

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTATitle: **Thursday, April 27, 1978 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Speaker, it's with a great deal of pride that I introduce to you today, and through you to the members of this Assembly, 37 grades 8 and 9 students from the Bob Edwards junior high school, situated in the Calgary McCall constituency. They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Lidgren.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, that this school purchased its own bus by the collection of funds through various projects, and the bus is driven by the teachers. I have a particular pride in introducing this group today, because the teacher Rob Lidgren happens to be my son-in-law.

Mr. Speaker, this group is seated in the public gallery, and I would ask at this time that they stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure today in introducing to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, a group of grades 4, 5, and 6 students from University elementary school. They are accompanied by one of their teachers, Sonia Yudcovitch, several other teachers and parents, and their bus driver. They are 90 in number and are seated in both galleries. I'd ask them to stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Commonwealth Games**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Premier. It comes out of the tour we had the other day with regard to the Commonwealth Games. The indication was that there would be certain extraordinary and extreme demands on the city of Edmonton. In the planning of the province and its responsibilities, I wonder if any special types of services or programs will be activated during the time of the Games. I relate to such things as social services, policing, transportation, labor, or medical services.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I would have to refer that matter to one of the three ministers involved in the Commonwealth Games Foundation society. I'd refer it specifically — in this case for general response, although there may be more specific ones — to the Minister of Recreation, Parks, and Wildlife.

MR. ADAIR: Thanks very much, Mr. Premier. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the question is: will addi-

tional funds or projects be provided for policing and the like? I would say at this particular point, no. They are more the responsibilities of the city of Edmonton. But as I mentioned to the press yesterday, there is certainly a review of a request being made to us by the Commonwealth Games Foundation for additional dollars relative to escalation of costs that have occurred since their 1973 estimates.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Has any request been made by the city of Edmonton for additional finances for the items I raised, such as policing, transportation, labor, and so on?

MR. ADAIR: To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, not to the province of Alberta. I believe they have held discussions with the foundation.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Solicitor General. Has any representation been made to your department for additional funding, or for additional provincial police officers being made available?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, in support of the Edmonton City Police we're already deploying a very large contingent of Mounted Police drawn from the provincial contingent. No formal request for fiscal support for the Edmonton City Police has been made, although the subject has been raised informally. But I hadn't regarded it as an application.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Have any steps been taken or been requested to increase the medical services such as outpatient care or special care within the hospital services?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, two requests have been referred by my colleague the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. One was that the Commonwealth Games wanted some convenient administrative package for the athletes through Alberta Health Care. We agreed to keep track administratively of all the medical expenses for the athletes while they're here during the course of the Games, and to bill the Commonwealth Games for that. So that's just an administrative matter.

The second matter happened to fit the priorities of the University of Alberta Hospital, which had within its top three priorities a request to us for drug-testing equipment for the athletes prior to engaging in events. If we had not agreed to that, all the drug testing would have had to go to Montreal. Therefore, in co-operation with the University of Alberta Hospital and the Commonwealth Games, we agreed to fund drug-testing equipment for the Commonwealth Games. Those are the two matters we have agreed to.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, upon reflection, perhaps I should supplement the question first raised with me by the hon. Member for Little Bow, having regard to the answers just given by the Solicitor General and the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife.

I considered it an informal representation made to me, but in the sense that it might have been con-

strued as other than that, I did have discussions during the course of our tour of Commonwealth Games facilities on Tuesday with the mayor of the city of Edmonton. He raised with me, as I anticipated he might, the fact that when they had done their accounting, so to speak, we would be getting a submission from them with regard to various supplementary services. Of course we have not had that submission to any of the ministers who are affected. I advised the mayor that when we receive the submission it would naturally be taken into consideration, but in advance I could give no undertaking.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that answer very much.

I'd like to ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Business Development and Tourism. I wonder what assistance is being made available by his department in providing sufficient accommodation and so on. What types of agreements have been made with, say, the Tourist Association or the motel and hotel owners at the present time?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, there has been no formal agreement with the motel and hotel owners. That's a private-sector matter. But the Travel Alberta organization has developed a reservation system which involves all 14 information centres throughout the province. They feed it into a central location in the city of Edmonton to assist in locating people who come to the city to take part in the Commonwealth Games as spectators.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is with regard to the charging of rents or the pricing of accommodation. Has the minister had any concerns with regard to this, and will any controls or actions be taken by his department?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, we've not been involved in that matter.

MR. DOWLING: If I might supplement that answer, Mr. Speaker, we have the accommodation guide which is designed by Travel Alberta. In that accommodation guide, in the main for hotels in Alberta, the prices indicated are quoted for that yearly period. There is some aberration in that, with regard to some motels. But if the price is not going to be fixed, that is stated emphatically in the document. Another possible thing is put in the document: that the price will be maintained at this level or up to a 10 per cent increase over the period of a year.

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could add some supplementary information as it relates to my department in the preventive area. Additional funds have been provided in the budget this year to supplement the funds for the city board of health, to enable them to step up their inspection procedures and anything related to the communicable disease and public health inspection areas.

As well, we have arranged — and I'm not sure as to the present status, but we are sure that a plastic "isolette", which is used for isolation in the case of exotic diseases . . . We saw it on a recent visit to Ottawa and felt that perhaps it might be a useful

thing for us to have in Alberta because of the Commonwealth Games. We've been told this will be available to us, and I expect it will be here. I sincerely hope and pray it will not be needed.

Capital Punishment

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my second question was to be to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, but I'd like to direct it to the Premier at this time. The concern is one that has been constant not only in Alberta but in Canada. It's with regard to capital punishment. I was going to ask if, in any of the federal/provincial conferences or the discussions of the premiers, Alberta has had a policy position with regard to this matter, and if one has been articulated.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, we have been pretty vigilant and determined in trying to assure that the House of Commons and the federal government respect the jurisdiction of the government of the province of Alberta and its Legislature. I think we should reciprocate.

Crime Prevention

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Solicitor General. The Solicitor General has had an advertising campaign on television and in magazines across the province. Could the Solicitor General indicate what effect that campaign has had at the present time?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, as I said in response to a similar question in the House two weeks ago, the federal government has sponsored at the University of Alberta a study of the effectiveness of our campaign, which is the first crime prevention campaign of this type in Canada. Since the campaign is ongoing, it's far too early for them to be coming in with any assessment or report.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question to the minister. In the city of Calgary there is financial support for the provincial Rape Crisis Centre, and it is my understanding there isn't support in the city of Edmonton. In his program, has the minister considered additional financial support to the program in Edmonton?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, so far as I know the Rape Crisis Centre is not being supported by a grant from my department under crime prevention. But we do have pilot projects in crime prevention which might operate in one part of the province and not in another, such as the anti-vandalism experiments with silent alarm systems in Edmonton and Calgary. Every policy we embark on in crime prevention is not universal from one end of the province to the other. They're mostly experimental, leading the way for other police forces.

Public Service Ethics Code

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address this question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. On October 19, 1977, the Provincial Treasurer released the draft code of conduct and ethics for

Alberta government employees and indicated that the government hoped to have the new code in effect on January 1. What specific obstacles have stood in the way of the government's enacting the code as originally planned?

MR. LEITCH: A short answer, Mr. Speaker, is none. Members of the Assembly will recall when that I filed the proposed code in the House I said it was just that: a proposed code. There were a number of issues on which different views could, with considerable merit, be expressed, and I asked for responses to the proposed code. The responses were numerous and lengthy, somewhat greater than I had anticipated. It has taken us a little more time to evaluate them. We're nearing completion of that. In the near future I would expect to be able to have the proposed code of conduct and ethics in final form.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Section 2.2 of the proposed code suggests that deputy ministers may vary or add to matters in the code, providing they don't make it more permissive. In the government's review, will the government be removing this particular feature? It does provide for a rather unusual situation of inconsistent rules that may be applied to public servants in the province.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, my memory is that we would not anticipate any change in that provision. If the hon. member wishes to debate its merits, I'd be delighted to do that with him at some appropriate time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Have there been any meetings with the AUPE on this question? Specifically, has the Provincial Treasurer himself met with AUPE on the question of the code, in view of their concern that some of the aspects of the code really relate to areas that should be subject to collective bargaining?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I've not personally met with members of AUPE. I did receive a submission from them, and during our review very careful thought was given to all the points they raised. I would have to check, although I think members of the Public Service Commissioner's office have met and discussed the provisions of the proposed code with officials of AUPE. But to be certain of that, I'd want to check with the Public Service Commissioner's office.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. In view of the Treasurer's invitation to debate the merits of the so-called King John provision in the proposed code of ethics, will it be the intention of the government to table the document during the spring session and hold a debate in the House on the code before it is implemented?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I would hope to have the code completed before we adjourn the spring session. I wouldn't propose a debate on the matter; however, if the hon. member wishes, he can of course precipitate

a debate by putting the appropriate motion on the Order Paper.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. In view of some of the concerns in Ottawa with respect to senior management personnel — we have Mr. McKenzie saying they should be fired, Mr. Baker saying they should be kept, and Mr. Clark saying they should be shifted — has the government of Alberta asked the Human Rights Commission to review that section of the proposed code relating to the restriction on political activity of senior management personnel?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I recall receiving some comments from the commission, which again were very carefully considered by us as we were reviewing the code. At the moment, I can't recall whether the specific item the hon. member refers to was commented on in that submission.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Where does the AUPE proposal now stand, that the final appeal procedure should not in fact be the Treasury Board but the Public Service Employee Relations Board? I believe that was a specific proposal.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, again that's a matter we gave very careful thought to. It was our conclusion that in view of the nature of the code, an appropriate appeal or review body would be the Treasury Board, as was outlined in the proposed code I filed in the House.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one last supplementary question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Has there been any decision to change the section with respect to conflict of interest, tighten it up — the section that presently applies says "may" — and change that to "shall" where conflict of interest does exist?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, changes were made in that section, but I can't recall whether we changed the words from "may" to "shall". I would have to refer to the actual document. The hon. member will have an opportunity to do that sometime in the immediate future.

Natural Gas Rates

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question to the hon. Minister of Utilities and Telephones is with regard to the suggestion by Canadian Western Natural Gas which would result in postage-stamp rates for natural gas. Could the minister indicate whether his department has conducted an assessment of what the results would be on the operation of rural gas co-ops of allowing utility companies to charge rates lower than those charged by rural gas co-ops?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, we have not conducted an assessment of that matter, which is before the Public Utilities Board at this time. However, I can say that basically what's involved is rate averaging over a wider geography than is now the case. The result of that would be a somewhat lower cost of natural gas

in the rural areas. That is the proposal before the Public Utilities Board and being evaluated at the present time. I think it's an important decision.

In terms of the possibility that these rates might end up below the rates that rural gas co-ops pay, I doubt that that would be the case because, after all, the rural gas co-ops are purchasing ownership in their system when they pay their gas bills. But even if that were the case, it would amount to a lower bill for the people in rural areas affected.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Could the minister indicate whether the government has made any submissions or presented a brief to the PUB with regard to postage-stamp rates?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, it has certainly not been a practice for a department to make submissions to the Public Utilities Board.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate when the gas utility rate design inquiry will be completed? When it is completed, will it be made public?

DR. WARRACK: Offhand, Mr. Speaker, I don't have a way to know that. If my colleague the hon. Attorney General, who has administrative responsibilities with respect to the Public Utilities Board, happens to know that answer, he might add. But without inquiring, I don't know the answer.

World Oil Pricing

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, may I first acknowledge the privilege of asking a question from approximately the same spot as I asked my first one nine years ago.

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister with the strong arm and the long reach, the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Can the minister advise the Assembly whether or not he has received an invitation from any OPEC country with respect to attending a meeting on world oil pricing?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I have received an invitation to visit Venezuela and meet with the energy minister of Venezuela. While undoubtedly we would have discussed oil and gas pricing, I don't think it would have been on the narrow matter of OPEC pricing. However, he is the chairman of OPEC this year, so I would have to say that the subject would probably have come up. I was going to make that trip to Venezuela sometime in April, but there were conflicting calls on his time and my time, and it wasn't able to go through.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the minister a supplementary; that is, whether or not his department or some of his officials are having ongoing correspondence, particularly with respect to dropping world oil prices and the effect this would have on the Alberta industry and in fact the Canadian pricing of oil?

MR. GETTY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GHITTER: A supplementary to the hon. minister. Should the opportunity arise to visit the OPEC countries, particularly Saudi Arabia, I'm wondering if he would consider taking the Member for Calgary Buffalo to the meeting in order to keep matters in perspective.

MR. SPEAKER: The question, by its form and also as to substance, is obviously hypothetical. [laughter]

Tourism Promotion

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Business Development and Tourism. Has the minister or his department received any reaction from the tourist zones regarding the see Alberta campaign?

MR. DOWLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. As hon. members will recall, I mentioned that prior to the campaign being undertaken we met with the principals of each zone organization, explaining the proposed program in detail, and at those meetings received general acceptance of the program.

Since its introduction, hon. members should be aware that we have received in the order of 30,000 inquiries in writing to Travel Alberta, which put considerable strain on that little organization. However, they are managing to cope. We have had some indication of substantial activity from some of the zones, with people coming in and wanting their passports stamped. So we think it's off and running and doing very well.

The other part of that is that I have had submissions made to me just today, private-sector companies wanting to become involved to a greater extent than they've ever been involved with tourism before.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. minister. I've received only one complaint; that is, that only one passport went to each family. Where a family requires more than one, how do they get another passport?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, the single passport is for a family. Should there be eight members in that family and they take the trip around Alberta and visit 14 zones, all eight people will receive the medallions that are associated with a tour of the zones. So a second passport is not necessary.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. minister. In some families there are boarders and people who are not relatives, who would not be travelling with the family. That's the one I was referring to.

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, if that's the situation, they can drop a line to Travel Alberta and a passport will be in the return mail.

DR. WALKER: A supplementary to the minister. Does the minister have the collusion of the federal government in the issuing of passports?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, we checked that matter out very thoroughly with our Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, and received advice

that what we were doing was totally legal and a great idea.

Vinyl Chloride Emissions

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. In some recent studies there's been a link between mammary cancer and the level of vinyl chloride emissions. I wonder if the minister has reviewed the level of emissions in the province; and is the department taking any action with regard to this?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, that's a matter to which the department has certainly given very close attention. Inspectors in the department are very close too, in the sense of their being familiar with and up to date on the most recent findings in that respect. In order to try to summarize those findings or the extent of the risk that may be involved, I would have to review the material for the hon. member. But I can certainly assure him that it's a matter that has received close attention, not only in recent months but recent years.

School Taxation

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Associate Minister of Energy and Natural Resources and ask whether he's had an opportunity to review the submission of the Peace River Stockgrowers Association expressing some concern at the levying of a 30 mill supplementary requisition by the Northland School Division on grazing leases in unorganized school districts?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, we did have the opportunity to receive this submission and reviewed it. Because it does not fall within the purview of our department, I would pass the question to the Minister of Education.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I then ask the hon. Minister of Education, in as gracious a way as I can, if he would bring us up to date on whether the government is going to take a reasonable attitude and not tax grazing leases?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, until an amendment was passed, I believe unanimously, by this Legislature a couple of years ago, all property owners — whether by way of fee simple or by way of lease — in that huge part of the province served by the Northland School Division paid absolutely no school tax by way of supplementary requisition. As a result of the amendment to the act, properly speaking they are now paying that supplementary requisition to that school division. I don't have the information relative to the effects it has on grazing leases or the amounts, because I haven't received a submission in this respect.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has the government given any consideration, then, to extending that principle to other leaseholders in the area, such as timber operators or oil companies that have leases in the said areas?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, the property that's properly subject to assessment, and subsequently a supplementary requisition, is dealt with in The Municipal Taxation Act. If the hon. member feels that amendments to that act should be introduced, I'm sure he'll add a bill to the numerous he already has on the Order Paper.

Landlord and Tenant Legislation

DR. PAPROSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I wonder if the minister would now confirm that he will be introducing landlord and tenant legislation this spring session.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, yes. As I indicated in the debates on the estimates of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, the drafting is proceeding, and I would hope to be able to introduce it.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister would also confirm whether that legislation would give consideration to quasi-judicial power for landlord and tenant advisory boards?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I think the contents of the bill should be left until it is introduced.

Farm Fuel Tax

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. The minister indicated in the Assembly on March 16 that he had approached Ottawa with regard to the 10 cent excise tax being deducted at the source. Could the minister indicate if he has made further representation, and what the response has been?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I had a response last week from the office of the responsible minister in Ottawa, I believe from the executive assistant, indicating that the matter was under consideration. I would expect a further reply in due course, which I haven't yet received.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has the minister contacted other agriculture ministers of the western provinces in regard to getting a consensus on the issue and presenting that to Ottawa?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the matter was discussed about a year ago by western ministers of agriculture, indeed I believe all ministers of agriculture, at meetings which I attended. Provincially, I think it's fair to say that most, if not all, ministers agree that there should be a method of refund on that federal excise tax, which is really a tax being charged to western Canadians to subsidize eastern crude oil imported from offshore; that we should have a method of obtaining that refund for agriculture purposes without the very lengthy and complicated application form that is required.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I understand the hon. Member for Drumheller will be withdrawing motions 130 and 134 at the appropriate time. I therefore move that Motion for a Return 135 stand and retain its place on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

128. Mr. Notley moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing a copy of any correspondence or reports arising from An Evaluation of the Impact on Electric Power Rates on Industrial and Regional Development in Alberta, prepared by Acres Consulting Services Ltd., as listed in Motion for a Return 116/78.

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, with regard to 128, we as a government have established a policy of not tabling correspondence relating to any documents that are produced by various departments. The reason for this, of course, is that correspondence relating to significant factors going into the report is normally given in confidence by entrepreneurial interests, and this kind of thing.

We believe that if we ever were to get into the position of tabling this correspondence as a regular routine, not only would we destroy our source of information but we would destroy the ability of the department to act responsibly, representing the people of Alberta.

The correspondence relating to this study is considered commercially confidential, Mr. Speaker, as it evaluates the capability of several leading consulting firms. Therefore I would suggest that members defeat the motion.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would just say to members of the House that the proposal here is:

... a copy of any correspondence or reports arising from an evaluation of The Impact on Electric Power Rates on Industrial and Regional Development in Alberta

Mr. Speaker, one of the key elements of any sort of industrial strategy in this province has to be the impact of electrical power rates. I would say quite frankly that that is the kind of information the government clearly felt strongly enough about to seek, at the expense of the taxpayers, a study and evaluation.

That being the case, Mr. Speaker, in my view we should have as much of this information as possible. If contained in that there is clearly the odd bit of information that is of a confidential commercial basis, then some kind of appropriate amendment could have been advanced by the minister. I would doubt that in the evaluation the basic thrust of it would in fact necessitate the release of confidential information.

But, Mr. Speaker, that's not the sort of thing I can guess at from this side of the House. It's the sort of

thing where an appropriate amendment could be worded by the government side, so the basic information could be made available. But specific matters of a commercial nature that relate to the specific commercial situation of one company or another needn't be released. The general thrust is information that, in my judgment, should be made available to the public.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, a lot of people in this province are concerned about whether we're going to see an industrial development strategy developed as a consequence of having some idea of where this government's going — some idea of what the components are, how they link together — or whether we're going to simply allow the boys in the back room to wheel and deal behind closed doors. In my view, Mr. Speaker, that isn't good enough.

[Motion lost]

129. Mr. Notley moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing a copy of any correspondence relating to or reports arising from the Study to Evaluate Opportunities for Development to 1985, prepared by Associated Economic Analysts Ltd., as listed in Motion for a Return 116/78.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, buoyed as I am by a few voices of support, with great expectation I move Motion for a Return No. 129, standing in my name on the Order Paper, and in doing so look hopefully to this new sign of independence in the Tory caucus.

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, with regard to motion 129, the same arguments apply as applied to the former motion. You should know that the entire documents on the western position on industrial development, as on agriculture, were in fact tabled. Included in that document was a transmittal letter to the Prime Minister of Canada from the province of Alberta. Everything significant with regard to our position is in fact now public knowledge. It involves the Western Economic Opportunities Conference in Calgary in 1973, when we decided to make that joint presentation.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would recommend to members that they defeat the motion.

[Motion lost]

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make some changes to motion 130. I therefore beg leave to withdraw motions 130 and 134.

MR. SPEAKER: So ordered.

head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I beg your pardon. I was about to leave the Assembly when I realized my duty had not been done. The hon. member Mr. Young is not in the Assembly this afternoon, and I suggest that we move therefore to Motion No. 204.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry. I didn't catch the operative words of the motion.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I was saying that Mr. Young is not in the Assembly this afternoon to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. minister please refer to the member by his constituency, as is usual.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, the mover of Motion 210 is not in the Assembly this afternoon. I therefore move the House proceed with Motion 204.

MR. SPEAKER: That's automatic under the standing orders.

MR. FOSTER: Yes.

204. Moved by Mr. Taylor:

Be it resolved that the government of Alberta give consideration to the adoption of the automatic assumption principle in Workers' Compensation, under which a miner who has been exposed to coal dust or rock dust for a period of 20 years or more and who is suffering from loss of lung function, be given the benefit of any doubt which may exist as to the cause of the lung condition and compensated accordingly for either pneumoconiosis or silicosis.

