

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA****Title: Tuesday, June 12, 1979 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

**head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 11****The Alberta Income Tax  
Amendment Act, 1979**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, The Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, 1979.

This Bill incorporates three initiatives: first, enrichment of the selective personal income tax reduction, benefiting more than a quarter of a million lower income Albertans at a cost of \$38 million. Secondly, it improves the formula for assistance to renters by increasing benefits for those with lower taxable incomes by \$3 million. Thirdly, it drops from 11 per cent to 5 per cent the corporate income tax on income earned in Alberta by small companies qualifying for federal small-business deduction. That will assist over 17,000 businesses, providing benefits of about \$40 million.

[Leave granted; Bill 11 read a first time]

**Bill 13****The Workers' Compensation  
Amendment Act, 1979**

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 13, The Workers' Compensation Amendment Act, 1979. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of the Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

The Bill provides for an increase of 10 per cent in the compensation of permanent pensions. It also provides for the board's fiscal year to be the calendar year rather than July 1 to June 30.

[Leave granted; Bill 13 read a first time]

**head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to table with the Legislature a document known as the Buffalo Lake Regulation Study, Phase One, done by Environmental Engineering.

In addition, under The Land Surface Conservation and Reclamation Act, I wish to table the annual report of the surface reclamation fund.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to file two copies of the consultants' report on compensation under The Surface Rights Act.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a response to Motion for a Return No. 103.

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to file three copies of a report by the provincial Ombudsman on allegations of racial discrimination contained in a report of the Metis Association of Alberta, 1979.

**head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Member for Edmonton Meadowlark, it gives me great pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 30 students in the public gallery from St. Justin school. They are accompanied by their teacher, Miss Kathy Lamothe. I'd ask that they rise and receive the customary greeting of the House.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 18 grade 5 students from the Newton elementary school in Edmonton Highlands constituency. They are accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Yewchuk. They are seated in the members gallery. I would ask that they rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in introducing some 30 very enthusiastic youngsters from grade 5 in Grandview elementary school in the constituency of Edmonton Parkallen. They are touring the Legislature today and observing its business, accompanied by their group leader Miss Maslen. I would ask that these students and their parents and group leader rise and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I too want to join the members here in welcoming a class of some 55 grade 5 students from the Elizabeth Seton school in the constituency of Edmonton Beverly. They are accompanied by their teachers Serge Magliocco and Sylvia Adams. I would ask them to rise and receive the usual welcome from the Assembly.

**head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Education of the Handicapped**

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to clarify a comment I made yesterday regarding the resource centres for the dependent handicapped. In response to a question from the hon. Member for Little Bow, I indicated that some 17 contract positions had now been provided by the Department of Social Services and Community Health to the Edmonton Public School Board. In fact it was part of the proposal that those positions would be in place. As I indicated, that responsibility would be transferred from this department to the Department of Education.

**Day Care**

MR. BOGLE: While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I'll respond to a question from the hon. Member for Clover Bar regarding any studies which have been done on day care relating to private corporations. The answer is

no, there have been no such studies from our department.

#### **Municipal Works — Cold Lake Area**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask my first question of the hon. Deputy Premier, the minister responsible for economic affairs. My question concerns promises made by the government, by the former Minister of Municipal Affairs, to the mayors of Cold Lake and Grand Centre this past February with respect to the funding of a regional water and sewer system to service Grand Centre, Cold Lake, Canadian Forces Base Cold Lake, and the Cold Lake Indian Reserve. Is the government now in a position to honor those commitments to those communities?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, my understanding of that matter is that in fact there was a commitment to some special assistance for the water lines that might be developed in those three communities, but naturally that would have to await the outcome and the report from the ERCB. In the meantime, a co-ordinator of several departments is working in the area, and getting strong support from the MLA in the area, relative to the various problems that are going to be associated with major developments in the Cold Lake-Grand Centre area.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the Deputy Premier indicate if any commitment in writing has been made to these communities? I'd like to bring to the Deputy Premier's attention that in two of these areas the municipalities are hesitant to give out building permits because of the problem they're having with these major services. Is the government in a position to make a firm commitment to these communities?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that a letter has gone from Municipal Affairs. I'm sure the hon. member hasn't had a chance to understand the debt reduction program, but substantial changes in the financing of sewer and water came about with the introduction of that program and of new direct grants from the Department of Environment.

