate that information . . .

DR. BUCK: You're out of order. Would the hon. member indicate as to who he is directing the question. He said . . . There is no such political party, Mr. Speaker, and I beg that the hon. member address his question properly.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, if I may continue, did the hon. member indicate that information regarding . . .

DR. BUCK: Would the hon. member address his question.

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly we should leave that concern for the hon. member to whom the question is being addressed. [interjections] Order please. Order please. The hon. member who's being asked the question is in no apparent need of someone else to intervene on his behalf.

DR. PAPROSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a shame that the hon. member feels the other hon. member requires assistance. Mr. Speaker, did the hon. member indicate that information regarding other dam sites, including this dam site, was not provided, when in fact he has information which he is reading today and which . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The hon. member isn't asking for information. He's asking for further opinion and further debate.

DR. PAPROSKI: A point of order for clarification. Did he indicate in his comments that information was not provided on the other dam sites?

MR. SPEAKER: Clearly the comments speak for themselves. I heard them.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to participate for a few moments in the debate and to perhaps sum up in time for a vote on this important subject before the end of the day.

It seems to me that I was fascinated indeed with the most recent speech of the hon. Member for Little Bow, because I was very taken last August when he broke ranks with his party leader to back the dam, and today he has been whipped back into shape by a ruthless party leader and the whip is on. Yes indeed, in order to preserve the solidarity of the Socred ranks, Speaker backs his leader. Marvellous. The ruthless and all-powerful Socred leader has won the day. Well, perhaps the hon. leader doesn't see himself in quite that light, and perhaps the people of Alberta don't see him in that leadership role either. The opposition, excluding the hon. Member for Drumheller, is stalling, purposely stalling, trying to stall an important decision that has been studied, and studied, and studied.

We are elected to this Legislature to make decisions. A decision has been made with respect to the Red Deer Dam. And in case the hon. members of the opposition are not aware, the decision has been approved by the government caucus. I'm a member of that caucus and, in addition, I'm the chairman of the caucus committee on irrigation. We studied the question and agreed with the decision. We've had a thorough debate, and it's now time to proceed. If I thought for a moment the decision would be altered in any material way by public hearings, perhaps I could support the resolution. If I thought for a moment the resolution was before the Assembly for the purpose of serious consideration, perhaps I could support the resolution. But in fact it is there for the

purpose of attempting to stall a decision for crass political purposes. And it is symptomatic of the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest to the hon. member that he's making the Chair somewhat uneasy.

MR. HORSMAN: Yes, I felt uneasy myself when I uttered those words, Mr. Speaker. [laughter]

It is symptomatic of the opposition, either alone or in parts, to chase will-o'-the-wisps in hopes those will-o'-the-wisps will turn out to be solid political issues that will bear them some votes at the next election. But I would remind members of the opposition that those will-o'-the-wisps are like most, probably composed of either swamp gas or sewer gas.

Mr. Speaker, the decision has been made. I support the decision. I am indeed sorry we have lost the support of the Member for Little Bow on the decision. He was quoted as saying the government shouldn't fear running roughshod over environmentalists' concerns about an Oldman dam. He said irrigationists' votes far outnumber those of environmentalists. He also went on to say that politics has to be taken out of this, and we have to get things done. Well, I agree with that latter statement.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say one other thing on this subject. In the 1971 platform of the Progressive Conservative Party, which brought the now government to office, it was pointed out quite clearly that water is perhaps our most valuable resource. To demonstrate that concern, the government of Premier Lougheed, and in particular under the leadership of the then Minister of the Environment, embarked upon a study of water resources in Alberta to determine the priority area for water management and control, and the decision was made then to proceed first on the Red Deer River. The Minister of the Environment outlined in great detail the subsequent steps which were taken in order to determine which type of water management would most appropriately be undertaken on the Red Deer River.