[Adjourned debate March 21: Mr. Purdy]

MR. PURDY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to participate in this debate today on Motion 204, put on the Order Paper by the Member for Drumheller. The resolution was first debated in this Assembly on March 21. Reading through *Hansard*, I think there has been some valuable contribution to the motion from the Member for Drumheller and members on this side of the Assembly. I've been reviewing the remarks made in *Hansard*, and most of them were regarding underground mining. While I concur in the motion of the hon. Member for Drumheller, I also have concern regarding some of the people who live in my constituency, because we have two very active coal mines both of the strip-mining nature. We have approximately 300 miners employed either at Wabamun or the Highvale mine, both digging coal for the Calgary Power electrical generation stations on either side of the lake. I think there is some concern in that area too.

I've been reviewing the legislation, The Workers' Compensation Act, and there's not that much in the act to follow up the member's resolution. Also there's very little under the general regulations under The Workers' Compensation Act, and that's including amendments up to January 1, 1978.

So I took a step further, Mr. Speaker, and looked at some things that have happened in the United States and Great Britain. I think that a book prepared by Leo Kramer sets forth some of the problems the United States government came across, and what they have done about it. So this afternoon I'm going to try to share with members of this Assembly what has been done in the United States, and maybe we can adopt some of this into the Canadian picture here.

One object of the study done by Mr. Kramer was to describe the procedures by which a miner learns about his health condition and the possible actions open to him under the federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. The act was amended in 1972 to include black lung benefits.

The second object was to analyse the results of the legislation in terms of, one, the numbers of health-impaired working miners who elected to request transfer to jobs in the mine that conformed to the standards for clean air, and two, the number of both miners and ex-miners who applied for and received black lung benefits under the program administered by the Social Security Administration. The overall objective was to investigate the operation of the program, with a view to developing a design for the service which could be performed by the employment service of the manpower administration in co-ordination with other states and federal agencies participating in the program.

Because of the study and the persistent decline of jobs in the mining industry over the years, the bituminous mine working force increased in age. As of January 1, 1971, a sample of miners from the welfare fund — and that was over 100,000 — disclosed that nearly one-fifth of the active miners were over 55 years of age. Apart from the railroad industry, bituminous mining is one of the oldest work forces in the U.S. economy.

The hazardous nature of coal mining has always been well known, but legislation in the United States requiring stringent safety regulations for coal mines and hygienic standards for exposure to coal dust has lagged behind that of other countries. Repeatedly, mine tragedies costing the lives of many miners have been a catalyst for the passage of federal laws to improve the safety standards of the coal mining industry.

The development of mechanical mining equipment which generates a substantial amount of coal dust contributed to a high rate of pulmonary and respiratory ailments, including silicosis. This is caused by fine particles of silica mingled with carbon dust, and has now been recognized as an occupational disease of miners. Mine workers were also known to be especially susceptible to other lung diseases, such as tuberculosis, bronchitis, and emphysema.

It was not until 1942 that coal workers' black lung was recognized in Great Britain as a specific disease entity associated with coal dust. Since that time, the attention focussed by European countries on the study and prevention of this impairment has stimulated the allocation of funds for continuing research on dust disease, with emphasis on black lung, and has resulted in compensation payments for workers disabled by this condition.

Lacking a sufficient body of knowledge on black lung which was based on research, American scientists relied primarily on the findings of European investigators. Early research in this country, however, has identified and acknowledged that black lung is a modified form of silicosis affecting anthracite coal miners. A study that began in 1928 revealed that this condition, brought about by the breathing of intermingled silica dust and anthracite coal dust, was present to some degree in approximately 23 per cent of the total number of workers examined.

In early 1950, black lung was recognized in the United States as an occupational disease that caused disability and death among deep-mine workers. Consequently, investigation continued to substantiate the evidence that a severe chest disease problem existed in the mining population. Finally, in an attempt to assess the extent of the health impairment condition,

study samples were undertaken by the Pennsylvania Department of Health from '59 to '61, then by the United States Public Health Service from '63 to '65. The findings of this latter comprehensive study of working and non-working bituminous coal miners demonstrated that black lung is a serious health problem related to coal mining, affecting in various degrees about 10 per cent of the active miners and about 20 per cent of the retired miners in that particular sample.

The recent public awareness of the existence and effects of black lung as a distinct mine-connected disease, coupled with the Farmington, West Virginia, mine disaster of 1968, laid the groundwork for the enactment of the federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. The intent of this act is to increase the protection of the health and safety of miners in general. Therefore the law declares that the coal mining industry must assume responsibility for reducing dust concentration to a safer level. That was to be done by December 31, 1972. Additionally, X-ray programs to detect evidence of black lung are now made available to all working miners, and benefit payments are authorized for total disability by the disease.

An unusual feature of this act provides that the active workers whose X rays show development of black lung be offered the opportunity to move to a less dusty job in the mines with no reduction in their regular rate of pay. It was thought that a substantial number of miners eligible for this type of transfer under the act would exercise their right, and they did.

With passage of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1972, the United States Congress applied its general commitment in the federal coal mine safety act to provide healthy and safe working conditions to all of the American industry. The Occupational Safety and Health Act does not specifically provide occupationally disabled workers with the option of changing jobs, as does the other program. However, the Department of Labor, charged with the responsibility of the administration of this 1970 act, has realized the need for exploring the transfer options available to eligible miners, with interest in its possible broader application to occupations and industries covered by the broader act.

It is anticipated that some miners, faced with the decision of whether or not to request a transfer, would benefit from professional guidance. Also, younger workers in the early stage of the disease might consider leaving the coal mining industry entirely to work in a less hazardous environment. One theoretical alternative for the miners was to go to the employment service, the agency best set up to give them counselling, advice, and possible training under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

With a view toward aiding health-impaired workers on an all-industry base, the office of research and development within the manpower administration of the United States Department of Labor financed a study of the occupational experience of the 1969 program. The program had five particular steps which I would like to see this government look at. One, description of the basic operation procedures of the X-ray program for active miners plus the experience with the transfer option. Two, field survey of a representative sample of coal miners to determine their views and actions in regard to any imped-

ing legislation and its administration; interviews with teams selected from various people who administered a questionnaire to 204 miners. Three, field interviews of community, state, and federal agencies which would provide services that may be required by a miner afflicted with black lung. Four, in cases that determine a further amount of study, a limited number of coal workers showing the action taken by miners with severe cases of the disease. Five, design for support services to assist health-impaired miners in exercising all viable alternatives, whether they decide to remain in the industry or leave the mining industry entirely for another occupation.

It is clear that a significant number of miners who are working in a high dust level position [distrust] the transfer option and resist exercising it to indicate any ailment to the operator which might threaten the miner's job security. A review of the attractive benefits offered by the welfare and retirement plan fully discloses the reason for a miner [masking] his disability in order to safeguard the future welfare of himself and his family.

The fund offers a cash payment of \$1 50 a month to miners 55 years of age who have accumulated 20 years of service in the mines, five of which must have been with union mines, with one of those five years falling immediately prior to retirement. This pension is drawn for life, regardless of additional income work from any industry not related to mining. Moreover, benefit payments to a retired miner, or from any state or federal source, do not affect their pension. As an added incentive to miners, the fund expects to implement in the near future a bonus program increasing the pension by an additional \$7.50 a month for each year worked after eligibility for retirement at age 55 to age 65. Thus, a miner working a maximum of 10 years beyond his retirement age could raise his pension from \$150 a month to \$225 a month.

Comprehensive medical and hospital coverage for the miner and his eligible dependants commences upon employment and continues so long as a pensioner earns more than \$100 a month in jobs not related to mines. Once the individual is entitled to Medicare at age 65, the fund continues to supplement these benefits as well as cover costs for medication required for long-term illnesses. Each fund beneficiary is issued a medical card, which identifies him as being authorized to obtain services offered by qualified physicians and accredited hospitals approved by the fund.

Area medical officers of the fund, through arrangements made with these doctors and hospitals, relieve all bills and medical reports on beneficiaries. If a report indicates that additional care may be needed, including rehabilitation, arrangements can be made and process reports would be kept on file. Training may be offered for miners unable to return to the coal industry yet capable of less strenuous work. Area medical officers also provide aid to miners filing claims for workers' compensation, social security disability, or black lung benefits.

Upon the death of a pensioner, a widow would receive a \$2,000 allotment paid over two years, while the widow of an active worker is granted \$5,000 over a five-year period. In either case, she or her dependant continues to have health coverage until the allotment is paid in full.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, the economic advantage to a union miner of remaining in the industry until retirement may outweigh his concerns over his health. Few middle-aged miners who show development of black lung would risk their security for a job in clean air.

The purpose of the 1969 legislation was to reduce the cause of black lung and provide a means for those already afflicted to move to mine jobs in a less dusty area. However, it appears that the economic advantage of remaining in the coal industry until retirement, rather than risking one's job, seeking a transfer in the mines or deciding to leave the industry entirely, outweighs the miner's concern for his health. This is very unfortunate.

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare was assigned the responsibility of overseeing the administration of the black lung benefit program. This duty was delegated to the Social Security Administration because of its experience and capability in administering a nation-wide program. Following enactment of the act of 1969, the district social security officers received materials for clarification of the provisions of the new legislation and for publicity of the program amongst potentially eligible applicants. Regardless of age or date of onset of disability, a miner may be eligible for benefits if he is totally disabled by black lung from working in a coal mine.

The amount of basic black lung benefit is equal to one-half the current minimum wage paid to a totally disabled federal employee in a certain class. Benefits range from \$169 for a totally disabled miner, widow, or other eligible recipient, to \$339 for a miner or widow with three or more dependants.

A miner or widow getting black lung benefits and also benefit received from workers' compensation, unemployment compensation, and disability benefits from his state because of the miner's disability, will have his black lung payment reduced by an amount equivalent to the state benefit. Federal benefits will not be reduced if a miner under 72 years of age earns up to \$2,100. Above that, he loses \$1 of benefit for every \$2 earned, with no ceiling on the amount he earns.

Frequently the evidence needed to document a claim may be found in records maintained by social security or the workers' compensation board. The availability of information speeds the process and allows the claimant to receive notice of acceptance or denial more quickly. The state of Pennsylvania, for example, has had coverage since 1965 for miners disabled by black lung. As a result of this active, long-going program, more complete medical files are available. Thus social security has been able to make decisions in less time on many claimants from the Pennsylvania area.

If the necessary evidence on the claimant is not available, the appropriate state agency is responsible for developing the claim medically. Arrangements are then made for the purchase and reading of an X ray by a qualified physician located in a medical facility as close to the miner as possible. However, owing to a large number of claimants at the beginning of the program and to the confined geographical area of the mining community, it has been difficult to obtain enough qualified persons and medical facilities.

Should a miner wish to have his private doctor perform the examination, he can be reimbursed for

any fees paid and for travelling expenses incurred. It must be borne in mind, however, that social security may refuse some X-ray interpretations by private physicians, pending the determination by the expertise of the physician taking and reading the files.

Any miner with complicated black lung is presumed to be totally disabled, and social security begins paying benefits at once. Benefits may also be granted to miners with negative X rays or with simple black lung if they furnish other relative medical evidence of a total disability, respiratory or pulmonary impairment, that developed from employment in a coal mine. Factors such as age, education, and length of service in mining are considered before a final determination is made.

Until a miner is diagnosed as totally disabled, he is considered employable. Under the legislation of 1969 about one-half of the claimants were denied black lung benefits. Those who failed to qualify for payments had insufficient medical evidence to determine total disability or had a disabling lung condition other than black lung. Disability from these types of impairments was not recognized by the association. However, with passage of the Black Lung Benefits Act in 1972, the criteria for total disability have now been liberalized and miners suffering from other incapacitating lung conditions arising from employment in the mine may be eligible for benefits. Benefit claims no longer can be denied solely because of negative X ray findings. Supplementary tests may be obtained before a decision is reached.

As a result of this new law, the administration is now reviewing the many thousands of claims previously disallowed. Quite probably a number of claims are being awarded without further medical evidence. However, it is clear that those miners with negative X rays will have to furnish pertinent information to document a claim for a disability, respiratory or pulmonary impairment. These claimants are notified by the department to gather the additional evidence, and ample time is allowed to submit the requested information before a decision is made based on the new law.

By the summer of 1972, a total of 96,000 miners had been awarded benefits under the black lung program. This figure has now been reduced to 88,000, the decline owing generally to the deaths of the beneficiaries. In addition, benefits were paid last year to 78,300 widows and 9,600 dependants. On re-examination of X rays under the Black Lung Benefits Act, a total of 23,800 miners have been awarded benefits, and the process is still continuing.

Mr. Speaker, I brought this forward because I think it's something we could look at in Alberta to try to determine what problem we have here. The route we could go is documentation by the miner of his history in the mines, and secondly, by an updated X-ray program, much as we do under some of our other programs in industrial health and safety. Some companies, or most of them, are now bringing employees in and testing them for hearing. This is an upgrading program every year to see if there is any hearing impairment because of job conditions. I think this is something we could look at for the coal mining industry.

I support the member's resolution. I think it's a good one and something the Assembly should adopt. The government should go ahead and look at it, and

put in place what is asked for.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Motion carried]

205. Moved by Dr. Walker:

Be it resolved that the government of Alberta consider the introduction of legislation to standardize the requirements for incorporation of a village to the minimum regulations as now required for incorporation of a summer village, thus enabling many hamlets to become eligible for greater autonomy and greater representation on rural municipal councils.

[Adjourned debate March 21: Mr. Trynchy]

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, it's a privilege to get involved in Motion No. 205. There are certainly many ways we could favor the resolution. There's also the other side to this. As I proceed today, I'd like to point out some of the difficulties we may encounter in trying to make hamlets into villages or vice versa.

I understand incorporation for a summer village takes a population of 100 people. If all hamlets with 100 people in the province of Alberta were to become incorporated as villages, I think the tax burden that would accrue to these villages would be something they could not cope with.

For information, I have considered a couple of hamlets in my constituency. Before I go on to that, Mr. Speaker, I think the resolution saying we'll have greater autonomy is something we can all live with. As a matter of fact I don't think anyone in the House wouldn't suggest that greater autonomy is necessary, whether it be a hamlet, village, or town.

Greater representation on a rural municipal council: Mr. Speaker, I just don't follow that, because it's my understanding that once a village is incorporated, then of course it has no representation on rural municipal councils. The only way they can have representation on a rural municipal council is if they remain a hamlet. Village or town status does not provide that flexibility.

Mr. Speaker, just to put the other side of the story for a moment if I may, I'd like to speak of one hamlet in particular that has, say, a population of 150. Their assessed tax base is about \$100,000. The mill rate at present is anywhere from 22 to 32 mills, split mill rate, which would bring revenue of \$22,000 or \$30,000 a year.

If they were to govern themselves as all other villages and towns do, there's just no way they could cope with it. They couldn't even hire a secretary plus a town or village maintenance man for the revenue. Of course, they could increase their mill rate to 80 or 100 mills and bring in \$100,000. What can you do with \$100,000? They could go and get per capita grants on a different basis from the provincial government. But those grants would have to be so high in proportion to their population that the towns and villages next to them would be asking for the same grants, and justly so.

Mr. Speaker, as we look at this, what does a hamlet want if it were to change to village status? What are they looking for? They're looking for local autonomy, which we all support. They'd like to govern their own affairs. But they'd also be looking for a real tax credit or tax supplement from other sources. They couldn't

operate on their own.

Look at some of the projects hamlets are facing today, such as streets, sidewalks, street lighting, fire protection, and a development officer in most of them, because they're expanding. Then we go to the main topic of water and sewer. Every hamlet, village, and town should have water and sewer, and we have programs for that. But unless they have a tax base around them, such as industry . . . Take, for instance, the hamlet of Blue Ridge. Its population is around 250; its tax base is about \$121,000; its mill rate is 32 mills. By that, you can see the type of revenue they would accrue yearly. But what they could do is annex, say, the Simpson Timber plant next to them. Of course that would bring in quite a bit of assessment. But then the rural people in ID 15, who are now receiving that revenue, would object; it's not within the borders of the hamlet or so-called village. It would cause them difficulties in getting that approved.

Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to read the budget of one of the ID hamlets in my area. They have a budget of about \$2.9 million. The transportation portion of that is \$1.2 million; environment health, \$5,000; preventive health and welfare, \$2,000; environmental development, \$67,000; recreation and culture, \$49,000. So even if they were to have just recreation and culture development in the hamlet, at \$49,000, there's just no way a hamlet could operate.

There are so many things we'd have to look at if we were going to incorporate into villages all hamlets over 100 people and give them the local autonomy they respect and want. We also have to provide the necessary funding to make sure they work. I'd be willing to guess, Mr. Speaker, as we look around our hamlets throughout the province — and we can look at one hamlet in particular: Sherwood Park. Why do they remain a hamlet? There are good reasons. It's beneficial for them to have the tax base of the county. They get done the kinds of things they want, they have representation on the county council, and everything is working out fine.

To become a village would be a real burden for a hamlet of 250 people in rural Alberta. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, as I talk to some of our people in hamlets in the rural parts of the province, there is more concern — not so much with local autonomy; they'd like to have that — that they need more funding. They'd like to become involved in a bigger area. As I mentioned, ID 15 has approximately a \$3 million total budget. They'd like to see that greater, because they can't get done the kinds of things they want. When you look at street construction, lighting, sidewalks, and curbs, it seems impossible that it could ever be accomplished by changing a hamlet to village status.

I'd just like to take water and sewer for the hamlet of Blue Ridge and the burden it would have upon its 250 people if this was a village. The tender were for \$1,243,000. Of that, there is a certain amount of grants: a \$233,000 grant from Central Mortgage and Housing; the Department of the Environment will have an annual grant of \$44,000; the ID grant will be around \$15,000. But the interesting point I want to make is the frontage tax. That tax which the people of that hamlet have to pay just to enjoy the benefits the rest of us enjoy throughout the province is in the range of \$6.50 to \$10 per frontage foot. That comes

pretty high for a tax base of 32 mills. They're looking at more frontage for water and sewer — maybe three times as much — than the annual taxes for the property. Of course when you look at hamlets, there is no industry inside the hamlet; there is no expensive development; there is no expensive housing. So they don't have a good tax base.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's time we reviewed funding to hamlets. I think it's time we had a real good look at whether some of our villages would like to revert to the MD, the ID, or the county, still having some local autonomy by having their councillors or members of that village elected to the council and be represented in the manner they are in Sherwood Park.

Mr. Speaker, an interesting thing we should also consider — and I look at the bill the Member for Stony Plain presented a while ago — is fire protection in rural Alberta. When you reach into the IDs in northern Alberta — not just mine, but in the Peace River country, throughout all of northern Alberta — they all want fire protection. Of course the cost of a fire truck is anywhere from \$60,000 to \$100,000; the fire hall, the heat, the utilities to keep that equipment ready for winter service. Unless we as a government provide additional funding in a major way for some of these things we talk about and I have mentioned today, a hamlet can't make it, a village couldn't make it, and even a town of 600 or 700 people is finding it difficult to get along.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak for a moment on representation on rural municipal councils. I think I could support that aspect of the resolution, even for villages. It seems that even under the county system the villages are a separate body, don't have any jurisdiction in county affairs, and vice versa. It might not be a bad idea to incorporate some liaison in a meaningful way, have a representative or member of the village council sit on the MD, county, or ID council. I think the intricate part of both governments is similar. The funding is of course somewhat different. When we look at such programs as street improvement, recreation funding . . . In an ID, they sort of incorporate all the recreation funds toward one location and try to set up an arena, swimming pool, a larger school, or some facilities at a school, and this of course is funded from the ID at large.

Without that type of organization and funding, and if they were to become a village, there is just no way, as I mentioned before, that they could even pay the light bill to keep the facility open, let alone try to operate it. They couldn't pay the debenture on it. So the program in this resolution is somewhat a mixed bag, I would say. We could support one or two parts, with some additions, and one or two parts of the resolution would be unacceptable even to greater populated areas such as villages.

Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come in all hamlets, especially in the ID areas, that we look at our tax base. It just doesn't seem fair. When people ask for more services, rightly so they should receive them. I'd like to give you an example of 22 mills taxation in an ID. In a county 2 miles across the boundary the mill rate is 100 mills. Yet the services seem to be equal in both the county and the ID. I think we have to reach a better compromise of mill rates. I do not suggest for a moment that we should increase the mill rates in the IDs to 100 mills. I can't see how we could reduce the mill rates in the coun-

ties and villages to, say, 20 mills. But we should arrive at a happy medium. The revenues of an ID are going more and more to services in the hamlets — such as lighting, streets, sidewalks, curbs, water and sewer — and less and less is being spent for the purpose it should; that is, roads in the ID.

In the three IDs I represent, Mr. Speaker, just to give you an example of road construction that's necessary — and it's necessary because the rural areas of Alberta, especially in my area, are booming, expanding; more and more people are moving in. Every year when we go to our meetings we have a roads budget of \$1.2 million, and we have a request for \$40 million from each ID. So right now in the IDs in the province of Alberta we're running about 12 to 15 years behind in road construction. That just gives you an example of what's going on out there. I see some members shaking their heads, of course. I guess they'll have to come out to rural Alberta and look around. It's a serious thing.