My colleagues in Environment and Municipal Affairs may want to supplement that answer.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Environment indicate if there's been a commitment by his department to these communities to help them with their problems with the water and sewer systems?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, with regard to sewer and water, the new program which came into place April 1 makes provision for the initial capital costs, up to \$200, to be passed on to the residents, and the balance, to a maximum 90 per cent and a total of \$2,000, to be picked up by the province of Alberta. In addition, I think the Deputy Premier has referred to the \$500 per capita funding, which is pending and in which the funds will be used to retire earlier debts in the area of water and sewer.

Our department is encouraging the use of regional systems, and it will be part of our direction with regard to both Cold Lake and Grand Centre.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Environment. Is the minister in a position to indicate if his department has been doing any studies to find out if the sewage treatment system in that area is adequate or inadequate, so that there would be no danger of pollution of Cold Lake, which I'm sure the minister is aware is probably one of the cleanest lakes in the province?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether I can answer that specific question regarding sewage systems. I have been in some discussions with the member for the area, and no reference has yet come over my desk as to that particular concern. If it is a concern, I would appreciate receiving comments from the municipalities concerned.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, along that line to the Minister of Environment. Have the minister or members of his department been looking into the public hearings — the discussion that was taking place that water would be taken from Cold Lake for the proposed Imperial Oil plant? Is the minister in a position to indicate what studies the department is carrying out to find out the effects of lowered levels of Cold Lake, if the pipeline were not built from the North Saskatchewan and water were taken directly from Cold Lake?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that as notice.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my last question to the Deputy Premier, so there's no misunderstanding. As of now, Mr. Deputy Premier, there is no commitment in writing to these communities that the government of the province of Alberta will pick up the major costs of major water and sewer projects in that area?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I think I answered that question earlier by simply saying that there is the new environmental program just outlined by my colleague and that there is a letter outlining the assistance to these communities. And it's there. But I think the hon. member shouldn't be too premature until we get a report saying whether the project is going ahead.

DR. BUCK: I'm not being premature, Mr. Speaker. It's just that you'd think that an oral commitment is the same as a written commitment, and this is ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, so the Deputy Premier is saying there is no commitment in writing.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, that's not what I said. I said there is a letter that the former ministers involved wrote to the communities. I also reminded the hon. member that there has been a change in the funding through the Department of Environment. Those things have to be taken into consideration.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Deputy Premier. Will this problem of water and sewer in the towns of Cold Lake and Grand Centre be dealt with through the normal programming available to any other community in Alberta, or will some type of special consideration be given because of the

potential influx of population and the weight that can go on the tax base?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I think it will probably end up being a combination of both. We've done some things previously in the province, relative to the Red Deer water line, and as my colleague has outlined, we'll be looking at the overall policy of regional water lines.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has the government commissioned any studies, and have official discussions with local governments been undertaken, to ensure that local programs, all the way from sewage treatment facilities to additional areas for housing expansion, are in a position to go immediately, should the okay be given by the provincial cabinet? I raise that question in light of the increase in capital works budget now, before we get into competition with major projects.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the provision of infrastructure in the Cold Lake area is in the planning stages, with respect to any decision that might be made on that project's going ahead. We are simply not moving to provide accommodation for an influx of large numbers of people without having before us the Energy Resources Conservation Board report. Those hearings were concluded only a week or so ago. We don't expect the report for some time yet, and would make a decision sometime after that. It's unreasonable to suggest we would be moving ahead with servicing lots and building a development in either of those communities for an influx of people that we don't yet know is going to come. But yes, the planning is progressing and, I think, satisfactorily.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, or perhaps the hon. Deputy Premier. Should the ERCB give the go-ahead and the cabinet finally decide, is the government at this stage considering as one of the options deferring the commencement for a specific period of time to allow the gearing up of the infrastructure so we don't get into the situation that arose in Fort McMurray?

DR. HORNER: No, Mr. Speaker. I think the amount of lead time the design engineering requires will give adequate time to put all these other things in place.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a short supplementary. Can the Deputy Premier assure the taxpayers in the area that the project for upgrading sewer and water will not be borne just by the taxpayers presently there, but that there will be increased funding by the provincial government?

Mr. Deputy Premier, I think the concern the people have is that through the ordinary mechanism the people there will have to bear the tax load for the people who will be coming in, until we get to a major point where we presume the provincial government would do something.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, that's the very point of the new environmental sewer and water grants as

direct grants, instead of having the people there heavily finance the front end relative to sewer and water expansion.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary will be to the Minister of Environment. It's very interesting to see that the hon. Member for Clover Bar has a real interest in the water situation in Cold Lake.