Now we've had available to us since June of last year the information quoted today by the hon. Member for Little Bow. He has all kinds of questions. Has he asked them? Did he ask them in the fall session?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. HORSMAN: I don't recall any series of questions. Anything on the Order Paper? Anything during the question period? Why not? It was all available . . .

DR. BUCK: What's this, Jimmy boy? January 30, '78.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the concern over the Red Deer Dam is no doubt very real to those people who will be affected. The concern over the Oldman dam site will be very real to the people who will be affected. But never in the history of this province has water management and control been studied as it has been by this government. When they built other storage dams in southern Alberta, did the then government go and ask the people? Did they ask for public participation in the planning process? Did they? The silence of the opposition benches is evidence that they did not. It was not until this government came into office that the type of public hearing and public participation in the planning process was

instituted. But there comes a time when you must make decisions. That's what we're here for.

Now they say that the whole purpose of their motion is to allow people to come to the Legislature. Well, I would ask them to examine their roles as members of this House. Seventy-five of us have been sent here by the people of Alberta to make decisions. Our job is to stay in this House and participate in debates . . .

DR. BUCK: Tell your Premier that.

MR. HORSMAN: . . . and not to walk out of the House and put on . . .

DR. BUCK: Where's the Premier?

MR. HORSMAN: . . . displays which I could . . .

DR. BUCK: Where's the Premier?

MR. HORSMAN: . . . hardly characterize as mature.

I am trying very hard indeed to avoid being unparliamentary. I see the Speaker is shaking his head at me. I apologize to the Speaker and to the other members of the Assembly. But they walked out. They walked out of this Assembly where they were sent by the people of Alberta . . .

DR. BUCK: After the debate, Jimmy.

MR. HORSMAN: . . . to represent them in this House. What kind of performance is that, I ask you, Mr. Speaker?

AN HON. MEMBER: Shabby.

MR. HORSMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the time is fast approaching to vote. I intend to vote against this motion. I hope it is perfectly clear to the hon. members opposite and to the people of Alberta that when I vote on this motion I find it perfectly clear that I am voting in favor of a dam on the Red Deer River at Site 6.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, can I conclude the debate?

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I should be able to conclude my remarks if we could perhaps stop the clock for a moment or two at 5:30 so we could bring the matter to a [vote], having regard for the fact that the members of the Assembly have a function later on this evening.

I want to say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that I thank the government for reconsidering its unwise decision of last Thursday and making it possible for this debate to continue today. I want to say that it was my intention to spend some of my time, in the course of concluding my remarks; dealing with the comments made by the Deputy Premier this afternoon. But when I recollect some of the inaccuracies of the Deputy Premier's comments, and also recall

the administrative record the Deputy Premier had when he was Minister of Agriculture, and the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, I think his comments fit into that general category.

Mr. Speaker, what we're really facing here is a resolution which was brought to this Assembly at the earliest possible time, saying to the members: we believe it to be important that the people of this province have an opportunity to come before their own elected members of the Legislature and express their views, both pro and con, as to going ahead and building a dam at Site 6 on the Red Deer River.

We used the example of the Bighorn. And, Mr. Speaker, had this government gone ahead with the recommendations of the Environment Conservation Authority, I would have said there was no basic need for the hearing before the Assembly. But this government didn't do that. For some reason this government refused to accept the recommendations of the ECA, and that is the government's right. But to this day we've never got the real reason why the government is going ahead with the dam at Site 6 when it has at least two very obvious alternatives on that river.

This afternoon we heard members — I think sincere, genuine members, backbenchers — speak about this issue for the first time. I welcome that. You see, Mr. Speaker, the issue isn't whether we're going to have a dam, or whether there's going to be water management on the Red Deer River. I think every member in this Assembly agrees with that. It's a question of are we going to dislodge a number of people from west of Red Deer, take them out of their homes? Are we going to do that with just one swish of a vote here in a few minutes — or are we prepared to look at the question or possibility of building a dam west, in an area where there isn't one, not one, farmer living today, where there is no agricultural land at stake at all? That really is the issue.