Last fall I went to road meetings. As we sat through our meetings we discussed all our hamlets. They want a light bulb or two. It's just about impossible to justify giving them a street light, because when you take the budget of the whole ID, and it's a vast area, you don't have the funds. You say to the people, okay, let's raise the taxes. So two or three people who complain to you say, look, we have no quarrel with that; increase the taxation. But we've seen it happen in an ID. The assessment went up, and what did we get? A flood of letters saying there was just no way they could accept assessment which was tripling or maybe a little more than that.

When we have farmland that's assessed at \$250 a quarter, it's just unreasonable. Yet the people are not willing to accept just a little more. We have farmland, one quarter section in my ID, assessed at \$250. That's pretty low. Yet when that gentleman or that lady wants a road and it's 4 miles away from another road, and you have to build this road at \$60,000 to \$70,000 to \$80,000 a mile, and they write you a letter and say, we paid taxes on that land for 40 years — and rightfully so; they should have a road, because we're living in Alberta, a pretty good province. But when you look at the taxation they've paid, and it amounts to \$12.50 to \$20 a year; I've had lots of cases of that. I'm just giving you an example. I'm not trying to say these people aren't justified in asking, because they are. We should reciprocate if we can, but under this structure there's just no way we can.

So when we say we should move hamlets into villages, it wouldn't last for two council meetings. They'd say, let us back into the ID; at least we had some help there from the government or the minister. Because once you're tied into a village and you're strictly working on your own assessment, your own tax base, I think we'd have just about every hamlet in Alberta revert. If we took a plebiscite today, I'm sure we'd have a number of villages . . . I know of two or three villages which are having annexation; they're bringing in a quarter section and want to develop 100 to 150 lots. It's just about impossible. They can't do it on their own funding, on their own tax base. No way. They have to ask for government funding.

So if the government's going to get involved, let's get involved in a major way. Let's sit with them and bring some real good policy that would incorporate more working relationships with villages and the IDs,

the villages and the Department of Municipal Affairs, because that's where it starts. In that way we could really move in a major way.

Sure, 10 years ago, or even seven years ago when I was first elected, our IDs were pretty dormant. We didn't need too many roads. We were ahead. As a matter of fact, at one time our foreman told me he had all the roads built and money left over. Seven short years ago that was happening in rural Alberta. Today, as I mentioned, I could take the whole highway budget the hon. minister has, \$200 million of capital works, and spend that in my constituency very easily and not have everything done.

AN HON. MEMBER: Don't get any ideas.

MR. TRYNCHY: That's just some facts, Mr. Speaker, that I'd like to relate to some members who aren't aware of what's going on out there.

MR. DIACHUK: But then you couldn't get across Edmonton.

MR. GHITTER: It would be cheaper to buy them all airplanes.

MR. TRYNCHY: Yes, and probably hire the Member for Calgary Buffalo to fly them.

AN HON. MEMBER: He couldn't pass the exam.

MR. TRYNCHY: It's a good resolution. I think there's just so much in there that we'd have to look at. The Minister of Municipal Affairs is groping with the problem. I know he's heard from me on a number of occasions. I say we need more funds. The ID trust is gone in a matter of a few hours. We need more oiling money, more gravel funds, more construction funds. There just seems to be nowhere to get it. I would suggest that all of northern Alberta, every ID, should be brought into the department, and we should sit down with them and incorporate a tax that is fair. There's just no way we can live with a 22 mill tax in the IDs when they should be somewhat more. Sure, it's nice not to pay any taxes or very little, but you can't expect roads, power, school buses, and all those things when your taxation is that low.

I guess the message I want to leave is: the sooner we as Albertans and as rural Albertans realize that what we receive we must pay for, I think we'll go a long way.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I just want to compliment the Member for Macleod for putting this resolution on the Order Paper. I think there's so much more that can be said, and I look forward to the members from the other IDs or rural Alberta, or the member from Sherwood Park telling us how great it is to have a hamlet. I don't think we should be too concerned about how quickly we could move the hamlets to village status. We should be concerned about how to make the hamlets number one and other government bodies such as village and town councils work just a little better.

Thank you.

MR. ZANDER: Mr. Speaker, if the rural members could only understand the part of the problem that

lies in the IDs and what lies in some of the counties, I think they'd be very much surprised . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Rural members?

MR. ZANDER: Urban members, I'm sorry.

It's easy for an urban member to explain to his constituent that he should go to the town council. When you're in an ID, they send you to the MLA. And that's the other part of it.

The resolution itself: you could argue the points both ways, Mr. Speaker. I think there are probably a half dozen reasons for and against that resolution. But I think the hon. Member for Whitecourt has pointed out some of the facts that lie within that motion that should be brought forward. Of course one is that in most hamlets, and I'll also include the village, the tax base is not sufficient. Most hamlets comprise somewhere between 50 and 300 people. The assessment on the tax base is somewhere between \$50,000 and \$150,000.

Let's look at the assessment. Suppose there was a hamlet within a county, and I have a number of them. Based on a mill rate of 96, there is no way a hamlet could possibly exist with a tax base on a municipal mill rate of 54 mills. It would have about \$5,400 to spend. Let's look at the budget expenditure for such a hamlet if it did go on its own. For a part-time secretary we would be looking at at least \$6,000; an office or some arrangement of an office with utilities connected to it would be about \$7,000; street lighting; snowplowing; the total operating costs would be \$14,000 in municipal expenditures. Then the obligation they must face as far as the school foundation and the supplementary mill rate are concerned also amounts to 54 mills. We find that in order to exist a hamlet would have to have a rate of about 130 mills. So it can't operate within the budget its tax base allows. As the hon. Member for Whitecourt has mentioned, not all people in hamlets are as fortunate as the Sherwood Park area, which I understand has a population of over 30,000 but enjoys the tax base of the county it is situated in. It would not want to leave under any conditions, because it enjoys the industrial tax base.

One could argue that we should go on a province-wide sharing of the industrial taxes within the province. This has been suggested by the former government. But let us not forget that what we classify as industrial assessment must be equally applied to the rural people and to the cities. Mr. Speaker, if Sherwood Park found that it lost its autonomy by not having . . . They have only two I understand, but if they had three on council, if they suggested only that, if a vote were taken in that hamlet, I believe it would ask that it remain where it is. I'm saying that under the present conditions it is a disaster to allow a hamlet to gain the status of a village.

In 1969, Mr. Speaker, a village reverted to the status of a hamlet because it could not pay the debenture borrowings on its sewer. There was a \$300,000 installation of sewers, and they found themselves unable to cope with the payments. It then reverted to a hamlet, and the hamlet enjoyed the industrial assessment surrounding it. Government assistance, grants for streets, sidewalks, sewer, huge grants over and above what anybody else receives per capita in the province might make it feasible. But at

this time I don't think we should ask that they be put in a position just because they want autonomy. Autonomy is something everybody wants, but with autonomy goes responsibility, financial responsibility. I'm sure that within my constituency not one hamlet would want to go to village status, because most of them can understand that their house is very cozy and warm, therefore let's not shake the balance just because they want representation on school committees or municipal councils.

Perhaps a way could be devised, Mr. Speaker, where a village or hamlet by virtue of its population could elect both an urban and a rural member. This has happened in the past. But now, under The County Act, the members of the school committee cannot exceed the number of the county council. Consequently, if you have a county council of seven people, you can't have more than seven members on the school committee. Therefore if autonomy wants to be achieved, it could not be achieved because there are more towns and more villages than there would be members that could be accommodated on the municipal council. One must understand too that if we were to change the act and make it possible, the only funding within reason would have to be by way of huge government grants.

The hon. Member for Whitecourt has also mentioned the difference in assessments between IDs and counties. It's understandable, and I don't know the reason why, because you can have one parcel of farmland on one side of the river that's in an ID of equal quality as on the other side. One quarter section on the ID side is probably assessed at from \$450 to \$1,000 or maybe \$1,500, whereas inside the county it's assessed at \$4,000 or \$5,000.

You can't have services without taxes. It's quite understandable. You can't have the cake and still eat it. It isn't possible. I think we will have to bring the assessment up to par in some way. There should be no difference between the quality of the land on one side of the river and on the other side, which is an ID, and both parcels of land could and should be assessed on the same basis. Mr. Speaker, we can assess a house in the city of Calgary according to our assessment manual. If the same house were located in the city of Edmonton, it would normally have the same assessment, within \$1,000. And if it were in Lethbridge, it would still be the same. Why can we not equalize the assessment or bring assessments in an ID up to par with a municipality or a county?

I know the hon. Member for Whitecourt has mentioned that some of those quarter sections are only paying \$22, and one could not expect much service for that. But I think the benefits derived from the IDs that pass on to the general treasury of this province have to be recognized. Maybe we should go that route. If certain people qualify for certain grants, then if you're going to take something, you must give something back.

I know my time is up, Mr. Speaker. I would suggest that before we proceed with that motion — it hasn't gone all the way, as the hon. member said — there should be an amendment to take in other parts that are not now in the motion. Therefore I cannot support the motion the way it is.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express a few words on behalf of the hamlets and to take part in the debate which the hon. Member for Macleod has properly put forward. In doing so, I think he has recognized a very important problem that hamlets across the province are experiencing, specifically the difficulty the hamlets in his own jurisdiction are having, generally within the outline of the comments the other speakers have touched on. I want to add to those points made, to perhaps give some general overview as to my feeling with respect to the question, and to touch somewhat on some of the elements which could be considered, weighing the comments of the various speakers, in terms of future policy or future direction of the government with respect to some of the amendments or assistance which could be given to a hamlet or other forms of small villages.

In terms of statistics, Mr. Speaker, as hon. members have indicated we do have a substantial number of hamlets throughout the province of Alberta. The number escapes me, but I think you can understand the difficulty in determining the number. As the hon. Member for Macleod indicated, a hamlet is a very loose form, which is not very specifically defined. As I understand the legal definition of a hamlet, if you had three or four houses together in any one quarter section I suppose you could in fact have a hamlet.

I guess this is the smallest urban form we have in Alberta. Looking at the definition in the dictionary, I found that it really dates back to an old English definition which indicated that this was a small village which did not have a church. So in fact it was one which was not a centre of activity, as a church was a very important part of the activity in most of the ancient European countries. The villages, which is the next step the hon. member is referring to, including summer villages, are perhaps just as much a difficulty as the hamlets.

Let me move to some of the quick comments I have, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Member for Whitecourt indicated that in the IDs we have taken a very important posture with respect to assistance to the hamlets. We now have in front of us four different hamlets under construction. We will continue to provide a major amount of assistance to the hamlets in the ID. But as the member properly pointed out, the cost on the frontage per lot is tremendous. And if you add to that the user fee, the costs for sewer and water systems become prohibitive.

Let me also add, Mr. Speaker, that we have under way sewer and water systems for about 13 or 14 hamlets within the IDs. We hope we can complete them within the next planning period. On the point itself, I have no difficulty with the general recommendation of the resolution, finding no difficulty at all with the criteria moving from 50 to some other smaller amount. But I think it should rest with the hamlets themselves to determine whether or not they want to go to some higher urban form.

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

MR. PURDY: On a point of order, I think that is not a designated motion today, so we can go until 4:30. We have only one hour left in private bills.

MR. SPEAKER: If the member would like to refer to the temporary portion of Standing Order 8(3)(e), "Debate on Motions other than Government Motions shall not continue for more than one hour." That debate has now gone on for one hour.

head: **PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS
OTHER THAN
GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS
(Second Reading)**

**Bill 214
The Small Business Act**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move Bill 214, first of all I'd like to summarize the objectives. The first objective would be to require the minister to establish programs to assist a small business in obtaining government contracts. The target figure suggested would be 40 per cent of government contracts for small business in Alberta.

The second major provision in the act would encourage the breaking up of large contracts where this is feasible — I say "encourage" deliberately rather than a mandatory provision — so that the larger contracts would be of a more manageable size for smaller businesses, and thus would allow smaller concerns to bid on contracts.

The third would be to establish an obligation on the part of the minister and the government to assist small business not only with counselling, as we have at the present time through the Department of Business Development and Tourism — to step that up — but to add grants where appropriate, and some changes in the loan system that I'm coming to in a few moments.

The fourth provision of the act would be to establish a select committee of the Legislature on small business that would have the obligation of reviewing the government's approach to small business in this province.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the place to begin any discussion of this kind of proposed legislation is to ask ourselves: is it necessary to single out a small business for this type of legislation? I should point out that similar bills are being submitted in other Legislatures in the country. I would say it is necessary, particularly in the province of Alberta where, in my judgment anyway, the emphasis of the last few years quite frankly has been on large business enterprises. The government members will dispute this, but so be it. That's why we're going to have a debate.

I think it's fair to say the small businessman has had short shrift. I look, for example, at \$100 million we loaned to Gulf through the heritage trust fund at 8.125 per cent; \$100 million to Cities Service at 8.375 per cent. Yet, Mr. Speaker, when I look at the AOC rates I find 9.25 per cent. It's fair to say it will go down to 8.25 in the smaller centres, but in the urban centres it's 10.25. So we have the irony of a small businessman in our urban centre attempting to obtain loans from the AOC and having to pay a substantially higher interest rate than two of the largest oil companies in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I think the question of the size of contracts is quite important. Yesterday in Public Accounts we had a brief discussion on the size of

contracts allocated by AGT. Various representatives from AGT were here before the Public Accounts Committee. They really didn't get a chance to answer the questions posed, because the minister got up and said that as far as he was concerned there are economies of scale. I suppose from time to time the question of the scale of the contract is relevant, and this bill doesn't say that in every specific instance we should break down the contract into smaller components. But the bill does place the emphasis on doing that where it is possible and practical.

We talk about diversifying Alberta's economy. Quite frankly, one of the things we should be looking at is an electronics industry. How are you going to have an electronics industry if one of the major purchasers in the province sets out a tendering procedure on which only the large firms, the ITTs, are able to bid? Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, if we're going to develop an indigenous local business sector in this area, we have to be prepared, where it's feasible and practical, to take tendering policies on the part of the government, break them down into smaller components. That isn't always going to be possible. But where it is, the emphasis should be placed on trying to achieve that goal.

Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of case studies I wanted to bring to the attention of the Assembly in discussing the bill before the House this afternoon. They deal with smaller Canadian companies bidding against larger firms. For example, we have the case of Stenocord Systems Alberta Ltd. concerning the rejection of their bid to provide a sound-recording system for the Alberta provincial court system. The contract was finally won by Gyyr Products, a larger firm. The difference between the bid of Stenocord and Gyyr Products was \$600,000 and \$336,000. One was a small, Alberta-based company, the other wasn't. But without getting into the details of this particular instance, the point I want to leave is that when one looked at the specifications of the tender, it was fairly clear that the specifications were set out in such a way that the smaller firm couldn't feasibly bid on the project, to have a reasonable crack at getting it.

I have another example, again of a small Alberta firm: Frederick McKay Aviation were bidding on the question of supplying the Alberta government with a Cessna 337 Skymaster aircraft. This company made a proposal but wasn't able to follow it through. Again without going through the correspondence in some detail, their feeling was that they lost the bid because they didn't have the personnel to continue to — I shouldn't say lobby, but at least press their case with the relevant civil servants. The net result was that the bid went to an American company at approximately \$3,000 more to supply the same aircraft to the Alberta government, and it could have been supplied by an Alberta-based company.

Mr. Speaker, I don't cite those cases to make cases in themselves, but to illustrate the broader point. It seems to me there should be a very deliberate effort on the part of the provincial government to tailor their tendering policies to make it possible for smaller Alberta concerns to compete. Sometimes that's going to require breaking up a major contract into smaller components; sometimes it's going to require taking a closer look at the type of specifications we're demanding, to ask whether we really need specifica-

tions, whether we're talking about — I use this term because Tories are always using it when it comes to social services — Cadillac services, or whether we can get by with Chevrolet services which are supplied by local contractors. Sometimes it may require providing assistance, so small businessmen can make their way through the maze of bureaucracy that tends to exist and, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the efforts of my friends across the way, exists in good old free enterprise Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say quite frankly that I think our emphasis should be placed on expanding the role of small business in the Alberta economy. There's little doubt that the small-business sector is an important employer, approximately one-third of the labor force. Small business tends to be labor intensive as opposed to capital intensive. By and large the profits that are made stay within the country, rather than being sent out in one way or another. The arguments in favor of the small-business sector, put very eloquently by people like John Bulloch and others, have been made elsewhere and have been made in this House before, but I think it's important to underscore some of them today.

Mr. Speaker, I raise the issue because I think it would be a mistake for members of the Assembly to be rather carefree and say, everything is great in this province; we've got all sorts of major projects on the horizon and the opportunities for small business are going to be so great. There is no doubt we're going to see a substantial capital boom in this province. If the Alaska Highway project goes ahead, the Cold Lake project, a third oil sands plant at Fort McMurray: all these projects will have a rather substantial impact on the economy.

But as Mr. Bulloch from the Canadian Federation of Independent Business points out, that impact is not necessarily going to be good for the small-business sector. It may be all right for the businesses right in the locality that on a short-term basis can gear up and supply goods and services. But for the small businessmen in the rest of the province, we find that with capital booms the cost of labor goes up, the price of materials goes up, the price of transportation rises, and frequently the businessman trying to operate in Fairview, Grande Prairie, Ponoka, Wetaskiwin, or wherever it may be, finds very little benefit from the boom in Cold Lake or in Fort McMurray. Indeed some of the after-effects of the boom, some of the ripples, increase the cost to that individual businessman.

That's the submission of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business. Quite frankly it's also the submission of this government. I'm sorry the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower isn't in his place today. When he was the Minister of Labour, his department commissioned a study called The Management of Growth. It looked at the staging of capital expenditures by the private and public sector in the province. One of the conclusions the management of growth document reached was that if we have massive capital booms, or major capital expansion, the people who are most likely to be the first casualties would be the smaller businessmen, not in the immediate areas, but the smaller businessmen 200 or 300 miles away who have to pay the costs of the boom but don't have an opportunity to share in the immediate benefits.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that when it comes to

any boom situation there are short-term advantages. No one would deny that. But all one has to do is look at some of the great projects that have been constructed and look at the little communities after the construction has been completed. All one has to do is look at Hudson Hope. It's looking a little better now because they're building another dam. But before the dam was built, here was a town of 1,000 people that 10 years ago was buoyant. There were all sorts of shops on the main street, but five years ago there was one store left open and an almost deserted main street, because the capital boom had come and gone. With it had come the business opportunities. It's fine for the people who are able to sort of get in, make their money, and quickly get out. But our long-term public policy for small business in this province surely should not be the "get rich quick": to take advantage of the temporary boom and then bye-bye, it's up to the next person who comes in to have to close the doors.

Mr. Speaker, the long-term objective of a clearly thought out program to assist the small-business sector is — and I underscore — probably even more important in a province like Alberta where we have major capital booms than would be the case in other parts of the country.

What are some of the things that can be done to assist the small-business sector? In this particular bill we have the commitment to set aside a target for government business. That's one thing we can do. Another thing we can do is look at reducing the corporate tax rate on small business. Other provinces have moved in this regard. There's been a 2 per cent reduction in the province of British Columbia, a 1 per cent reduction in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I remember sitting in my place in that corner over there in 1974, and with great fanfare the hon. Premier stood up, all the television cameras were whirling, there were banner headlines in every daily paper in the province, and the government indicated they were going to come in with a brand spanking new business taxation and incentive program. It was really impressive. Everybody was indeed impressed. After the Premier caught the headlines and the committees started working on it, we had continual promises being made on this matter. Then, by George, on January 29, 1975 — this was during the period when we had a goody a day announced in that three-week session before the Legislature was dissolved. We had one ministerial announcement after the other. On January 29, the hon. Provincial Treasurer at that time, Mr. Miniely, rose in his place and tabled the objectives and the terms of reference for the Alberta business taxation and incentive program.

Mr. Speaker, the sad commentary is that, just like most royal commission reports, this position paper is gathering dust and there hasn't been any significant follow-up. The goodies were won, the small businessmen were intrigued; they all dutifully trotted off and voted Tory; and then after the election was over and the hon. members were re-elected, unfortunately the position paper was left. Now they're going to have 'Stomp Around Alberta' as the alternative.

Mr. Speaker, I think quite frankly that most small businessmen would be more in favor of some of the objectives contained in this position paper that have not been acted upon as yet.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Stomp around with the Alberta film and caps.

MR. NOTLEY: That's right — brought in from what part of the United States at the Tory convention?

Mr. Speaker, in any event the fact is that promises were made that have not been followed up. Other provinces are moving with much more co-ordinated programs to assist small business than we are. I mentioned the tax reduction in British Columbia and Saskatchewan; some of the other programs the province of Saskatchewan has initially undertaken designed to foster small business in that province. I could go down to half a dozen different programs. But in the case of business in communities of less than 6,000 population, there is a reduction in the interest rate of any money loaned by the government of 4 percentage points. That's a substantially more generous arrangement to get business under way than anything we have from the AOC at this stage of the game.

So, Mr. Speaker, there are things that can be done, and I submit to the government in concluding my remarks and inviting other members of the Assembly to participate in this discussion — I hope we have enough time so the matter can come to a vote — that it really isn't good enough to put all our eggs in the basket of large projects. I know that they capture the headlines and they excite people; no question about that. You get an announcement of a Syncrude project or a Cold Lake project and the initial impact is very striking. But the long-term future of the province, Mr. Speaker, is going to be written much more in the way we deal with the less striking project; the project that will involve smaller operations; that will involve that sector of the economy that may never be big enough in itself, project by project, to get on the front page of the *Edmonton Journal*, but countless hundreds and thousands of small business enterprises, particularly related more to the renewable resource sector. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment that kind of approach will yield much better long-term benefits to the people of this province than concentrating our time and effort on the major projects.

