

*Oral Questions***ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS**

CONTAMINATION OF WATER SUPPLY AT BANFF, ALTA.

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of the Environment who is responsible for national parks, I direct my question to the first acting minister, the hon. Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. For two months or more the people of Banff have been very concerned, to put it mildly, about a parasite in their water which causes diarrhoea, vomiting, cramps, and sometimes swollen limbs. This parasite is carried by beavers which are a protected species. I advised the minister about this about a month ago. What action is the government taking to make the water safe?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Madam Speaker, if I may, I will take notice, of what appears to me to be a slightly technical question, for the Minister of the Environment. I will try to bring the hon. member an answer perhaps tomorrow.

Mr. Taylor: Madam Speaker, I thank the minister. I notified the office of the Minister of the Environment about the question. I thought he might have given the first acting minister the information.

NECESSITY FOR FILTRATION PLANT

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Madam Speaker, regulations in the Alberta department of the environment give the department the authority to order a filtration plant where the water is of poor quality or where there is a dangerous parasite in the water. This is seldom used, however, because town councils are just as anxious as the department to keep their water supply good. Will the government, since it is responsible for the townsite of Banff, order a filtration plant or instal a filtration plant in order to protect the water for local inhabitants and also for the thousands of tourists who will shortly be coming to that area?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Madam Speaker, I will certainly bring that to the minister's attention.

* * *

[Translation]

AIRPORTS

SALE OF EXPROPRIATED LANDS AT MIRABEL—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Public Works. Last week, the government decided to sell off one third of the expropriated land at Mirabel, that is, 35,000 acres out of a total of 96,000. What is the government going to do with the remaining 60,000 acres? Why not get rid of the rest as well?

● (1450)

[English]

Hon. Paul J. Cosgrove (Minister of Public Works): Madam Speaker, as many hon. members know better than I, the decision of the government followed a year-long study by a commission, a company established to take a look at land uses around the airport. It was as a result of those intensive studies and negotiations with all persons affected concerning the airport lands that there was a recommendation that all of the lands, in light of the experience at the airport over the last few years, were not required. Some lands were to be returned to private ownership and other lands were retained on the advice of experts, for example, for the ministry of transportation, who indicated that in order to serve two purposes, that is, to permit the airport to be established, without terrible inconvenience or safety hazard to the people in the area, a certain amount of the acreage could be released back to private ownership, which decision was finally reached.

Mr. Skelly: It is a very surprising response, Madam Speaker, especially to fall back on the defence that a year-long study was conducted, considering the sabotage done to the Kent Commission. The government really should not have any qualms about proceeding in a more equitable manner, at least in one case.

SELL-BACK PRICE OF EXPROPRIATED LANDS

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): I would like to ask the minister a supplementary question. The proposal of the government is to sell back the property at today's market prices, less 15 per cent. In the interest of fairness, would the minister not be prepared at least to allow those individuals whose land was expropriated to purchase back that land at the price at which their land was expropriated plus the accumulated interest?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Skelly: Fair ball.

Hon. Paul J. Cosgrove (Minister of Public Works): Madam Speaker, one of the reasons the study did take a year's time was in order to be fair and to find a formula which was, in fact, fair. It was no easy task to hit upon a formula which could be fair to the taxpayer of Canada in general, that is, the person putting up the funds for acquisition of the property, and which would spell out to whom, how, and under what basis we could manage a resale of the property to people in the area. That was difficult, and we did attempt to be fair. It was a complicated question, taking into account assessment of market values. That was a matter involving not only technical advice but also some appreciation by people in the area. That is why we had representatives from a broad spectrum of the community on that committee trying to decide what would be a fair formula to people in the community.