The question that members have to face in their own conscience, and to their own constituents across the province: is it worth perhaps \$10 million or \$15 million dollars to keep that prime agricultural land, to enable those people to stay in their homes there, or in fact don't those people really count? Basically the report will show all members we get basically the same results, the same benefits of a dam at Site 6 as at Site 11.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh no, we don't.

MR. CLARK: That's what the reports point out — that basically we get the same benefits, Mr. Speaker. And it rests on the shoulders of the members of this Assembly who vote against this resolution, because what they're doing is voting against making it possible for those people affected and others to come before the House in rather a last-ditch effort to try to convince this government that the decision the cabinet made was wrong.

Mr. Speaker, during this session we have the Bill of Rights behind us here. That Bill of Rights is of precious little good to the people who are being affected. We know this is a tough decision the government has to make. The decision really is: do we dislodge those 23 families without at least giving them a chance to come before the Assembly? Do we dislodge those people without even giving them their

day in the highest court in the province, the Legislative Assembly? Or are we prepared to build that dam west where it will cost some more money, but we're not going to take that agricultural land out of production and we're not going to dislodge those 23 families.

When we look at it, that really is the basic issue, Mr. Speaker. Members can try to draw all the red herrings they want across all the other issues. They can make fun of my colleagues and me. We're quite used to that in this Assembly. They can make fun of Mr. Fischer, who is the Social Credit Party's nominated candidate in the Innisfail constituency. Maybe Mr. Fischer doesn't speak as clear English as some of the members in this Assembly, but he's a person who is prepared to stand up and speak very, very directly. [interjections] Mr. Speaker, it's all well and good for the hon. members to cast those kinds of innuendoes around. But the basic question is simply this: we in our particular party are quite proud to have Mr. Fischer as our candidate in that constituency.

Mr. Speaker, the issue for the members to wrestle with before the vote is called is, why will this government not go the extra mile, in light of the Bill of Rights behind us, to make it possible for the people in that part of Alberta who'd be affected to come before the Assembly? Why? Why not? The government has a big enough majority. What's it afraid of? We could spend two days doing that. It seems to me that would be a great step forward as far as this Assembly is concerned. Mr. Speaker, that's the reason for the motion being put forward at the earliest possible time.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

I assume, incidentally, that there was a unanimous murmur of assent to the suggestion that we stop the clock.

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

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

|       |            |            |
|-------|------------|------------|
| Buck  | Mandeville | R. Speaker |
| Clark | Notley     |            |

Against the motion:

|          |           |              |
|----------|-----------|--------------|
| Adair    | Horsman   | Paproski     |
| Appleby  | Hunley    | Planche      |
| Ashton   | Hyland    | Purdy        |
| Batiuk   | Hyndman   | Russell      |
| Bogle    | Jamison   | Schmid       |
| Bradley  | Johnston  | Schmidt      |
| Butler   | Kidd      | Shaben       |
| Chambers | King      | Stewart      |
| Cookson  | Koziak    | Stromberg    |
| Crawford | Kroeger   | Taylor       |
| Diachuk  | Kushner   | Tesolin      |
| Doan     | Leitch    | Thompson     |
| Donnelly | Little    | Topolnisky   |
| Dowling  | Lougheed  | Walker       |
| Getty    | Lysons    | Warrack      |
| Ghitler  | McCrae    | Webber       |
| Gogo     | McCrimmon | Wolstenholme |
| Hansen   | Miller    | Young        |



|        |           |       |
|--------|-----------|-------|
| Hohol  | Miniely   | Yurko |
| Horner | Musgreave |       |

|         |          |           |
|---------|----------|-----------|
| Totals: | Ayes - 5 | Noes - 59 |
|---------|----------|-----------|

[At 5:39 p.m. the House adjourned to Friday at 10 a.m.]