In concluding my remarks in this debate, I say to the members of the Assembly that with the Alberta heritage trust fund we have indeed a tremendous opportunity to come up with some imaginative programs — not programs that are simply going to put in place uncompetitive businesses, but programs, along with some of the changes I am suggesting in this bill, that will make it possible for the Alberta-owned small-business sector to grow and become stronger.

MR. ASHTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make it clear from the outset that I agree with the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. I too am in favor of small business. I'm also in favor of motherhood. I'm in favor of lower taxes, higher incomes, a house for everybody.

But I think we then have to look at the bill. We both agree that the title is a good objective: The Small Business Act. But, Mr. Speaker, I am against redundant legislation. Because of my occupation I deal with legislation from day to day, and I think there is a great amount of concern amongst the public, and a resistance to any legislature passing legislation that is redundant. If the hon. members in the Legislature

have read the bill, and I hope they do — I realize they may not read all the bills introduced by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, but I suggest they do read this — I think they'll find in there a litany of all the programs the government is now undertaking. Anything that happens to be in the bill that the government is not already doing is probably not justified in being done. So on that basis, the bill is about six years too late.

Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to stand here and take the time of the House to enumerate all the government programs, because I'm sure all the members are fully familiar with all of those.

AN HON. MEMBER: Take a half hour anyway.

MR. ASHTON: I'm sure Mr. Speaker will be speaking later, and will list all the government programs he's familiar with.

In responding to a couple of the comments made by the member who introduced the bill, I suppose I'm shocked, astounded, and very much offended by his implication that in the Stenocord situation the contract was somehow designed against the other small companies and in favor of Stenocord. I think that's the kind of charge which is certainly unbecoming in this Legislature. What is even worse, when he referred to the other situation where one particular Alberta-based company couldn't afford to lobby the relevant civil servants — I think that's a fairly accurate quote, Mr. Speaker — I just suggest to the hon. member that he step outside the Legislature and make that kind of charge. That's certainly an affront to every civil servant in this province, and I suggest he reconsider his comments.

He did indicate that from time to time he had been reading some of the government statements on business taxation. I'm pleased he paid so much attention to it. I'm also interested in his comments on the heritage trust fund. But I think we can't forget that if the hon. leader of the NDP, the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, was ever the government in this province, we would never have had the Alberta heritage savings trust fund. He would have blown it long before now, so there would be nothing there to help the small businessman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. ASHTON: The hon. member mocks, Mr. Speaker, but I think he realizes I'm closer to the truth than he feels comfortable with.

I suppose some people would suggest that I as a member really am not qualified to speak on small business in some respects. Perhaps I should point out that I have run a small legal office for a number of years, and my wife and six children own and operate a jeans store. Maybe I'm not that well experienced in the area of small business, but compared to the member who introduced the bill, who I understand has never been gainfully employed in the private sector, I probably could be considered to be an expert.

AN HON. MEMBER: Very good, John.

MR. ASHTON: On that basis I would suggest that the bill is misnamed, in that it refers to The Small Business Act. Of course, that is misleading — I'm

sure not intentionally — but it should be because it deals only with certain sectors of small business, primarily those dealing with the provincial government, government purchases, and so on. Therefore, maybe it should be called the Some Small Business Act, the Government Purchases Act, or Government Small Business Act. So it is misleading. If by circulating a bill with that name on the front of it he is in any way trying to suggest it does something for small businesses generally, I would say that's not accurate. It certainly wouldn't help my wife's jeans store. I don't notice the government buying too many blue jeans or T-shirts, so it wouldn't help her at all.

I'm rather intrigued and sort of entertained by the hon. member's newfound interest in small business. I suppose he's begun to realize, and I commend him for this, that there aren't too many of the type of people he's usually appealing to in this province. And he understands there has been some rather dramatic growth in small business in this province in the last number of years. Of course it suddenly occurred to him that, by gosh, the small businessmen have a very strong political influence. So he introduces The Small Business Act. But I suggest they are not that naive to be taken in by that rhetoric at this time.

When I read the bill I looked at it and thought, well, from my past experience the hon. member doesn't usually have too many original ideas, so he obviously picked up the bill from some other province. Obviously he must have gotten it from, say, Saskatchewan, or perhaps the former socialist government in British Columbia had introduced such a bill, or perhaps the former NDP government in Manitoba had brought in such a bill. I could be corrected, but after some rather thorough research we found none of the other NDP governments that have ever existed in this country introduced such a bill. So I suppose we can indicate that the member is rather unique, and perhaps he did create the idea himself.

But then I went a little further, Mr. Speaker, and it was discovered that an almost identical bill was introduced in the Ontario Legislature as a private member's bill by a Liberal MLA. Now we've of course seen all sorts of examples of the alliance between the Social Credit Party and the NDP in this province, but now they've extended their alliance to include the Liberal. [interjections] Perhaps there have been some conversations between the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview and the leader of the Liberal Party in this province, who we see lurking about the galleries from time to time. That's good, because I'm sure he can use the extra input.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that the best favor we can do for small business in this province is to continue the approach we have taken for the last number of years; that is, to develop and encourage an increased intensity in our free-enterprise economy, because all businesses benefit. The opportunities are there, not only for big business but for small business. The number and size of small businesses is increasing at a rapid rate. Again, speaking from my own experience and the experience my family has in running a small business, I think that rather than introducing bills which involve more interference in the private-enterprise economy, we should have even fewer bills like this. I would suggest that if the hon. member wants to do something constructive, he might go back through the statutes of Alberta and

consider which of those we might repeal to assist small business.

As an example of what is happening in this province, I was aware there were some increases, but I wasn't aware of the rather staggering increases. As an example, the statistics are, with regard to the number of Alberta companies incorporated in this province — and of course that's a pretty good indicator as to the number of small businesses that are starting. In 1970, 3,172 Alberta companies were incorporated. In 1977, 13,575 new companies were incorporated. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of record that really makes a mockery of an attempt by the NDP to bring in a bill like this. I suppose they're trying to encourage an alliance with the chamber of commerce or something, I'm not sure. But I don't think it'll work.

In that same year, 1977, 885 extraprovincial companies were registered in this province. They're coming from provinces like British Columbia, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba. That's what's happening. Compare that, Mr. Speaker, to what happened in Manitoba in 1977. Now the latter part of that year they were replaced by a free-enterprise government. Although conceding that the population of Manitoba is only about half of Alberta's in that year, there were only 2,675 incorporations compared to our 13,575. There were only 133 extraprovincial registrations in Manitoba in 1976; in Alberta there were 885.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my comments on the bill, I reaffirm my own position, and I believe the position of every free-enterprise member of the Assembly, that we do everything reasonable to encourage small business. But they don't want subsidies or special considerations; they just want a fair shake at it. This bill does not do that. It doesn't purport to do it, and although I agree with some of the comments made by the hon. member during his debate, he wasn't talking about the bill at all. I would suggest he read his own bill. Perhaps his researcher put it together and he forgot to read it.

That's all I have to say, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview revert to introduction of special guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS** (reversion)

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now that I have the hon. members sufficiently exercised that we can have a good debate, I'd like to introduce four people in the public gallery. They are not from the small-business sector, but they are actively involved in the farm sector. Jean Lehy is the women's president of the National Farmers Union of Canada. I wonder if she would stand and be recognized by the members of the House. Doris Jeanotte is the regional director of the National Farmers Union in the Peace River block of British Columbia. They are accompanied by Joe Grendys and Harry Rienders.

head: **PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS
OTHER THAN
GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**
(Second Reading)

Bill 214
The Small Business Act
(continued)

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I thought for a minute we weren't going to continue with the bill when you recognized the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, but I want to take my few licks at this legislation. Being a small businessman, I want to say that I share with many businessmen in this province that the less legislation, the better off small business is. You can kill small business with too much kindness, particularly with government legislation.

The target, as the mover indicated, is to have some 40 per cent of government contracts to small businesses. I can see the same member rising and questioning a minister of our government why the portfolio responsible for allocating and looking after the tendering has risen maybe by 100 per cent in staff. You know, this would be fine. Some of these approaches the mover has made would definitely provide employment, because we would have to have that many more civil servants to administer this. Maybe it is the objective of the Member for Spirit River-Fairview to create more positions for civil servants, but I really hope it isn't.

The suggestion to establish a select committee to review government obligation to small business would be a good exercise. However, our government has had several reports placed here. The example used by the Member for Edmonton Ottewell of the growth of small businesses in this province indicates that small businesses are doing well and are thriving under the Conservative government.

It is interesting to listen to the mover, as reflected with no experience in business, again prepared to tap the heritage savings trust fund to provide some imagination for the small-business community. I can't really believe, and I'm not really shocked, but I can expect that from the NDP member. However, what troubles me is how differently a member of the NDP can speak in this province when some of his colleagues in the neighboring province of British Columbia, when in government, did just the opposite. They took all the advertising, all the publicity the government of British Columbia was providing, and farmed it out to a giant corporate magnate from the province of Ontario who set up an office in Vancouver and took over this business. Now what happened there? The same philosophy, the same party . . . They practically took him from Wall Street. The man was doing so well there that they thought they'd take his advice. I'm not against taking somebody from Ontario and helping out British Columbia.

MR. NOTLEY: He was from Montreal.

MR. DIACHUK: Was he from Montreal? Well, even so much farther. Possibly that's what started the separatist movement, by taking the first businessman from Montreal to British Columbia by the then Barrett government.

It's interesting also that back in '71 — I reflect on

the comments made by a returning officer for one of the Edmonton constituencies where a candidate for an aldermanic election here who supports the same philosophy as the mover of the bill, the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, kept admitting that he forgot to put the label of the printer on his publicity. And off the cuff the admission was: well, I went to a small private printer because I got it cheaper; when I go to the union shop it costs me twice as much. Again, this is a member of the NDP who ran for the aldermanic position in Edmonton. It's interesting how differently these people of the same philosophy, the same party, can do business in these provinces.

We would really be way out if we tried to adopt this bill and force it on the business community. I like the example the hon. member used of Mr. Bulloch, but you know, he has a well-paid position, he is doing well for himself, and he's honestly not a small businessman; he's now an entrepreneur for an organization that has quite a voice, I admit. I read his publication and enjoy it. I don't necessarily agree with all his approaches and recommendations on small business in this nation. But to hope that small business would endorse this — I haven't had any correspondence from any constituents or businessmen in my constituency to support this small business act. I hope they don't, because it would shock me more than what I've heard here today. But I doubt that I would be overwhelmed, as we do get correspondence on some of the legislation we receive.

In closing, I would like to support the Member for Edmonton Ottewell in some of his references and his eloquent assessment, as a member trained in law, that this legislation is just not worth supporting. That is the way I intend to look at it. Mr. Speaker, as a small businessman in this province I don't need any more legislation. Neither will I be supporting this bill. I'm sure I'm not surprising the Member for Spirit River-Fairview with the fact that I don't intend to support it.

Thank you very much.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this bill is necessary, on the grounds that in Alberta the government is already doing much to stimulate the activity of small business. I believe the Alberta government is providing a significant support program for small business. As well, the statistics are readily available, and the hon. member who introduced this bill, the NDP member, has those statistics; he has a researcher and those statistics have undoubtedly been drawn out to show him that in fact this has been going on and that small business is doing well.

Mr. Speaker, small business does not want, and has not wanted, a handout. They don't expect anything extraordinary, traditionally or historically in Alberta. The hub of our economic society has been small business. Indeed, they merit support in our society, emotionally and socially, and they get that. I think any extraordinary support is unnecessary; this government has already provided the needed support to give them the necessary stimulus.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you some examples that this has in fact happened in Alberta. We refer to the Alberta Opportunity Company, which, hon. members will remember, was established to finance small business in Alberta and to provide loans where the usual financial institutions do not provide those

loans. In other words, the conventional loans are not provided because there is apparently a higher risk. So if they go to banks, treasury branches, and so forth and are refused, they may come to the Alberta Opportunity Company. This is an example where this government has taken up the challenge, where the risk is indeed a little higher. Yet we as a government established this particular program — not only for small business but the Agricultural Development Corporation for farm activity in a similar vein — because we recognized that the traditional financial institutions were not filling that gap.

Mr. Speaker, let me examine some of the elements regarding, for example, hotels and motels, and Alberta Opportunity Company financing in Alberta. They may charge, for example, 1 to 2 per cent less for a new business in a small town to help it get started. But in a larger community or for the expansion of an existing profitable operation, they keep their rates in line so as not to steal business from other motels, which is in line with the free-enterprise system.

Of course they provide the ability to repay over 15 to 20 years or 10 to 15 years and, as a matter of fact, discourage the 20-year payout, because they'll be paying more interest. After many explanations the small businesses recognize this, so in fact they're providing advice regarding financing and how this should be done.

Because of the risk and because many small businesses sometimes need the extra stimulus to get started . . . And believe me, once they get started they take off like a bullet. This has in fact been proven in Alberta. As a matter of fact, it's been proven right across Canada, with respect to small business, because that is where the economic activity really is. This of course shows very well in other countries like Japan.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Alberta Opportunity Company even gives postponements if they later encounter some difficulty with respect to their business. I think this is very significant, because a small businessman with a family business, or where he may be in business for the first time, may indeed encounter some difficulties, and have increased confidence. That confidence is reflected by the Alberta Opportunity Company, which is this government, our society helping these small-business people. Mr. Speaker, there is general across-the-board advice regarding construction, engineering, insurance, and so forth.

The availability of the Alberta Opportunity Company is widespread, to stimulate small business across the province. Just to remind hon. members where these offices are located, there are branches in Grande Prairie, Edson, Edmonton, St. Paul, Calgary, Lethbridge, and Medicine Hat, in addition of course to the head office in Ponoka. Besides all these branches, Mr. Speaker, the Alberta Opportunity Company don't just sit in their branch offices and wait for the business to come in, although maybe they should be doing that. They really are assuming the higher risk of small business, where other financial institutions have turned them down. They go out to other communities and advertise and inform the public in an open-governmental way that this opportunity is here. Many other small communities have benefited as a result.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the advice they give to small businesses, of course they also recommend

that the small business should not get a loan over 80 per cent of its development costs. Again, it's in a wise, economic frame of mind. To put it bluntly, they say, listen, you've got to take a risk anyway, but don't take a greater risk than you have to, because you may fold. So it's cautious, but it stimulates, helps, and assists, and it advertises that.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the program has been immensely, fantastically successful. Let's just take one month. I think hon. members of the Assembly will appreciate this: in March 1978 the AOC for the average small business has approximately \$40,000 to \$50,000 per loan. So it is truly the small business that the hon. member seems to be concerned about. Yet in the bill I see nothing that would assist them to any great degree.

The activity in loans in March 1978, Mr. Speaker, was the highest since the AOC came to reality in 1972. It's an 82 per cent increase in dollar loans over the same month in 1977, and 34 communities were involved: places like Fort Vermilion, Milk River, and Bear Canyon — I don't even know where it is; I apologize to the hon. member who represents Bear Canyon — places like Kitscoty, and I know where Kitscoty is.

MR. TRYNCHY: Bear Canyon is in your constituency.

DR. PAPROSKI: In my constituency, he says. I'd be really worried there, hon. member.

The question immediately asked, Mr. Speaker: what kinds of loans flow out to what kinds of businesses? One might get the impression that this is a big multinational corporation. And the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview knows very well that these are for small family businesses: general stores, millwork shops, the professional pilot who has one airplane and wants to spray crops or apply necessary pesticides and so forth, and support for his equipment for that airplane. These are the kinds of things, Mr. Speaker, that the Alberta Opportunity Company has been doing for small business. Maybe the members of the Assembly should be reminded that there is no other such program in Canada. We are the only province doing this. We can so quickly forget that in fact this is happening here for these businesses when we're so involved in our day to day activity.

Mr. Speaker, let me examine some other activity which demonstrates the activity and success in Alberta, and why this bill is not necessary. Small business is indeed very, very active. As of June 30, 1977, regarding industrial projects, the planned projects were 120, the value was \$6.45 billion, and the jobs created were 6,584. Under construction, another 92 projects with a total value of \$5.3 billion, creating 5,220 jobs. Opened in the past six months, another 52 projects with a value of \$0.524 billion — and I underline "billion dollars" — with a creation of 1,088 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, again the word is "fantastic" business activity. The small business is involved directly, indirectly, and prominently, and there is no shortage of activity for the small-business community. The total number of companies incorporated to do business in Alberta is now well over 75,000. The hon. member from the other side of the House alluded to that. Again, fantastic. Many of these are small businesses, coming in and doing a very good job.

Regarding corporations, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who spoke after the introduction of the bill indicated that there were only 3,000 companies incorporated in 1970, but in 1977 there were over 13,000 incorporated companies. A very important statistical fact that hon. members of the Assembly would appreciate, and I think the hon. NDP member should appreciate, is the business failure rate. In Alberta in 1976 there were 204 business failures, and in 1977, 122: a decrease of 40 per cent. Mr. Speaker, that is fantastic when the economy of Canada is where it is at this time. When we compare this to our neighboring provinces — and I won't go through all the provinces, Mr. Speaker, because I'll tell you the statistics are shocking.

First we'll take Canada: there was a 33.5 per cent increase in business failures, whereas during that same period in Saskatchewan there was a 96 per cent increase. And what government is in power there? As I suppose this hon. member gets his information from Saskatchewan, it really worries me when we're going to go in that direction.

Let's take Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, where the so-called NDP government has just left. I can see why they left, because during that same period of time the statistics show there was a 60 per cent increase in business failures also. [interjections] Sixty-six, somebody said. Well, it's 60.3 to be exact.

Mr. Speaker, these statistics are valuable to the hon. members, because when we analyse such a bill we have to ask ourselves, as one of the hon. members has already indicated, do we need more regulation to hamper the small business? I suggest not. If the hon. member would travel around this province and speak to some of the small businesses, I can assure him he would get that same remark.

Mr. Speaker, let me reveal some of the provincial corporate income tax rates in Alberta, relative to other provinces. Again it demonstrates that small businesses are stimulated and are relatively better off. And we're not even speaking of the lowest natural gas rates, the fact that those same businessmen are men and women out on the street and families who pay the lowest personal income tax as well as the lowest corporate income tax, no gasoline tax, and no sales tax. The general rate in Alberta is 11 per cent. In Manitoba it's 15 per cent. In Saskatchewan it's 14 per cent.

Another item, Mr. Speaker, regarding regional development. Regional development in this province has been stimulating activity in the smaller communities in a wide variety of ways. I suppose the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview may not recognize or may not even know. I don't know if he uses his research assistants effectively or not. But there is a regional development program in Alberta, and therefore small business is stimulated in that direction also. It has been in operation for some four years. There are some 10 regional offices in Medicine Hat, Lethbridge, Calgary, Lacombe, Camrose, St. Paul, Edmonton rural, Edson, Grande Prairie, and Peace River.

Mr. Speaker, there have been positive results from this type of program across Alberta. What is it doing? In a very cursory way — because I could speak on this particular program for half an hour, and unfortunately we're allocated only 20 minutes — it provides opportunities and incentives to Albertans to participate in

economic development of the province. It contributes to creating more and better jobs. It eliminates population and economic erosion in rural areas; statistics have shown that we've reversed that, as has been mentioned by many hon. members in this House. It helps communities up themselves in providing an improved social and economic life style. It works toward balanced economic growth. I can go on and on, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why don't you?

DR. PAPROSKI: You'd like that? Next time.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, a brief has been submitted to the federal government, the industrial sector in the multilateral trade negotiations, a brief jointly submitted to the government of Canada by the provinces of Alberta, British Columbia, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba. Surely this type of brief, worked on jointly by all western provinces, and I give them credit, is of great assistance regarding trade and industrial strategy, and is very, very important and very significant to every entrepreneur.

Why am I referring to this brief? Because every entrepreneur, whether he's small or large, should benefit by that kind of brief. It's available for review. Many small businesses already are contemplating some of the activity. When we think of Red Deer and the petrochemical activity there, and the spinoff of a 10:1 or 15:1 activity as a result, it's that kind of thing we're talking about, where small business can dovetail into the major type of activity. If the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview would only go to Red Deer and see the activity there, I suggest this bill would not be here today. He'd be embarrassed to bring it in. He'd blush, he'd quickly tear it up, and walk away.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion: the problem with the bill and the NDP mover is, of course, that he really hasn't done his homework and has run out of good ideas. He's grabbing at straws. He tries to make a case for small business when the case, as somebody mentioned already, has been made by this government since 1971. And it's not only been made, not only been documented, but actually has been acted on with vigor and intensity by the Progressive Conservative government. He knows that.

Mr. Speaker, we've just started; we haven't stopped. We recognize as a government that small business in our community — as the family, as the individual in the family — is the hub of our economy. The small business in Alberta is very healthy and viable, and I'm sure will remain that way as long as we keep our ideas flowing in that direction.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for not being in the House during the early part of the debate. I am delighted with an opportunity to contribute very briefly. First of all I'd like to say that most of you read the articles in the press just recently where the conference board suggested that the growth rate in Alberta would be something of the order of 4.5 to 5 per cent this year. That coincides with the statistics the Treasury and our department were able to come up with for the potential growth rate this year.

I think it's significant, and I'm not just sure whether it was mentioned, so I'm sure members will bear with me if I repeat some of the very interesting statistics

that my friend has given you. One that he may not have had an opportunity to say is that Alberta has 17 per cent of the investment during this last year, with only 8 per cent of the population. We are now almost 2 million in number and I think that's really significant. The petrochemical industry is reaching its peak this year, and you'll notice that the Provincial Treasurer put in his budget a 31 per cent increase in capital expenditure to keep the economy rolling. It's not in there for the purpose of overheating the economy. It's in there to level off the humps and make that flow of economic progression even, rather than making an up-and-down graph situation.

I'd like to mention just a few things that we undertake in our department. We obviously are most interested in expanding the economy into rural Alberta and making certain that every part of the province participates equally in this great time to be in Alberta and be a part of it.

There are about seven things in policy you might mention that we really believe firmly, and they've been mentioned since 1971.

First of all, maximum upgrading of resources in the province: we believe that for certain, because we just can't continue to ship the jobs down the pipeline to other parts of the country. I say again how very devastated we were as a government, and how the Alberta people should be really devastated with the development of the PetroCan industry in Sarnia — a real detriment to further advancement in Alberta, a very difficult thing to overcome.

Secondly, we believe most assuredly that we should expand the economy all over the 255,000 square miles of the province. Therefore we've taken a strong position that wherever possible there should be decentralization of government services. You will hear in a very few days of a further move in that direction, where the government has some influence of a research institute that will probably be located somewhere outside the major urban areas. That's not to take away from the urban areas; it's simply a method of suggesting there are alternatives in rural Alberta which offer exactly the same kind of advantages you will find in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary, and the major cities of Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, and Grande Prairie.

I should also say that over the period of the last six years — comparing it with the previous six years like 1966 to 1971 — from 1971 to 1977 there's been a complete turnaround in population growth. Their cities are still growing, but not at the fantastic rate they were growing during that initial period. There's been a slowdown of growth, but still a substantial growth in those major urban areas. But there has been a fantastic growth in rural Alberta: even the isolated communities are growing at the rate of 8 per cent, as opposed to a negative growth during that first period.

There are now approximately 40 identifiable communities in rural Alberta which have no substantial growth; they've stabilized, there's no growth. That's about 100 per cent turnaround from what it was in the previous six years. So things are moving, and not necessarily because of government policy and support alone, but primarily because the government has taken the time to move into rural Alberta and stimulate those few people in every community who are really involved, who want to see it move ahead —

economic development groups, branches of the chamber of commerce, that kind of thing — those are the people who make it move.

The prize example of that kind of thing is the Johns-Manville plant establishing in Innisfail. A very long procedure went into that. The Johns-Manville people came to Edmonton and said, we want to establish in Alberta. We said, that's a great idea. We have some alternatives to propose to you. What kind of facilities do you need? They listed the facilities: they needed water supply, ease of transportation, communication network, a labor force involving this number of people, et cetera. We suggested, here is where you might consider locating. We gave them the names of the communities, a rundown of the infrastructure in each of those communities — 10 different communities in central Alberta. One of those was Red Deer, another was Innisfail, others were Ponoka, Lacombe, and so on, because they wanted to be in that general area.

The entrepreneurs chose Innisfail of their own volition; they were not forced to go there. And the moment they showed some interest in Innisfail, along came the Innisfail town council, the Innisfail economic development committee, one man from our department, the Department of the Environment, the Department of Municipal Affairs, the Department of Utilities and Telephones, and Transportation. Every one of them pulled together, and Johns-Manville is now located in Innisfail doing a superior job, employing local people. The support industry that has developed as a result of that one little instance is just unbelievable. Just ask the hon. Member for Innisfail.

Mr. Speaker, that obviously involves an expansion on a school system, and more people employed there; expansion on a hospital perhaps, and more people employed; an expansion of a plumbing operation; a need for a further dentist, for additional people in the medical clinic; and so it goes. There's a tremendous spinoff benefit in new facilities being established.

AN HON. MEMBER: A new pharmacist?

MR. DOWLING: And maybe a new druggist, maybe a new pharmacist, or an additional one. There are so many things being undertaken by every part of our department.

Travel Alberta, for example, decided we should do something to stimulate a movement of people into the northeast part of the province. We went to see the people of Cold Lake air force base, and suggested we undertake jointly the promotion of an air show. What happened? Sixty-five thousand people moved into the Cold Lake area over an entire weekend. If every one of them ate a hamburger, that's 65,000 hamburgers. If every family bought five gallons of gas, just imagine what that did for those communities. This year that air show is in Medicine Hat, and next year it will probably be somewhere in northern Alberta.

MR. TRYNCHY: In Jasper?

MR. DOWLING: The airstrip at Jasper is not really large enough. As a matter of fact, that's something perhaps I should talk to you about sometime, Mr. Speaker.

We really believe most assuredly that government is there, our department is there as a supportive

mechanism. It is not regulatory in any sense. People will very quickly say, oh yes it is, you have the Opportunity Company. It is absolutely not regulatory. While I'm here, I don't want any part of it to be regulatory. That's for the other government departments. Ours is supportive. We believe firmly in the free-enterprise system. We believe the people who make things hum in Alberta are the free-enterprisers who are out there doing it for themselves, making an investment, gambling on going broke. Everybody should have that right too. They should have the right to go broke and the right to go into receivership. So we simply support them.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you know we have 10 regional offices over Alberta. That probably represents 12 or 15 per cent of the total staff complement in the Department of Business Development and Tourism. There are 10 offices located from northern Alberta all the way to southern Alberta: Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, Red Deer, Edmonton, Calgary, Edson, St. Paul, and so on.

Those people are not sitting in their offices shuffling paper. They're out visiting the communities that region represents. They're out asking them what kind of help they would like. They're forming economic development committees. They're doing it all by themselves, and they're not regulated. They're not regulated according to the times of day they can open their stores. They're not told: today's Sunday, you can't be open. They're told: it's your red wagon, go and do it, we'll support you. We support not just really small businesses like drugstores and so on. We support them all. If you can imagine it, a very small entrepreneur might be manufacturing little baskets for strawberries . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Blueberries.

MR. DOWLING: . . . blueberries, radishes. What do we in the department do? We take him to the States, to an area where they use all kinds of baskets. This fellow got a contract for several million baskets to be manufactured here in Alberta.

MR. JOHNSTON: That's assistance.

MR. DOWLING: That's the kind of service I think we should be offering. We didn't loan him the money. We didn't give him the money by way of grant, which may be suggested by some people as the way to move. But in my view that's not the way to move.

What is the department to do to assist Alberta companies interested in expanding outside Canada? We've had a number of involvements. We have been involved in a mission to Russia. That doesn't necessarily involve just the major companies. We had a mission to Aberdeen, Scotland; the London offshore show. Recently the new Minister of Housing and Public Works attended a show in the Far East for us and was very successful. As I indicated in the House, \$40 million worth of Alberta merchandise was sold there. As a result of the involvement in a trip to Russia, a contract was signed by an Alberta firm for a substantial number of millions of dollars of product coming from here. That has to be really, substantially good.

But, Mr. Speaker, there's no way we should ever get into a situation where we set aside small busi-

ness as a separate entity. It is not. It's so integrally involved with big business, it's a part of the whole package. Eighty-five per cent of business done in Canada is done by small business. That 15 per cent is the start; you have to have that 15 per cent in order to get the rest. That's why we're often accused of being a government interested only in major oil companies, petrochemical plants, and all this stuff. That is absolute nonsense. We are interested in those major entities because they are the ones that produce the others. The service industry employs the bulk of the people, it's not those major entities.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, we put out a policy statement. It's called A Statement of Policy on the Utilization of Alberta Design, Engineering, Construction, and Manufacturing Services. We believe very emphatically that we, as Canadians should have no preferential treatment. We believe that our entrepreneurs all across Canada should have an opportunity to bid on projects in Alberta, as Alberta entrepreneurs bid on them. We should also have the right to bid on those projects being undertaken in Quebec, the James Bay project, Ontario project, any project anywhere.

That's not really the situation that exists. We are now one of few. I think we are the only jurisdiction in all of Canada that has no preferential system. We still believe that's the right policy. And you should know that at the next premiers' conference that item will probably be brought up as a major item for consideration. All that preference does, if you say it's a 10 per cent preference for Alberta entrepreneurs . . . If I were a sharp businessman, I'd work the figures out, get my numbers together, and then add 10 per cent, because I'd be assured of that contract. If the guy is sharp, an Alberta entrepreneur can compete with anybody.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you are aware that we have held a number of seminars throughout Alberta. We had one in Taber early this year, April 1977. Since then, we've had a further one in Taber, one in Vegreville, and one at Olds.

Each of those was a seminar on economic development where we have one or two people from our department, highly skilled people who come from the private sector, to be there as resource personnel, to stimulate the local people to think for themselves and say, what are the resources we have here at our disposal? What can we do for ourselves? What do we need? Do we need a dentist? Do we need some manufacturing concern? Is our hospital in order? What do we need? We don't have a drugstore. They examine what is there. What is in the Olds area? What's in Drumheller? What do we need? They do this. They've been extremely successful. The hon. Leader of the Opposition himself complimented us on the excellence of the resource people we had, particularly those from our department.

We also hold small-business courses where we engage a firm — I'm not just sure of the firm's name at the moment, but these are experts in the field of management. Our department charges a \$20 fee for enrolment, which goes to the firm we engage. They enrol perhaps the management of 25 firms. These firms come together each evening for a matter of something like four or five weeks and discuss each individual business, or businesses in general, giving the outline of what could be done to upgrade the

skills of management. Then each of the entrepreneurs has an opportunity to be dealt with individually by this firm of experts.

Of those seminars or management schools that we've held — the first one was in Drumheller; we've had one in Edson and there have been three or four others — on the average there is a 95 per cent positive result. The 5 per cent results from people who don't need any help.

But you'd be surprised to know of the things required by the private-sector people. They need money, management, and market. Management is the one that's so often lacking. They can get money. You can always get money if you're willing to pay enough in interest rates. But management is the key. If you haven't got that management, you're taking the first step to failure.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to talk about a great number of things. I would like to continue the debate. I get the impression that there would not be anybody willing to speak any further on this resolution. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, the House will continue with estimates of the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife tonight.

I move we call it 5:30.

[Motion carried]

MR. SPEAKER: Do hon. members agree that when the members reconvene at 8 o'clock, they will be in Committee of Supply?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[The House recessed at 5:24 p.m. and resumed at 8 p.m.]

head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

head: **(Committee of Supply)**

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee of Supply will come to order.

Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife

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

MR. ADAIR: Thanks very much, Mr. Chairman. I think what I'll try to do is take a moment to go over some of the things that are happening in the department, then work from that particular point.

I really think that for the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife this probably is going to be one of

the more exciting years, because of a number of things. One, Mr. Chairman, is the Commonwealth Games. We've had a chance to tour the facilities. Of course they're coming up on August 3 to 12. I hope everyone in the Legislature will be participating, as well as a good number of the people of Alberta. Add to that the fact that the Queen and Prince Philip will be attending the Games, and visiting in Alberta. That is another reason we in the department are quite excited.

We are asking for approval to increase funding to provincial sport governing bodies and youth associations by some \$375,000, the program I announced yesterday.

And of course Alberta summer and winter games are alive and well in the province of Alberta. This past winter we saw Medicine Hat hosting a really exciting and successful Games. The chairman Don Skagen, managing director Max Gibb, and members of the council have announced that the '79 Summer Games are going to be held in the city of St. Albert and that the '80 Winter Games are set for the city of Grande Prairie. Interest is high in both the communities and the volunteers in all of the communities, and the participants who are looking forward to attending those games.

So I think we've come of age in that particular area, Mr. Chairman, and certainly with the assistance of the basic grant of \$150,000, plus the legacy grant of \$50,000 that is held for final payment until after all the bills have been paid. If there is a deficit, it covers that; if not, they use it for whatever facility development they may want in their community. For example in Red Deer they used it for their outdoor track; in Banff they used it for lighting in the arena and, I believe, curling rocks in their curling rink.

I think one of the areas where we seem to have some controversy at times is just exactly what and who is the leader in total recreation development funds in the country. Without any doubt Alberta is far and away ahead of all other provinces in total dollars spent. Going by the figures of last May, we had \$15.06 per capita, and the next closest to us was the province of Saskatchewan at \$13.88. If you move over just to facility development grants, we're almost double all the other provinces in Canada, at \$11.02 compared to the next closest, Newfoundland, at \$6.29.

Now certainly there are some areas where in total we are somewhat less. We're fourth in overall funding for the provincial recreation sport association and agency program assistance. Of course when you look at some of the figures, Mr. Chairman, it's interesting that Prince Edward Island, with a small sum of \$190,000, is second to Quebec; and Nova Scotia, with another small sum, is third. We're next in that total line, and that does not count the increase we have in place right now. So I guess I should point out that it is somewhat difficult at times to attempt to get more funds for recreation when you are in fact the per capita leader in the country.

Mr. Chairman, in the parks division this year expansion program work will take place in some 25 to 30 parks, with major construction plans set for Cypress Hills, Aspen Beach, Young's Point, Switzer Park, Cold Lake, plus of course the addition of the new parks at Midland Coal, Hilliards Bay, and the re-establishment of the park at Sylvan Lake. Added

to that, Fish Creek Park in Calgary, of course the opening of Capital City Park in Edmonton, and Kananaskis Country are going along quite well. So really a fair amount of activity is taking place in the province in the capital works division of the parks.

For the fish and wildlife area, the Brooks pheasant hatchery is ready to go. This year will see the first big year of pheasant production. We anticipate some 18,000 to 20,000 birds hatched, and day-old chicks distributed approximately fifty-fifty to the various organizations — upland birds, fish and game associations, 4-H clubs and others — the others being young adults for release in the fall. That's a marked increase, Mr. Chairman, over last year when we had some 7,000 birds. So we're almost triple in this first year. I think it's timely that it has happened, because we have had some difficulty in the southern part of the province relative to the harsh winter in the southeast corner.

It's our hope, too, to begin immediately on the expansion and extension at the rearing ponds at the Raven Station, and to commence planning and design for a new brood stock station at Allison Creek in the Crowsnest Pass. In that area we're hoping to be able to produce a facility that will handle up to 4 million eggs, and thus become somewhat independent in our own egg supply; along with that, redistribution capability for about a half million fish, in which we're going to be able to stock or transfer to the ponds some of the stock from the Sam Livingston Hatchery and thus increase our capability of our stocking program in the various lakes.

That's some of the good news. We've had some bad news in the sense that it's been a very difficult and tough winter on the wildlife in southern Alberta. Our latest reports relative to antelope losses look as if we may be losing up to 35 or 40 per cent, or have lost that high a ratio of the antelope. Going into the winter, we had some 14,000 antelope, and we may be down as low as 8,500. It's not what one might call the danger level, but it's certainly a very low level. We're going to have to really take a close look at our July counts before we look at possibly having to adjust the number of permits for hunting this year.

We also experienced probably one of the highest cost crop damage years, whether it was wildlife or by ducks and geese. Certainly that covers a broad area. Our fencing program did help to some degree. But this past winter was a most difficult one for all of us, certainly for the farm community.

As I said, crop damage really took a beating. We really only managed to survive because we had three reasonably light years, the last three years leading up to this year. In co-operation with the Department of Agriculture we're continuing to press the federal government for an increase in the per acre rate payment, and things are progressing reasonably well. We've had some pretty good discussions with the federal government of late, without in fact saying it looks promising there.

The other area I would like to mention is that hunter testing will take place for those whose hunting privileges have been suspended as a result of an infraction. We looked at the request for total mandatory testing. We felt it was really just a little too much to expect of the average daily life styles of individuals — and to look more at the violator to start with, then to put in place a promotional program that

would be more of an incentive for people voluntarily to take the same test. We're hoping that will in fact take place.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I'll try to field the questions.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of comments to make, and a couple of questions to the minister regarding some things he brought up this evening and some of the votes in his estimates. I'm happy to see the government has embarked on looking at Sylvan Lake, the total concept as a provincial park. I have a couple of areas in my constituency where maybe we should also look at trying to incorporate, or help them out in that regard.

I'm thinking of the summer village of Alberta Beach. We've made quite a change in the last four or five years, in help to the summer village of Alberta Beach through the Minister of the Department of Municipal Affairs, and extra grants for them. But they still are feeling the actual burden of the number of people who come there. It is a summer village with a permanent population of about 455 people, and it increases to 8,000 on a weekend. It puts quite a tax on the people who pay the everyday tax regarding garbage collection, beach maintenance, and the other things that go into looking after a summer village. I'm just appealing to the minister, whether he couldn't look at some other type of assistance for these — not actually taking it over as a provincial park. I don't think they'd want that. But if he could look at something to help the tax structure rate there, it would certainly be helpful.

Now the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife, for which the minister is responsible, has a tract of about 2,000 acres of land at Lac Ste. Anne, just west of Alberta Beach. I wonder if the minister could inform me this evening what the disposition will be of that land. Is it going to be looked at as a provincial park in the near future, is it years down the road, or what will happen to it? I understand the department has had it for a number of years now. I think the land is being leased back to some of the farmers in the area, but nothing has happened with it.

I have another question for the minister. When will we open up various sections of the Capital City Park in the city of Edmonton? What will be the opening dates for the various areas of that park? Maybe the minister wants to elaborate on how well it's going. When do you foresee the complete opening of the park for the people of the city of Edmonton to use?

MR. ASHTON: Stony Plain [inaudible].

MR. PURDY: Well, knowing my constituency, they'll probably come in to use it, because I think it's a worth-while facility for the people of Edmonton and the surrounding area.

Now if the minister remembers, about two years ago we had quite a debate in my constituency regarding Chickakoo Lake. There was a lot of opposition to that, and I think the department still holds an option on land in the Chickakoo Lake area. I wonder if the minister could inform me this evening what's — he shakes his head and says no. If he could give me an answer later on, I'd appreciate it.

The other area regarding provincial parks is Wabamun Lake Provincial Park, which has a real influx of

people on the weekends, probably starting this weekend because the lake is open right now. I didn't hear the minister say anything this evening about expansion of that park or upgrading of the facilities there. We have a lot of people visiting that park, and you have to be there by 2 or 3 o'clock on a Friday afternoon to get a tent or trailer spot. I'm wondering if the minister has any update for us regarding the expansion of this facility. Representation has been made to me by a number of people living in the Wabamun area. What do we foresee in the future for winter activities in that park, regarding cross-country skiing, downhill skiing, or learning skiing by some of our young children who are just starting out and can't afford or don't want to get to the facilities at Jasper or the ones offered in areas such as Lake Eden.

The other concern I have is: I wonder if the minister is going to embark on an educational program for snowmobilers in this province. I get the representation made to me on a number of occasions by farmers who have had snowmobilers come in, knock the fences down, cut them, and just trespass as they please. I wonder if we couldn't embark on some kind of educational program to try to set the record straight, to make these people knowledgeable in the correct way of using these machines. We have a lot of knowledgeable people. I had the pleasure this last fall, along with the Associate Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, of representing the government at the snowmobilers' conference here in Edmonton. I think the majority of these people are very responsible, but it only takes 1 or 2 per cent to put them in a bad perspective with the rest of the population of Alberta. I would think we could look at some kind of educational program to tell these people, this 2 or 3 per cent, to clean up their act and put the whole snowmobiling industry in the right perspective, as it should be.

Maybe the minister could also comment on how close we are to legislation regarding snowmobilers themselves, instead of being included in The Off-highway Vehicle Act. I know it comes under the Minister of Transportation, but I also know the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife has been looking at this particular aspect.

Regarding hunters and hunting infractions, I think the department has taken the right approach in that regard by saying that we are going to come in with rules and regulations that these people must be re-tested.

I would like to ask the minister a final question. What is happening now to the hunters' training program in Alberta? Is this going to be expanded or not? Maybe I can share with members of the Assembly that I was the third graduate of that class back in the late 1960s under Paul Presdente, who presented this class to Albertans. Reading about it and looking into it, I thought it was a very worth-while type of thing that should be done through the fish and game associations and our high schools. As I say, I took the course through Paul Presdente, and about 15 of us were in that initial class.

Other than that, we had the question last year in the minister's estimates regarding grants for community associations. As near as I can find out now, things are going pretty smoothly. Some of the problems we're seeing right now are happening in the communities, not in the minister's department, which

may have been evident before. But that is certainly cleared up. We've had a couple this year that clearly showed the community was at fault in this respect, not the department. As near as I can ascertain from talking to my many community associations, the department is doing an excellent job getting the applications processed and the cheques out as fast as possible. So I think, Mr. Minister, that program is going well. We in the rural part of the province appreciate it, especially in my constituency.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, do you wish to have all the questions and then answer them, or do you wish to cover them one at a time?

MR. ADAIR: Possibly I might just cover them while I have them fairly fresh in my mind.

With regard to the possibility of additional assistance and your request relative to Alberta Beach, it certainly is not included in this year's budget. But I think it's something we're going to have to take a look at as the operating costs increase. As you know, we have a small budget for assistance to communities and summer villages for their municipal parks, and certainly we'll take a look at that particular one.

I think you asked when Capital City Park might be opening. That is really with the hon. Minister of the Environment, but my understanding is that there is a plan for an opening in mid-July. It's the 8th, 9th, or that week. So it will be opened prior to the Commonwealth Games. I understand there will be a fairly elaborate opening for the Capital City Park facility.

When you asked me about Chickakoo Lake, I shook my head. I'll have to find out. I haven't got it on my list, nor do I have it right at the fingertips. It may be a big lake, it may be a fairly large one, it may have good beaches. I'm not sure. I haven't seen it.

Wabamun Lake Park: I think we'll have some relief at Wabamun as a result of the opening of Capital City. We anticipate some relief. Whether it's direct right away, we don't know for sure.

You also asked about the land around Lac Ste. Anne. My understanding is that it was purchased some years ago for future park consideration. There are no immediate plans at present for development of a park.

The educational program is quite interesting. When you're talking about snowmobilers, I think we might work with the Alberta snowmobile association, if they were to request that, and see if we could set up clinics that would serve the purpose of what you might call snowmobiling ethics, that cause those small numbers who break the rules to affect the attitude toward the larger numbers. There is no question about it.

I believe you mentioned the other one about the Department of Transportation and The Off-highway Vehicle Act. All I can add is that it is under review by Dr. Horner's department, and to my knowledge they're working on it at the present time. A draft will be presented to the snowmobilers for review as quickly as possible.

The hunter training program is going to be expanded. We will be upgrading the program. It is probably one of the most successful programs we have had in the province, and I congratulate the hon. member for being third in a large number of members

who have graduated from that course. As I said at the start of my estimates, along with upgrading that particular program we would be anticipating a promotional campaign to assist in motivating the individual to take it voluntarily and see if in fact that will work, rather than going to the mandatory test. If properly handled, I think they will more likely go to the voluntary test, rather than the mandatory test.

I thank you for your comments on the major facilities program. I too think it is working much, much better, and we're getting the cheques out. I think it would be fair to say that part of the result of that is because the communities, as well as our departmental staff, are getting more acquainted with the program as we move along. We're just into the third year; it's a very young program indeed. But some giant steps have been taken and some clinics held to alert the communities as well to the process, and it's moving along very well indeed.

MR. PURDY: One further supplementary question, Mr. Chairman. Regarding the hunter training program, has the minister held any talks or communication with the Department of Education to see if this program couldn't be included in part of our high school curriculum program for young hunters who may want to include this?

MR. ADAIR: I don't think we have talked to the Department of Education. But that may be a good point, because we've also looked at the possibility of expanding that to ensure that all the various clubs, be they air cadets or the like, would have the opportunity to take that expanded course.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, after the hon. Member for Stony Plain got through, there wasn't really very much left to be said. But I want to deal with a few items. One involves Kananaskis Park. The Stoney Indians have been hunting in this area for many years. They depend for some of their winter living on hunting in that area. Some concern is expressed by the Stoneys that the hunting may now be cut off. I'm wondering if the minister has anything to say about that. This will be quite a blow to the Indians if no alternative place is provided for them to supplement their hunting.

The other point about Kananaskis Park follows what the hon. Member for Stony Plain mentioned, snowmobiling. I think one of the major concerns of many snowmobilers, now that there is a commitment to take winter sport out of The Off-highway Vehicle Act, is the fact that there's no permission to pass through provincial parks or to use some provincial parks. You know, for the life of me I can't see what damage it will do where a provincial park, where there's snow, nobody is using it, and where it's simply lying idle — or permitting a passage through from one place to the other. It's certainly going to take business to Banff and probably Canmore, if this is permitted.

I think there is a real possibility to develop another industry in Alberta, the snowmobile industry. It's amazing what Quebec has been able to in that regard, and a couple of states to the south that are now specializing in advertising snowmobile areas, where they're encouraged and invited to come because they leave a lot of money behind them. It's a

wholesome sport. I would like to see Alberta get right in the forefront in developing this as a winter sport.

Everybody doesn't ski. Skiing is quite expensive. Unless you start skiing at the proper age, it's pretty difficult to become an expert skier or a very happy skier. But one can start snowmobiling at any age. Also, snowmobiling is a family sport. Father, mother, and all the kids go, sometimes grandma, grandpa, and a couple of aunts. You know, it's a wonderful way for these people to get together. They go out, they snowmobile together, they play together, and that helps to keep the family together just as praying does. It's one of the factors.

So I would like to see the minister pursue that. Particularly I think there's just no end to the possible potential in this province, with our areas, to develop a tremendous snowmobile industry for western Canada and, as a matter of fact, western North America.

The other point I want to mention is about coyotes. The hon. minister mentioned the other day that he couldn't line them up and count them, and I understood what he meant. I know you can't do that, but neither can you line up the antelope and count them. Yet the minister just told us that some 30 to 35 per cent of the antelope crop, I think the hon. minister said, was lost this year. That is sad, because the antelope is a splendid animal, a delicious animal to eat, a hard animal to shoot, and it develops a real sport. I'm sorry to hear about that loss.

But many of the — well I shouldn't say many, but it was mentioned at the meeting in the village of Standard that rabbits are increasing to the point where they're causing concern, and the coyotes are disappearing. I wonder if there is some way of ascertaining just what the proportionate population is. I understood that for a few years, by some means or other, we did have estimated counts keeping the population of coyotes, rabbits, moose, antelope, and caribou somewhat in balance. While I realize the department can't take that responsibility, I think we can help, through our hunting seasons, to keep them in balance. If coyotes are becoming too plentiful, or the other way around, if coyotes are becoming not plentiful enough and rabbits are increasing, it will have an adverse effect in some of our areas.

While I am on provincial parks, I would like to say to the minister that I certainly appreciate the information already given about the development of the park in the Drumheller valley on the land that was donated by Mr. Sid McMullen, the Midlandvale property. I think this is going to be a unique park. The department has taken some time to develop it. I have never complained about that, because it's far better to do your planning before you start the construction than to get halfway through and then start changing plans in midstream. So the people of the valley are quite happy about that too. They're glad to see the development going ahead, and I think it's going to provide a unique park in this province, maybe in western Canada, featuring the geological formations and coal mines there.

I'd also like to say to the minister that I appreciate his attitude and that of his deputy and men in taking a look at a request to take a small area off the east end of that park where people have been living for many, many years. In no way will it affect the park. I certainly appreciate the work the department is doing and the healthy attitude taken. They could have said

simply, well, it's not our business; we're not going to have anything to do with it. But they didn't, because it means a lot to the three or four people involved. There are only three or four, but they are people who have lived there for many years. I think that is appreciated by everybody in that particular area.

I'd like to enlarge on one other point raised by the hon. Member for Stony Plain. He was talking about the self-discipline of snowmobilers. I like the idea of the snowmobile clubs. If we can get people to join the clubs, there's the best self-discipline you can get because they're disciplined by themselves, not by an outside force. I like that attitude. In teaching school I've found that discipline wasn't too much of a problem if you had your class with you and they disciplined themselves for certain reasons. You could always set up a type of discipline that the members of the class would want to enforce for various reasons. I'm not going into that now, but in cases like that I found the discipline was always more effective because it was coming from the hearts of the pupils themselves. They weren't so much against the teacher as they were doing something against their own fellow student. If we can get that spirit into our snowmobile clubs — and I think it's in the clubs — and get more people to join the clubs, I think we're not going to have very much trouble with snowmobiles. I'm sure there's not a club in the province that would condone running down coyotes, rabbits, or any other animal on top of a snowmobile. It's not sportsmanlike, and it's not fun; it's really cruel. I think that's one of the ways we might work in that regard.

I would like to make one other suggestion. Maybe this is applicable only to the Drumheller valley, but I rather doubt it. Skiing is a very popular sport, yet in some of our areas, expressly the Drumheller valley where we have lots of hills, we just don't have a ski hill. We had one, but unfortunately it was lost through something which the skiers had nothing to do with. The owner of the property simply decided she didn't want anybody on her land, and that was it. There's no way to negotiate or talk. Yet with all those hills there, we have an area where scores of families wanting to ski have to go miles and miles in order to ski.

In setting out new programs I'm wondering if the minister could take a look at giving some assistance, not entire assistance, to local people to develop a ski hill. It is rather expensive because you have to have access, which many times means a road. You need a tow if the hill's any size at all. You need a smaller hill for the beginners and a larger hill for those who are advanced. I think it would be a real service in many communities of the province if we could get these ski hills within reasonable distance of our people. I think it's a program the minister might very well look at to see what assistance might be made available to local people who want to develop ski hills.

MR. ADAIR: If I could just lead into the points raised by the hon. Member for Drumheller relating to the Stoney Indians and their hunting rights in that area, looking back to the early 1900s Kananaskis Country was included in the boundaries of the national park, as you well remember. I think it was a game preserve until about 1950, so there was no hunting in the area until then. In Kananaskis Country, in the prime park area we did in fact have hunting last year. We

announced it in the middle of a hunting season and, rather than get everybody confused, we carried that on by order in council. We're looking at what that may mean for the future. But in Kananaskis Country, hunting could well take place without any problems. So out of that 2,000 square mile area, the 190 square miles for the park may in fact exclude hunting but the balance would be available for hunting privileges.

One of the points the hon. member raised was the use of snowmobiles and the use of them for travelling through provincial parks. Personally, I am opposed to that particular concept. The reason is that at the present time we have some 36,000 square miles of Eastern Slopes land plus private land in which we can develop a north/south trail system that could eventually take us from the Montana border to the B.C. border within the Eastern Slopes. That type of plan is just now beginning to get into the formative stages, where we can work with the Eastern Slopes policy with my colleague the hon. Mr. Schmidt, and develop along with the snowmobile associations, their task force group, and the industry itself. I think a very viable industry is already operating in the province of Alberta in the snowmobile field. So there are quite a number of opportunities in that area.

I appreciate the fact that the Kananaskis Park was one of the prime snowmobile areas for people for quite a number of years. I guess the easiest way is that, when we were talking about developing a park in that area, obviously we were going to close off some of that. Now by working together with them, I think we can resolve that. Although it's the human right, I guess, to say that what was in fact our place we may have to give up reluctantly. I think we can develop the kind of trail system they have talked about but are now getting down to the nitty-gritty with us in that particular area.

I think one of the basic facts is that with a good number of snowmobiles in the province, almost 50,000, less than 8,000 were registered. So very few were in fact registered. We obviously assumed that all the others were being used on private lands, because they didn't have to be registered. But many more are using the green zone areas and of course are now licensing to do that. But I think by working together — I think there was some lack of communication with the organizations. I'm not faulting whose side it may be. I would accept some of the responsibility for that. I think some of it also rests with the snowmobile clubs and associations themselves. I agree with the hon. member that there is strength in the association. When hon. Mr. Purdy was talking about the setting up of clinics or the like, I did mention I would prefer to see that coming from the association to us, rather than us sort of imposing something along that line.

The ski hill you mentioned and assistance for it, as an example the Fairview Ski Club has utilized major cultural/recreation facility funds for the development of a ski hill along the Peace River. It was one of their priorities, and they in fact received a fairly substantial sum of money to put their tow in place, assist in getting their lead road into the area, and the likes of what the hon. member was just talking about. That program is in place, and I would hope you're not looking at another separate program to impose on top of that. I'm not sure they have utilized their funds to this degree yet, but that is one opportunity available

to them within the master plan concept, if it were a priority for the community, to use funds from that program to develop ski facilities. I would certainly suggest that maybe they take a look at that to see if there is some way they can possibly use it.

I think that pretty well answers the questions the hon. member raised.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Could I ask a supplementary question with regard to snowmobiling and travelling through the parks? The specific area we're thinking of is between the Highwood junction and Banff. I couldn't quite follow what the minister was saying; it wasn't clear. It seemed you were saying you were considering it and you weren't considering it. Is the department's position, no, there will not be any snowmobiling on that route from this point on? Is that the definite position of the government at the present time?

MR. ADAIR: If you would like to go to a yes or no situation, the obvious answer would be no. If it's in the park, it's no, by regulation that has been in place for some years. Whether in fact we get to the point of changing that down the road — that may in fact happen. I would personally oppose that, because I think sufficient lands are outside the parks for use by snowmobilers. In co-operation with the department and other departments of government in developing the trail systems, that could be the long link they are talking about; for example, as I said earlier, the kind of link that could go from the Montana border right up to the B.C. border, within the Eastern Slopes, and then of course the lateral loops that might be off that particular route. At the present time, as we announced Kananaskis Country, that was one of the areas excluded. The two areas within the Country, very explicitly, were the McLean Creek and Sibbald Flats areas and the possibility of joining McLean Creek to Cataract Creek to the south . . . Yes, I believe it's Cataract Creek to the south; Waiparous is to the north. We're looking at the possibility of making the join to give them another long loop on the other side, but not in the Highwood area.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I can understand what the minister is saying. But at the meeting we had at Government House that evening, there seemed to be support for some kind of controlled route through the park on that particular route. In southern Alberta, there's a lot of representation. The concern they have with the route you mentioned, from the Montana border up into B.C., is the amount of snowfall and the limited period of time in which you can ski or snowmobile. That's the problem, which I'm sure you recognize. Has any thought been given to the possibility of very well marked out routes? My interest is really that Highwood to Banff thing.

The penalty that we set down in legislation, which could be enforced either through a citizen's arrest or through enforcement officers, is that for anyone who is off trail the automatic consequence, I guess in the court system, is loss of the snowmobile plus a heavy fine. That's enforced right to the limit, just like someone caught drinking and driving. You lose your licence. I support that kind of concept. I've said to the minister, it's great. Have you thought of anything

like that? The responsible snowmobiler will not get into difficulty if, say, either end of the route is well signed and it says, if you're off trail on this route there are no excuses. That could be well worded, that here is the consequence. Has any thought been given to that kind of approach?

MR. ADAIR: Well I guess, Mr. Chairman, what I did say to the group was that once we announced the plan and started the process of developing Kananaskis Country, I wanted the opportunity to get most of the work done before we started changing everything, so in the interim we could see what alternative plans we might be able to come forth with. So I would say that down the road I can see possibly taking a look at some of those and coming up with the likes of that. As a matter of fact, it was raised at that particular meeting, that I personally had suggested we look at going through parks, identifying a trail, marking it, and then, my term was, God help you if you get off the trail.

I wasn't able to use that particular concept, so we went to the other one of developing the two systems within the Country to start with, then developing from there, and working with them in the other areas of better snow country. Now as you get closer to the Montana border there are snow problems, there's no question about it. But I think in the Cataract Creek area, for example, heavy snowfalls can be utilized. It's outside the Country. Really what we're trying to do is to start from scratch with the development of a new concept of controlled recreation for everybody. In order to do that, basically we have to proceed with our plan and make some adjustments as we go along, but I wouldn't want to do them right off the bat. I indicated to them that initially I was holding firm until we could at least lay out our plan, get it working, and see where we could go from there.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could just add a word or two in connection with that. I'm always a little afraid of this word "control". It always indicates somebody is going to control this, and I like freedom of choice a lot better. It fits into our concept of our form of democracy. While I realize there have to be some controls, I wonder how far we have to go in controlling a sport if no damage is being done, if it's hurting nobody else, because somebody says you can't do it.

This is the part the snowmobilers, largely very reasonable people, take very serious objection to. For years they went over this. I haven't heard anybody talk about any damage. The snow is too deep to do damage for one thing. Nobody else is up there. Cross-country skiers never go into that country; it's too far away. They tell me they might see one or two around the Highwood, but they never see them between there and the route to Banff. You know, to tell them which route they're going to have to take — maybe they don't want to go from Montana up the B.C. border; they might want to go from Highwood to Banff. When there have been 40, 50, or 60 snowmobiles with families — father, mother, kids, grandparents, aunts, and uncles — that go on that trip year after year, it has become a pretty popular thing. They can go part way and have a picnic lunch, go to Banff, spend a night in Banff, spend their money, and then go back the next day. They tell me it's a beautiful trip.

To my thinking and to the thinking of the snowmobilers, it would be far more acceptable if the minister could say, we're not able to permit this because such and such and such. But simply to say, well, we've 'edicted' or ordained that nobody can take a snowmobile through a provincial park, isn't acceptable to our way of life. It's too much like a dictatorship, saying you just can't do it without giving any reasons. You know, a provincial park isn't a sacred thing. Surely a provincial park is for snowmobilers, the same as for everyone else. If they do damage, if they're hurting the interests of others, they shouldn't be there. And I don't think they'd want to be. But if they can go in, enjoy their sport, miles away from anybody else, without doing any damage, for the life of me I can't follow why we don't want to let them do it. That's the part that bothers scores of our snowmobilers.

I would certainly like to see the minister take a good look at the idea of getting more freedom of choice into this and control only where there are definite reasons to control.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to bring to the minister some questions on policy. One was in the area of recreation. With the Department of Education now out with the Woods-Gordon report, which fairly well recommends that whenever recreation is being planned on a new school the surrounding community has some say in it, I was wondering if the minister or his people have taken a good look at what is taking place in the United States with recreation. There the recreation dollars go to the school boards, and recreation is fit in around a school. Bearing in mind that the school population is probably well over half your population in any given area, that's where the action is. Again repeating the question: have you looked at the American trend of funding recreation directly through the school boards?

The other area I had was the wildlife damage fund. We're certainly hearing now considerable concern that the fund is not adequate even to begin to come near to what the damages are. I realize the federal government has considerable say in the damage fund. I was wondering if the minister had any success in dealing with the federal government to increase the wildlife damage fund.

Then of course, Mr. Minister, I couldn't let you get by your estimates without speaking on my favorite subject. That of course is fishing, and I speak from considerable experience. But I notice that we have half a dozen trophy lakes in Alberta, and one of the better trophy lakes for the last few years has been open for commercial netting. Also realizing that there is quite a population that makes its living from commercial fishing, I really question — if you're going to have only a half dozen trophy lakes in this province they should be kept as trophy. The trophy lake I'm referring to of course is Winefred. I was up there on the weekend. I was amazed at the number of roads that . . .

MR. DIACHUK: Sunday and Monday?

MR. STROMBERG: Oh yes; well, we won't talk about Monday. Officially I was sick Monday.

But from a year ago the people at Lac La Biche told me that a dozen gas wells are there. They haven't hit a dry one. The whole area from Conklin to Winefred,

a stretch of maybe 50 or 60 miles, every mile had a seismic road put through. With these wells there, with the pipeline going in next winter, the road to Winefred is open and it will no longer be a trophy lake. Has consideration been given perhaps to saying that that has to be a trophy lake; if you're going in there, you're going to walk or go by plane. Put a padlock on the oil company's gate and leave that one for us serious fishermen. Maybe I'm asking for too much, but it is quite a thrill to catch these 8 and 10 pound walleye.

But also we seem to have good success in our area, Mr. Minister, on bait stations. I was wondering what the number of bait stations in the province is for ducks and geese, and if the program is being expanded.

The other point is the hunting regulations your department sent out last fall. I had conflicting reports of how many mistakes were in the hunting regulations, as high as something like 15 mistakes. I understand they were recalled. But I really question — when they come out with hunting regulations, surely they must be checked for accuracy. The confusion those numerous mistakes caused to the hunters I think is almost inexcusable.

Of course I have to get the minister's opinion: is he still a friend of the wolves, or has he taken a stand now on wolf control in the province? And does he still believe that wolves are vegetarians?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, first of all I didn't quite get the gist of the question relative to recreation funding. Were you suggesting that the operational or capital funding be provided to the schools to build facilities directly? Maybe you could elaborate on that.

MR. STROMBERG: From the information I have, apparently in the United States recreation grants go to the school boards, and they are responsible for handling those grants. They are tying them in with the school system, even if it's for senior citizens.

MR. ADAIR: Well, I don't know if we have looked directly at that particular one. Our funding basically goes through the provincial sport governing bodies relative to the sport itself. Some funds are also provided to the ASAA, the Alberta Schools' Athletic Association, and basically that procedure will continue at the present time. I think we can take a look at what other funding arrangements are in the U.S., if you can provide us with some information on that.

Relative to the damage fund, as I said earlier we were fortunate enough to make it through this year because of the high payout we had. We were only able to do that because of some light years ahead of that which allowed the trust fund to have some reserves. In co-operation with the Department of Agriculture, the two departments working with the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mr. Marchand in Ottawa, we are negotiating relative to a new agreement. We have an extension, and it looks promising. But I can't go beyond that at this stage. We have asked for an increase to \$50 per acre. That would be only for costs of operation, not cost of the grain itself. If we got any increase at all it would be most welcome, and we would certainly appreciate it.

Relative to your comments on chaining, padlocking, or closing roads, trails, or the like to Winefred Lake or

any other lakes, certainly I would like to stay with the concept of freedom of choice and the right to travel at your own risk on those particular roads, recognizing that as the population in our fair province increases some of those areas will probably be more accessible as a result of some of the things that are happening.

You asked about bait stations. There are 26 in the province, and they have been working quite well.

We had some problems last year with mistakes in hunting regulations. People are involved in it, and we had some problems with proofreaders. I certainly hope it won't happen again, because it caused us all some consternation in the department, as well as the people in the country, the hunters who were picking up the regulations themselves.

MR. STROMBERG: The minister did not answer the questions on commercial netting on Winefred and on wolf control.

MR. ADAIR: On your question about whether wolves are vegetarians, I assume at certain times they may well be. It depends on what they're looking for.

Relative to Winefred Lake, yes, we have actually allowed some netting of fish by commercial fishermen, and they were staked out. Various sections of the lake were staked out, highly supervised, and with limits. The first year they were able to get the limit of, I believe, whitefish — I'm not just sure now — within the tolerance limit of game fish. The second year they got the tolerance limit on the first lift, and it was cut off. We are watching that very closely. But there are sufficient whitefish there not to harm the trophy calibre of the lake, as long as we can maintain that tolerance factor and keep it highly supervised.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of comments and questions for the minister. I'd like to congratulate the minister on the announced new policy with regard to funding of provincial sports bodies. I think it's needed and will be welcomed by the volunteer sector in our various communities.

With regard to that policy, I'd like to ask a specific question about the Alberta Schools' Athletic Association, since the hon. Member for Camrose raised that and the minister raised it again in his response. What is the exact present level of funding for the ASAA from the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife, and is there any hope in the near future that this level of funding will be increased to meet the increasing demands which are placed upon that organization?

I'd like to say I was disappointed there wasn't a great increase in the number of fish and wildlife officers, enforcement officers, in this year's budget. I know the minister has striven to attempt to get increased priority in that area. I'd just like to lend my support to the minister in his efforts. I think it's perceived in a number of areas in the province that there is that need for a number of increased positions in that area.

I'd like to congratulate the minister on the announcement of the brood stock rearing station at Allison Creek. It's certainly welcomed by constituents in my area of the province, and I'm sure it's welcomed by the sport fishing fraternity throughout the province. Would the minister be able to give some details of the exact nature of the facility to be developed

there in terms of this year's budget expenditures? Some concern has been expressed locally with regard to the closing to fishing of the Allison Creek reservoir. Would the minister be able to comment on what alternatives are being looked at in this area?

Finally I'd like to press again one of my pet projects I'm trying to develop in the southwestern corner of the province. It's with regard to the development of increased water-based recreation facilities in the eastern slopes of the Rocky Mountains. As the minister may be well aware, there is a lack of bodies of water in that area for recreational purposes. The present excellent fishing lakes we have there are man-made developed lakes, Beauvais Lake, Beaver Mines Lake, the Allison Creek reservoir, and Chain Lakes reservoir. They're all man-made. I think there is a need for more of this type of facility in that area, and I would ask the minister perhaps to direct some of his attention in that area in the years to come.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, I believe \$30,000 was provided to the ASAA, the Alberta Schools' Athletic Association, which was somewhat higher than the norm for a provincial sport governing body in the sense that it was something other than that. But they will now fit into the same system as any of the other sport governing bodies on the matching basis, and they will have that opportunity to use their registration fees, or whatever they may have, to pick up a matching portion. If they fit the criteria for the maximums, they would again receive that \$30,000 from us, and with the matching portion would have \$50,000 to operate from.

I appreciated your comments on the fish and wildlife officers, the enforcement people. We did receive approval for three new officers. Maybe now I could point out that we're anticipating putting one in the High River area, which would assist in serving the area that relates to the west area, the Kananaskis Country and that area in that part of southern Alberta; one at Evansburg, and the main reason for that is the increased activity with the oil activity in and around the new oil field in the Drayton Valley area; one at Fort McMurray, where we've had the large increase in population and the number of violations that have occurred in that area as well.

You were talking about Allison Creek. This year's budget is basically planning and designing, but also looking for the possibility of an alternate recreation fishery supply or lake or body of water. So we are in fact doing that, looking for a replacement for Allison Creek reservoir itself. As we begin to develop the brood stock station, that will not be able to be fished publicly. We'll have to have a replacement for the people in that area.

Possibly I can go into some numbers: spring rainbow, we're looking at some 2 million eggs; lake trout, a half million; cutthroat trout, a quarter of a million; brown trout, a half million; brook trout, three-quarters of a million eggs. That would give us roughly 4 million eggs from the Allison Station at its maximum production, and then with that the capability we have to use that for a redistribution facility, which will allow us to transfer from Sam Livingston to the Allison Creek area and from there to the lakes so that we will have a better opportunity to increase the production for supply and stocking of the lakes. I think it is quite an exciting concept, and I appreciate that we're

a little bit behind in getting that under way. We have faced some cutbacks. As a matter of fact when you look at the stocking, the number of fish we stocked this past year was down to 3.8 million from just over 7 million three years ago. Most of that is a result of our difficulty in obtaining eggs and fingerlings from across the line as a result of the changes we have had in the last couple of years for regulations — in our own best interest, to ensure that we have disease-free eggs coming in. So with our ability to begin now to develop our own dependency, I think we're moving in the right direction.

MR. ZANDER: Mr. Chairman, I think we have to give the hon. minister credit. He has certainly turned the department around in the few years he's been in that department. I know I've had certain requests, and he was positive in his answers. I only want to remind him that I know they're in the mill, that somewhere down the line I think you should remember — and I'm recalling the conversation and a memo I received from the minister regarding that land south of Evansburg along the Pembina River that was bought by the previous government for a proposed dam on the river at that time, and I think the Crown still holds that land. I think it would be suitable for a park because it is adjacent to Highway 16, and it would serve the constituencies of Whitecourt and Drayton Valley. I don't know when that park will take place, or when it's on the drawing board. I understand that the park in the Buck Lake area isn't on the drawing board. The land has been purchased and, as I hear by the grapevine, I presume it'll be off the ground in 1979. The only thing that worries me is that some of the land around the lake already purchased by that group, the Indian Affairs Department or the Indians from Hobema, would not be used other than for park purpose. I hope we have enough land in that area.

I wonder if the hon. minister would also recall the promise he made last year that he would be stocking lake trout in the Brazeau reservoir. It's a body of water where the former government, unwisely or otherwise, flooded the area with the trees in it. I think the Solicitor General and his crew out there have been able to try to clean that area up, by voluntary or involuntary labor. I think the department has also spent close to \$1 million to try to clean up that reservoir, which was the greatest mistake the former government ever made. It was one of them, anyway.

I think I would be remiss in not stating that the area in that peninsula between the reservoir and the Calgary Power canal — and before I go any further, I think we would have to thank Calgary Power, their personnel and the company. They have maintained that 12 miles of road and the additional 12 miles that go from the power plant to Lodgepole. They have kept the recreation area clean and have done so on a daily basis. At one time over 80 recreational trailers were there, and I noticed they were in the next day cleaning up, which I think is a responsibility rather of the government than of Calgary Power. But I think they proved to themselves and at least to me that they are good corporate citizens, that they've instructed their personnel to do the cleaning, to pick up the garbage, and to maintain those roads.

Since the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources is here, one thing I want to mention before

I close is my hope that no drilling in the deep zones will occur on that 100-plus acres in the peninsula between the two bodies of water, approximately 24 miles of it. I would certainly hope both ministries can get together. Considerable work was done to make this a recreation area. The boat launching sites, trailer parks, and what have you, are in there right now. I would hate to see it destroyed or infringed upon, because I think that is nature's best. When the ministers go back to their offices tonight, I hope they will lay it on their desk and say there will be no drilling in that peninsula. If this can be done, once the Solicitor General has cleaned it up I think we will have a heritage there for generations and generations to enjoy.

The Minister of Energy and Natural Resources says he wasn't there. I would welcome him to fly out to Drayton Valley. I will personally take him out there. Maybe with a good sturdy boat we can get across those trees and do a little bit of fishing.

Mr. Minister, I would certainly like it if you would stick to the promise you gave me last year, and the estimates that you would be stocking that body of water and the other body of water with some lake trout. I think they would make excellent fishing, also for generations to come.

MR. ADAIR: I think I had better stand up on that promise because "attempt to" and "promise" were not quite what we had said. We would attempt to see if we could do that, and I'll say that I'll still attempt to do that.

I pass your remarks relative to that peninsula to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. By the way he was shaking his head, I assume he agrees with the concept you're saying. I certainly do too.

In the land around Buck Lake I guess basically you were right. It's not in the immediate plans for a park, but I think we have sufficient land in place, or very close to that, possibly to get into the stage of planning a design and a park announcement somewhere down the road. At this time, though, I'm not prepared to say when that might be.

MR. ZANDER: I just want another supplementary. In combining the two ministries, I wonder if the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources could get — I just don't know how to put it — the information as to whether or not the former government had let the deep rights and they're still effective. I think those were 21-year leases. Whether they're still in existence or were bought back by the former government once the area was flooded, I don't know. But I think that has to be looked into before we go too far in the drilling program in that area.

MR. BUTLER: Mr. Chairman, in the first place I'd like to congratulate the minister for the way he has handled the major facilities grant. It has certainly been a real asset to our area. Many facilities were built, and many were improved on account of it.

I'd like to refer for a moment to the Blood Indian reservoir and the potential of bringing it into a park. It's my hope it will be brought into a park in the near future. The garbage disposal is being handled now by the number of people who are there, the local taxpayers, and it is putting an unfair burden on them. Besides that, I think it's going to get out of hand.

They go down and dig a pit with a bulldozer and send a truck down there once a week to clean it up. But it badly needs more supervision.

Mr. Minister, in case you haven't been there, this area has three miles of shoreline on each side of the creek. A dam on Blood Indian backs water up for three miles. It's amongst the 10 best fishing holes in Alberta. It's stocked with rainbow trout. You can go down there on a holiday weekend, and in those three miles on both sides of the creek you're very fortunate if you can find a place where you can cast a rod. Since they've had an all-weather road to it — road 884 now is oiled right to the park — the traffic there is increasing tremendously. I see you have a slight increase in your budget for construction in the east-central portion of the province, so I certainly hope you give this park favorable consideration.

I understand that the Department of the Environment has made arrangements to drill some wells there. That will certainly be welcome.

The area badly needs at least one more wildlife officer. I hope in the future when you get an opening for a wildlife officer, you give Hanna particular attention.

I had a question on the crop damage, and you've partly answered it by saying you're trying to go to \$50 an acre. I certainly hope you're successful. The \$25 an acre that has been in place is inadequate.

I'm very pleased to say the deer wintered well in our area. On Sounding Creek, in Hand Hills, and the area I've been around, the deer have wintered well. In some cases it was thanks to the farmers and their sense of conservation. Particularly in the Hand Hills area, there were farmers who let the deer run at their haystacks and never complained about it. I'd like to thank them for it.

That's about all I have to cover, Mr. Minister. I would like to hear your report on the Blood Indian Dam and its potential of becoming a park.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, we have had quite a number of representations, and certainly the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen has made the presentations on behalf of the people in the area very well indeed, either for the possibility of a park or recognition as a recreation area and then some facilities for boat launching, day use, toilet facilities, water wells, and the like. I would like to pass on to the hon. member that that's the route we're moving toward. I would hope we can move in that direction sometime this summer, because it certainly has priority in my own mind relative to the requests and the usage of the reservoir for a fishery.

Now you did comment about wildlife officers. I think one of the points we seem to get into every year and the difficulty we've had is that with the increase in population in the province of Alberta, with the increase in the opportunity as well for winter and outdoor recreation and the like, we certainly have a situation where we do need more officers. I'm pleased we were able to get three new ones. I'm not sure in my mind that's sufficient. I would like to have had six, and a commitment of six for four years as we previously had. I'll continue to work toward that type of request and approval of that if I can.

In relation to crop damage, I think I should also point out that Saskatchewan and Manitoba are supporting Alberta's request for the increase to \$50.

Again, I say we've had some favorable response, but we're now in the position where we have an extension of the agreement, but no increase as yet. We're still working toward that I think with as much fervor as we can. Certainly I appreciate the work members of the Department of Agriculture have done on our behalf in that regard as well.

MR. MILLER: I was wondering Mr. Minister, if any consideration is being given in the budget this year to the goose project at Kenilworth Lake. Over the years it's been extremely successful. I think this last year they turned some of the geese loose and they mated, and it seemed to be quite successful. In other years I believe they had an allocation of \$1,000, and I wasn't sure whether that was in this year's budget. Is there any other goose project in Alberta? It runs in my mind that the department was thinking of putting a goose project at Brooks. Is this correct?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, yes, within the Brooks Hatchery or the wildlife centre will be the capability to raise some geese. It will complement the program you have; it doesn't in any way deter from it. That one will carry on by a contract basis, and the funds are still in place for the continuation of the program you refer to. Certainly the facilities at Brooks will include a capability to raise geese as well and, as I said, complement the program you were talking about.

MR. JAMISON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, Mr. Minister, on behalf of the people of St. Albert I'd like to thank you for awarding the 1979 Summer Games to the city of St. Albert. I can assure you that we will take a page out of the Commonwealth Foundation group and come in on budget and on schedule.

It's my understanding, Mr. Minister, that the government contributes about \$150,000 toward the Games, also a \$50,000 additional legacy if it's required. I was wondering if you might inform the Legislature of the track record of the places Summer Games have been held — two Summer Games, I believe, and one Winter Games.

Another question on provincial parks. I was wondering if you might inform the Legislature of the status of the Calling Lake Provincial Park. I don't believe anything has been done there for the last couple of years, and I believe it was scheduled to be officially opened in 1978. At the same time I might request that you speak to the Minister of Transportation, as there are 15 miles of mud. Last year with 28 days of rain in July and 25 in August, it was almost impossible to get up there in any case.

I was listening carefully to the other members, Mr. Minister, and I hope you're not running out of money. I believe you have your next year's budget all set up.

With those few words, I'd like to thank you again on behalf of the people of St. Albert for the 1979 Summer Games.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for those kind remarks. Calling Lake has been a bit of a problem. Mother Nature is very difficult to work with. We do plan on having an opening in the fall of 1978 at Calling Lake Provincial Park, and there are moneys in place to do some work this summer, providing Mother Nature will let us do it.

Relative to the games, I take it you were asking, what was the track record of the communities that got the moneys, relative to budget?

Going from the Red Deer Games where we first instituted the legacy program, Red Deer came in basically right on budget. I believe they were within \$100, \$200, or \$300 of budget. They received the \$50,000 legacy, and, as I said earlier, it went toward the cost of that all-weather track they have in the city of Red Deer. Banff came in under budget, and their legacy facility payment went toward lights in the arena, curling rocks, a sound system I believe, and they spread it over quite a number of things. I'm not sure exactly what Medicine Hat is going to use it for. My understanding is that they've come in on budget. We haven't got the final word back from them as yet, but to date the track record has been good.

Just so it is clarified, \$150,000 is available to the community as a payment by government for the hosting of the games. A \$50,000 legacy is also paid, but it is held to ensure that no debt is incurred. If debt is incurred by the community, it would be paid out of that legacy first, with the balance going to the community. So it is a holdback situation to ensure that the bills are paid. We haven't had a problem on it to date.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, three questions to the minister. The first one stems from financial assistance for recreation development. I'd like to make a plea to the minister, Mr. Chairman, that in the future we give more consideration to our master agreements and our recreation grants to debt retirement and funding for utilities, such as power and fuel. It's becoming more and more evident that as we have increased costs in power and fuel, many of the small communities are thinking about whether they can continue operating these facilities, such as arenas, swimming pools, and curling rinks. I think we should come up with a program where we do not ask them to match it for capital expenditures, such as new buildings. In the community I serve I believe we have enough capital buildings now; we would just like to be able to keep them open. I think that is pretty evident throughout the province.

The next thing I'd like to ask the minister to consider: in 1971 I made my first request for a provincial park on Highway 43 in my constituency. Every year thereafter I've asked about it, and I don't know if I'm any closer now than I was then. But I'd sure like to see the minister consider a provincial park in my constituency, along Highway 43.

The third item I'd like to talk about and ask for the minister's consideration is: we met at one time with some of your department people at Whitecourt, Mr. Minister. We agreed we should have a special zone in the House Mountain area, which is bordered on the west by McLeod, on the north by Highway 43, and on the south by the base line. It is a small area, a real area for elk hunting and moose. We'd like to keep it separate, have different regulations, and maybe use it in a way that would be more beneficial to all the hunters in that area.

Those three things are all I have to say at this time. I'd like to thank the minister for his close co-operation with all my recreation departments throughout the constituency. I appreciate that sometimes we don't get the cheques out on time, but we appreciate

what you're doing.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ADAIR: Thank you very much. Relative to master planning, certainly the fact that they can use the funds for new facilities and for debt retirement is in place now, although we place less priority on debt retirement than we do on new facilities. But if a community has completed its facilities on their master plan, debt retirement would move to the top. So they could utilize it for that particular case.

I think we have a major concern with the operating costs involved in new facilities going into the various communities. I think we spend a fair amount of time talking to the community, ensuring that they, hopefully, can cover those first five years of operating, and we can look at what may happen down the road.

One of the alternatives I'd like to be looking at is in the second year of our program when communities have all the facilities they need, that we may be able to adjust the program at that time. I say in the second phase, because basically before they were able to tap it they had to show us they could operate for the first five years. But we could look at what moneys were left, so to speak, in the account of, say, the community of Whitecourt that they could utilize on some basis other than facilities. So if all the facilities necessary were in place and a fairly large sum of money left — and debt retirement not a factor, in other words all paid off — they would appear to "lose" the balance of the funds. We should be looking at some alternatives for any of those unexpended funds.

Relative to your request for a park along Highway 43, I'll take that as notice and see just exactly where we are. I took it as notice last year, and I appreciate your patience in that respect.

Relative to that specific zone, I think I have to sit down with you and go back over that one. I had forgotten about that. I do remember us sitting down and my officials being out there talking with you. I'll certainly take another look at that one.

MR. TRYNCHY: If I may, Mr. Chairman, just to follow up on that first one, the five-year, second phase. Mr. Minister, I'm finding that a lot of communities might not get to the fifth year because they're strapped for funds. So I'm hoping maybe we could move that up a little.

MR. ADAIR: Well, if that's the case, I think we're going to have to tighten up the program even a little more right now. The AAMDC, the AUMA, and the likes have been very strong in ensuring that we be as strong as we can when we're talking to communities about utilizing those funds, and that we lay before them the pitfalls, if I can use that term, of operating a large facility. We have done that. As a matter of fact, I think the communities in many cases have been extremely responsible in scaling down the size of what was an original plan to what is now an acceptable, operable plan, and are doing a much better job in that particular respect.

Certainly one of the concerns we have is the escalation of costs. As a department, I think we're looking at some other areas as well, not necessarily relating to the program itself but the likes of what we might be able to do to assist in the area of, say, utility costs,

and whether there could be another category aside from residential and industrial, which might be called recreational, if I can use that term, that would be of a lower rate — a better break for the public facility that in fact is in place.

If we can come up with any suggestions, or if hon. members have any suggestions in that respect, I would appreciate them. Certainly one of our key points is that we have to be as firm as we can with the communities to ensure that they don't get in over their heads right off the bat. Lately they've certainly been pretty responsible in putting their master plans together. That's one of the advantages of the master plan: it gets all the service organizations and clubs in the area sitting down and talking to each other about what they have in place and what they need. Within that you can almost see a sort of levelling off of the attitude — at one time, almost a Taj Mahal attitude — that we'll build a big one and somebody will pay for it. It's now down to getting that facility in place, or maybe just renovating an existing facility rather than replacing it, because of the costs we're facing today.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I have a few comments to the minister. First, I would like to congratulate him on the support of the sports bodies he announced in his ministerial statement the other day, and on the group he introduced in the gallery, especially one, a guy by the name of Max Gibb, who is probably responsible in some way for the start of the Summer Games in Alberta. I remember quite a number of years ago, when he was the regional director in Lethbridge, he started something called the Southern Alberta Summer Games. Last year, I believe, that developed from small games to one of the largest, and it had — I could be wrong — upwards of 2,500 participants from various areas in southern Alberta. It was hosted at Taber. The emphasis is on participation, not necessarily excellence as in the other games. With the funding and with this gentleman as director, if he carries these ideas through into the Alberta Winter Games and Alberta Summer Games, I think they're going to be even better than the ones in Medicine Hat.

Another part I was pleased to hear was the minister's comment on the work to be done on Cypress Hills Park this year. We've been a long time getting to this stage, with the master plan and that. It's a happy sign when we can put most of these things behind us and get on with some of the plans in the works.

One thing to do with the park, though. We still have the problem of the wildlife, the elk and the moose. I wonder if the minister could comment on the steps toward remedying the situation they see would be taken and when. I know there is strong feeling in the area about the elk, also the moose, that don't seem to receive the publicity but the people in the area have very strong feelings on the same.

MR. ADAIR: Yes, certainly. I appreciate the kind remarks about the managing director of the Alberta Games Council, Max Gibb. Without a doubt he is just a super guy, short in height but tall in stature. He has lots of good ideas. He's a really exciting type of person, and I think he has excited a good number of communities toward applying for future Games.

Relative to Cypress Hills, we've had a couple of

fairly long, hot summers during which we've been involved with the people of the area, talking about master plans and the like and whose recommendations they should be. I think we have basically all of them sorted out.

The area of wildlife: I guess the best way of responding to the hon. member is to say that we had agreed and do agree that there has to be some reduction, particularly of the elk herd in there. Of course that's in co-operation with the discussions we had with the grazing associations relative to some reductions they're looking at as well.

As to how we carry that out, we're looking at special seasons and the like to accommodate the reduction of the elk population. My understanding is that not too long ago we did have a count. I believe we had 517 elk counted by aerial survey. We also had one of the grazing association people along with us in the aircraft when we were doing those surveys.

We had a reasonably successful feeding program in the park this year. I think it was quite well accepted by the ranchers in the area, trying to assist them to overcome a problem because of deep snow. I don't know that I can go much further at this point, other than that the staffs from the fish and wildlife division and the parks division are still working out what system we may be able to use, whether a permit hunt system or some shooting within the park by permit, and outside and around the park as well. Obviously that has taken place previously. But once that starts, they go back into the park, and we've got to do something. Hopefully we're looking at using a permit system in that regard.

They do have a hunting system to some degree on the Saskatchewan side. That also compounds the problem a little bit. They start shooting at them over there, and they come into Alberta. Then we shoot at them from outside the park, and they sort of sit within the park. Then when we get into the winter area, they move out to reap the benefits of the ranchers' fall work. It's been a bit of a problem for us. We recognize it. We recognize there has to be a reduction and accept that fact in co-operation with, I think, the very excellent discussions we've had with the ranchers in the area relative to some reductions in their area as well. I think it's been a mutually satisfying summer, if I can use that term, and this past winter of discussions that I hope will also be ongoing in that respect.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Minister, a couple of quick comments. I forgot to mention one item when I was up the first time. I believe about the first time your estimates went through you made a comment about an in-between park, somewhere between a highway camp kitchen and a provincial park. I have one area called Golden Sheaf Park, which the minister is aware of, that the Unifarm people want to close. They feel that even with the extra \$1,000, \$2,000, or whatever it was, it won't be sufficient. They checked it just the other day and found that the one small shed that was only half gone last year has the two-by-fours sitting in the corner now, and that's about all that's left. I believe they propose to close it sometime in May. I'm not too sure. I think they've given up with it. I would like to know if this idea of an in-between park is still going.

I didn't make one comment about the feeding pro-

gram. Some of the ranchers said to me that whether or not they agreed with the feeding program it was good to see the elk have something to eat. But they said, could the officials please take it a little further into the park and not on the fence line, because they'd go in and eat and then would come back out if they didn't have quite enough.

MR. ADAIR: Having flown over Cypress Hills Park and seen exactly where the feed was provided, it wasn't quite on the fence line. It started at the fence line and went up to the top of the hill. Of course choice of where the elk went was a little difficult for us to make. But it was reasonably successful, in the sense that they stayed there as long as we had feed there and then moved out.

With regard to the in-between park, that comes back to the categorization system. I'm anticipating getting approval of that within the next 60 days, so we can utilize — we have some funds in the budget for that. It was the likes of that particular one that I was talking about relative to Blood Indian reservoir and the recreation areas, rather than a park where you could in fact spend a smaller sum of money in a number of places and provide some recreation opportunity on a day-use basis for the people and thus spread out the opportunity. Because today's parks, as we move into the newer, larger parks where we're starting from scratch . . . A lot of the parks in the past were developed as a result of the likes of, say, Golden Sheaf or a community or service club park that got too big to handle and then was moved into the park system, redesigned, and redeveloped from that point on. When you are going into the larger one now, \$600,000 unfortunately doesn't go anywhere anymore. If for example with \$100,000 we could have five sites where we could spend \$20,000 and provide the base services like tables, toilet facilities, a water supply, and possibly a boat launch, that would serve a major purpose for the outdoor recreation people of Alberta in a number of areas, rather than going to what might be called a park. It would serve the same purpose, and we're looking for the beginning of that this summer.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Minister, I would hope you would once again consider Golden Sheaf, because your description of what you envisage this recreation area to be is almost there.

MR. ADAIR: Possibly I could just say, yes, I'll see what we can do in that area.

I have two notes handed to me. Toronto beat New York 5 to 1 on one note or 5 to 2 on the other note — but Toronto won.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. The member for Whitecourt raised the question of the major facility grant program. I wonder if the minister could give us an indication where things now stand in terms of the amount of funds allocated under the 10-year program in total. It was to be \$100 per capita for every man, woman, and child in the province, but so much per year. Looking over the estimates, I gather that varies depending on the applications. I'd like to know just where we stand in the allocation of that \$200 million.

Mr. Chairman, along with that question I'd like to ask the minister what kind of co-ordination takes place between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife with respect to the allocation of grants, because we do have on one hand the major facility grants and we also have the agriculture society grants. Just recently the agriculture society grants have been increased from \$50,000 maximum to \$75,000 maximum. I would assume that at this stage the government is not contemplating any increase in the \$100 per capita allocation, but there was a change, I believe last year, in the termination of the share between the local community and the province on the major facility program. I would like to know whether the government is satisfied with that change, or whether there are any plans to modify it still further. I am not talking about the regional complex. I'm talking about the community-based multipurpose facilities, opposed to the regional multipurpose facility.

The other aspect I'd like to raise is with respect to project co-operation, and I have some other questions on other matters. Are there any plans to change the funding under project co-operation at this stage? I'd also like to find out from the minister whether we have any statistics at this point on the number of full-time recreation directors employed by various recreation boards throughout the province and whether there's been any assessment on how valuable the role of the recreation director is. I've had representation made to me in both directions from people in my constituency, those who argue that it really isn't necessary, others who say, no, if you're properly going to utilize the community voluntary effort, you need someone to co-ordinate, and the role of an able recreation director as a co-ordinator, stimulator, and that sort of thing is very important. To what extent is that part of the government's priority at this point in time?

Mr. Chairman, I think those questions relate to the major facility grant program and the recreation end of it. I have several other questions on other items that I'll pose when the minister completes his answer on this.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to go by memory now on the first two years. I believe we had in the MCR program basically \$20 million a year for 10 years. Of course the first year didn't see the total utilization of that, nor did the second. I believe it was \$13 million and \$17 million in the first two years. This past year just completed we used \$25 million of that. So to date we have used roughly \$45 million of the dollars provided to the program. We are including in the budget this year \$23 million, because we anticipated last year and this year being the two peak years and then levelling off a little bit again. So \$23 million is included in the program for use by the communities this year.

Relative to the ag. societies, we have an interdepartmental committee that worked together on applications that involve facilities that may be partly funded by the ag. society, because we have to ensure that they are not in a position of receiving a grant from the ag. society in the Department of Agriculture and then using that as part of their portion to get another grant from government. It's been working very well indeed. The people in Agriculture are work-

ing very closely with us to ensure that that doesn't happen, and it's properly explained to the communities as to what the moneys are to be used for on both sides.

Relative to project co-operation, no, we don't anticipate changing the ratio right now. There is an increase in the program, but that basically relates just to the population: as it increases so does the program to accommodate for those people who are coming into the province as permanent residents.

I don't have the figures right at my fingertips as to the number of full-time recreation directors employed by the various communities in the province of Alberta. I could take that as notice and provide that to you. I'm sure we do have it in the department. I don't have it with me, though, at this particular time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to pursue several other questions, and then I want to make a comment. First of all, Mr. Minister, I'd be interested in where things now stand in the planning for Dunvegan. I realize that there have been some fairly serious difficulties in any planning in that area because of the possibility of constructing perhaps a billion dollar dam two miles up the river. But it would now appear from the Dunvegan dam study and the plans of the Department of Utilities and Telephones, the utilities planning council, and what have you that we're some distance down the road at least before the government would consider going ahead on a dam at Dunvegan. That being the case, I would be interested to know whether at this stage the department has any plans to embark upon expansion at the current campsite.

The suggestion at one time was made, and I thought it was a very good one, that Dunvegan would be a unique area not only for a campsite as presently exists, but for a provincial historical park. It's one of the oldest sites in the entire province of Alberta, more than 200 years old. In terms of recapturing our history, the whole concept of developing an historical park on the Peace River at Dunvegan is in my view a very exciting proposition that would blend together both the Department of Culture and the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife and, as well, would have significant ramifications as far as Mr. Dowling's Department of Tourism is concerned. I realize the hang-up today has been the dam, but it seems to me this is one of those areas where we have all the advantages: of being central in the Peace, of having historical significance, of having very scenic landscape. In my view, it's well worth going ahead.

Before I go into some of the other questions, because they're in slightly different areas, I'd welcome a response from the minister.

MR. ADAIR: Boy you take a long time.

Mr. Chairman, it has been very well explained. The hon. member has in fact basically hit on exactly where we're at with it. It has been discussed as an historical park, and that would involve the Department of Culture, historic sites people, as well as the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. To use the term "you're right on", it has been in a sort of hold position as to just what the implications down the road may be, but certainly not a standstill position. They've been looking at the possible acquisition of some lands and what may be the total area that

could be utilized, because it probably does have some of the best land surface in the province of Alberta with some history behind it, as well as the little old church down there at the bottom. It's presently a campsite operated by Transportation, as you know, and there is a sort of hold on the area to ensure it could be utilized for an historical park at some time. The planning is in very preliminary stages at this moment, awaiting some of the final decisions that may well be made relative to the Dunvegan Dam.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, two questions in slightly different areas. The hon. Member for Camrose raised the question of wolves, and I thought the minister skirted it with some ability and agility. But I won't bring up the question of wolves; I will bring up the question of beavers and bears. One complaint often heard in northern Alberta — I'm sure the minister gets it from his constituency too — is that while we all love our national animal dearly, the little dears can be pests when they block up streams and those streams flood many acres of land. The hon. member from Lethbridge — they don't know what beavers are like down there; they don't have any water. They're trying to get the water from the north. Mr. Minister, I can understand the sort of philosophy of the fish and wildlife people, but at the same time there have been some problems, in my view.

The second question is with respect to the bears and the beekeepers. There was a program of assistance a year or so back to keep bears away by setting up electric fences around the places where hives are kept. Where does that now stand? I had one of my constituents call me the other day and say, hey, that program is no longer in place. So are we going to find that we don't have . . . We have a new member from the Calgary riding Mr. Ludwig used to represent, Mr. Kushner. But when Mr. Ludwig was here, we always had an eloquent and passionate appeal on behalf of the beavers and the bears. I'm not here to make an appeal on behalf of either, quite frankly, but the fact of the matter is that there was a program. Where does that now stand? Has there been any change in the program as far as beekeepers are concerned?

MR. ADAIR: Relative to beavers and bears, I've often said that I'd like to cross a beaver with somebody who doesn't care to work, and maybe we'd get somebody who would work and a beaver that didn't care. But certainly they are probably the most ambitious animal there is, and with the last couple of years of rains we've had, in the Peace River country particularly, we've had some major problems. Relative to that we are working — as a matter of fact this year with the Department of Agriculture assisting us as well in the predator control area — to try to see if we can speed up the process to ensure that we get the permits out to those who want to blow their dams and the like.

In the area of the bears and the bees, my understanding is that we're reviewing that program with again — the Department of Agriculture was involved before. They were the provider of the funds for the fencing materials that went around, and of course we would then come on request and remove the bears. In some cases we were packing the bears, if I can use that term, as far as 60 miles away. They were putting radio collars on them, and they were coming back.

We've used certain types of taste aversion to see if that can be a deterrent. I think it's working to some degree, but not as well as we would like.

One of the proposals before us right now from the Beekeepers' Association, presented to both the Department of Agriculture and us, is a request for a change in the fencing program. We've reached the stage where they have developed an immunity — I think that would be the term to use — to the one type of fencing we have been using. We're having to go to a better type of fence. Also in their request they are looking at some small compensation for the possibility of maintaining those fences. We're looking at that right now. To my knowledge the other program has not stopped, but we're looking at changing it at their request.

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Minister. I want to move very quickly into what is undoubtedly a very delicate area, an area that I guess it would probably be unfair of me to expect an answer from the minister on, but I think the appropriate place to raise it is during these estimates; that is, with respect to the Commonwealth Games. Mr. Chairman, I think the Commonwealth Games are really going to be a tremendously exciting experience for all of us. No question of that. And when we have people from throughout the Commonwealth, we're going to have athletes from areas of the world that have important cultural differences. There's no question about that.

Mr. Chairman, I'm just saying this as one member of the Legislature. It does seem to me that if we are talking about the Commonwealth Games, we must recognize that certain underlying principles bind the Commonwealth together, and among those principles is the rule of law. While there can be immense differences in the kinds of governments that operate and the 'isms', whether on the left or the right, it seems to me there has to be in the Commonwealth that underlying commitment to the very basis of the parliamentary system and the whole concept of British justice.

Now that raises an extremely ticklish question, and I don't expect the minister to stand up and answer this. I know that the question of whether Uganda is represented at the Commonwealth Games is not within the purview of either this province or the city of Edmonton. But I raise that as one person who has observed and taken the trouble to do some investigation, who has investigated some of the horror stories coming out of Uganda. Often it is fine for us to criticize certain types of nations, but we're a little worried about doing it if it's a black nation or a nation of another color. I don't think human rights has any color barrier.

What exists today in Uganda is a state of terror which, in my view, is completely inconsistent with the basic principles of the Commonwealth. That being the case, as one member of this Assembly I would have to say I hope that the day will come when the people of Uganda change their leadership and can once again enjoy the basic principles of what the Commonwealth is all about. But until that day comes, I for one do not believe that someone like the present president of Uganda can fit in with the principles of the Commonwealth.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, very seldom do we really agree on some of our philosophies, but in that case I certainly can agree with the statements just made by the hon. member. Relative to the Commonwealth Games and who might and might not come, I think one factor that might be considered is the state of unrest in those countries you are speaking about, and the fact that I personally would not think that anybody as a leader of the country would be away from the country for any length of time. He may not have a country or a spot to go back to, and that may be one of the deterrents that possibly will have a bearing on whether or not that particular gentleman comes.

On the more positive side, certainly from the standpoint of the number of nations that are coming to the Games, the general acceptance of Canada and what Canada has done, not just for the Commonwealth but the world, is certainly evident in the total numbers that have accepted the invitation to come to the Games. My understanding right now is that we have equalled the number of countries that in fact have come to any of the Games. I believe that is 42. Now whether the forty-second one is in yet or not, there has been an indication they are coming. So the Commonwealth Games Foundation is at the point of at least tying the greatest number of countries ever to participate in the Commonwealth Games. I'm hopeful that the Games themselves, classed as the friendly games, will carry that message, that in fact we are one and a part of each other, and that the games will run. I certainly have every reason to believe that they will, with every degree of smoothness and effort as a result of both the Foundation and the many thousands of volunteers here in the city of Edmonton and from the surrounding area who are going to take part as well. I think it's a concern to all of us.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I want to cover one point with the minister, and he did make some remarks just within the last half hour that I appreciated very much. It's my understanding, Mr. Minister, that you are setting up a new category of camping areas in which there may be an allotment of, say, \$20,000 available to a community area. I'm not sure what you call them at the present time. I'd like to say that the one park I've been raising with you was the McGregor Lake area, and over the years I've been making the submission that it should be a provincial park. But in terms of examining what goes on there and what happens — and I think I said this a year ago and I said it two years ago — if we only had a person there with a bit of equipment and the capability of keeping some order in the place, providing wood, and doing just some basics, that would even be satisfactory to the people at this point in time.

What happened in the McGregor Lake area, for example, was that many people started coming in from Calgary. The people looking after the park were volunteers. We did try to pay them with the \$2,000, but it just wasn't adequate to keep a person there or maybe get a truck of some kind, a spade, or whatever it was. The people threw up their hands and gave up, and the thing has deteriorated to some extent since then because of that very factor. Now if the minister is talking in terms of some kind of in-between category between a municipal park or a little local park of some of the Lions clubs and a large park, I commend him completely on that concept. I think that is a very,

very good idea and will meet a terrific amount of need across the province at the present time. It will make a lot of people very, very satisfied. So I would like the minister to comment on that to see if I have interpreted him correctly.

MR. ADAIR: Yes, generally you have, except that I think once the categorization system is in place we would designate some lands as park lands so that we could spend park dollars, if I can use that term, to upgrade it. So it would be part of the parks system, but may be called a recreation area. I use that as the name. It may not be that, but that's the concept. Where we would have a smaller parcel of land — and I was using the example of the Blood Indian reservoir, where you have the lead-in, day-use facilities, toilet facilities that would go along with that; water supply, boat launch, turnaround, and the likes of that — it would provide a sort of organized space.

One of the options from that would be attempting to try to elaborate on what Dr. Horner, the Minister of Transportation, has done with some of the campsites. That is to have a service club or organization in the area contract to look after it, where they would be paid to provide that service, which would be garbage pickup and the likes of wood supply, which I think would meet the requirements we're talking about in the case of McGregor Lake. I haven't got it in place yet. As I was saying, I'm hoping to have it in place within the next 60 days so we can get a start on it. It would be a modest start to start with, to see just how it goes. But I have every reason to believe that in the short, five-year term that would answer a lot of the problems we have from communities; the likes of people who are saying we have a problem at McGregor Lake and Golden Sheaf or those other areas where there have been large influxes of people other than from the local area it was initially set up for.

The likes of the number of recreation vehicles we have in the area now — all over Alberta and Canada people are very, very mobile. They move around to areas they like. If they happen to pick that particular spot, it becomes extremely difficult to handle when you have them all converging on a very small spot. Basically that is the concept we're looking at: creating an area we could designate as park lands under The Provincial Parks Act and thus be able to utilize our park funds for the creation of a day-use or recreation area.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Supplementary to the minister. I certainly make a request to the minister at this time that he put McGregor Lake on that list and consider it as one of those types of facilities. In the last four years, this is one of the moments where I feel I can give full credit to that decision of the minister and his department.

I wonder if the minister could comment on that request and on any progress made with regard to a city park or some type of park facility at the city of Lethbridge. We discussed a couple of years ago that Lethbridge wanted to look at the Oldman River valley as a possible park area. I wonder if any progress has been made with regard to that. If the minister could answer those two questions, I would appreciate it.

MR. ADAIR: That's the urban park concept, and as I stated the last couple of years, we're now getting very

close to finishing Capital City and Fish Creek Park, Calgary. I had indicated that we wanted more or less to finish those and see what kinds of costs, runs, or overruns — if that were the case, and I don't think it will be — we are going to run into in both of the metropolitan parks, and then look at a plan that would allow us to work with the other urban centres, which would be the likes of Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, Drumheller, Red Deer, Grande Prairie, and any of the larger urban centres. I would like to call them regional centres rather than cities, because I think a number of centres in fact have rivers running through. As a matter of fact, I happen to live in one that has a river running through that may have the possibility of a small park concept.

We are looking at the implications, and following along very closely with the construction costs and the like for Capital City and Fish Creek, Calgary, attempting to put together a plan. At this time I can't say when it will be presented, but it would be on the basis of using that same concept for the other urban centres in the province that we have put in place for the two metropolitan centres.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I have two other questions, Mr. Chairman. I'd like the minister to comment with regard to McGregor Lake in this possible new program, so I'm clear as to whether or not there is a possibility of going that direction. That's number one. Number two: the Summer Games were mentioned earlier. Last year we had them in Taber, and this coming year they're going to be in Raymond, I understand. I had some comment from the committees at that time that there wasn't adequate financing for those particular Games. For example, I know I had comments from the trapshooters. They were saying it's very costly to buy the shells and so on, and to put an entry fee in. I'm not too sure how the Games made out in total, but I was wondering if the minister has maybe reconsidered some of the financing for that type of summer games.

Thirdly, I have had concern in my pre-session meeting and in my intersession meeting with regard to trout fishing, particularly in southern Alberta. A number of people — and I made the comment in the House the other day — say they have to go to Montana to have adequate trout or lake fishing. Why can't we stock our lakes like that? I know the minister is attempting to put one fish hatchery in place. Does the minister see that meeting the necessary requirements, and will other fish hatcheries be made available in, say, the next few years?

MR. ADAIR: Well, I'll try to answer the questions. McGregor Lake: if that policy goes into place, I would see it possibly fitting into that one. I'm not sure where it would be in the area. I have three right now, and I've tried to use the areas — one south, one central, and one north — so that I don't pick any favorites to start with. But I would see that being the type of situation that could occur with that lake.

The other one, I believe, was regional Games. We're talking about regional Games now. There's been some slight increase. I have to check now. We started at \$3,000, and I believe we went up to \$4,000 for them, so there's been a slight increase. We know it's not totally enough for the actual Games, but raising their own funds to operate, getting everybody

involved, was also part of the concept of having the Games.

I haven't had any major requests about any shortage of funds in that particular area. I can't respond other than that. We did increase it from \$3,000 to \$4,000.

Relative to the fish situation, we have had some difficulties over the last number of years. We anticipate that once we've established our own capability that should generally handle our own stocking, recognizing too that there are some differences in the type of situation they have in Montana. I think we have to broaden our program to include other species of fish besides the trout family and look at other stocking possibilities.

We're also looking at increasing the number of man-made fish ponds, if I can call them that, in the south and particularly relative to — I believe the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest was talking about the need for the likes of fishing ponds in the Eastern Slopes and providing that opportunity. Kananaskis Country will have some increased fishing opportunity by way of some impoundments of water that will allow us to stock those areas.

One of the problems we faced relative to stocking streams was the high degree of fish loss because of putting fish into cold water and they, in turn, being killed by the resident fish in the stream.

I guess the short answer to the hon. member's question is that we anticipate that once Allison Creek and the Raven both reach capacity, we will be reasonably well off for a fairly good number of years with

our own stock. Now whether we in fact have some capacity to ship beyond our borders — we would then be subject to the kinds of regulations already in place for interprovincial transport of fish, as well as the U.S., across to our end. So I think we're mainly concerned with our own stock at the moment, ensuring we have that capability to have our own egg supply and keep our fish hatchery going.

I would see the possibility down the road, and I say down the road, of another fish hatchery in the province at some point.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise, report very little progress, and ask leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration a certain resolution, reports progress on the same, and asks leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report and the request for leave to sit again, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 10:10 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Friday at 10 a.m.]