Could the minister advise whether he has had representation from the hon. member about the water concern in the town of Lamont, which is in the Clover Bar constituency?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We would have to change the practice in the question period considerably if we were going to ventilate correspondence between members and ministers.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could provide a supplementary answer to some of the earlier questions involving this matter of water and sewer services in the Cold Lake region.

When the former Minister of Municipal Affairs visited that region to discuss financial problems they might have with regard to that particular part of the infrastructure, it was after we had made a decision to bring in the municipal debt reduction program, effectively eliminating the benefits communities had from the water and sewer program in the Department of Environment, which members should recall was a debt-shielding arrangement.

Since that time, of course, a very extensive new program has been developed by the Department of Environment. It was announced some time ago. Quite frankly, that program was developed with regions like Cold Lake and Grand Centre in mind. Indeed, if the hon. member would care to ask the Minister of Environment for copies of that new program, he'll see that a very, very substantial amount of capital funding is provided for water and sewer systems, with the criteria that the municipality picks up the first part of the expenditure and then the Department of Environment comes in with the balance, which is pretty extensive.

The commitment really made to that region was that through government programs, whether regular or special ones, we would try to ensure that the property tax payers in that area would not have to bear any inordinate tax increases because of the development in the area. We're trying to do that, taking into consideration the various programs available for municipal infrastructure, whether for water and sewer, Alberta Housing Corporation programs, or whatever.

#### Embassy Move

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my second question is to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. But before I do that, I'd like to thank the hon. Member for Vegreville for his brilliant contribution to the question period.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the Premier did not seem to be too concerned about the move of the Canadian embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, is the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs now in a position to indicate if further representations have been made by Alberta businesses as to the effect of this move on Alberta business?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I don't necessarily agree with the tone of the question — a lack of interest on behalf of the Premier. But I think the Premier made it very clear that the question of the location of embassies or External Affairs offices is clearly and rightly within the jurisdiction of the federal government.

In the meantime, however, we have received a couple of communications from several firms across the province stating their concern with respect to that decision which could be made by the federal government.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate what representation has been made by his department to the equivalent department in the federal government as to the concerns Albertans have?

MR. JOHNSTON: As the Premier indicated in his answer last Friday, June 8, we would commit to communicate to the Prime Minister a collective expression on behalf of the companies that have expressed their concerns to us. Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, it's a jurisdiction which is the right and the responsibility of the federal government.

I think to speculate further, both as to the decision and as to the possible outcome, leads us down a wrong direction for the question period.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister: has the government of Alberta made a representation or not? As this move will affect Alberta businesses if it is made, has the government department made that representation or not?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I indicated in the answer that we would continue to pass on to the Prime Minister the concerns of Alberta industries.

DR. BUCK: But have you?

MR. JOHNSTON: We share the view that that is their responsibility. That is not to deny that we are ignoring the responsibility and the implications of that decision for private-sector operations in Alberta. However, I'm sure that responsibility is theirs. There will be a substantial opportunity for representation by the federal Alberta caucus as well.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Has any informal representation been made by the government of Alberta to members of the federal caucus concerning this matter, in view of the fact that large numbers of Alberta dollars and business opportunities are jeopardized by this decision? By this possible decision. I should say, in view of the fact that the federal government now seems to be backing away from it.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, to the contrary, of course we're not backing away. In this role of the provinces in Confederation certain jurisdictions are clearly spelled out, and this one is the responsibility of the federal government. That is not to say that we do not share the concern, but we have not specifically communicated with the Prime Minister. However, as we indicated last Friday, we have passed on to the Prime Minister the collective views of the private sector in this province.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for clarification. In his answer "share the concern", does the minister express the position of the government of Alberta, that this government is in fact concerned about the impact on the Alberta economy of the possible move from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, since we are a government supporting the private sector, which we understand has been very successful, which generates jobs and real economic growth, obviously we are.

DR. BUCK: Never mind the speech, Johnston, just tell the Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is it the position of the Alberta government that Alberta as a province is concerned about this rather ill thought-out policy of the federal government?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Perhaps the hon. minister's words were lost in a certain amount of static that arose at that time, but he did specifically answer that very question.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Economic Development. Could the minister indicate if the government is going to assess the impact of the possible move on Alberta industry, and if that particular department would give assistance to such industries as ATCO Industries in locating other markets should that move take place?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, all I can say at this time is that we will carefully monitor any impact that might come out of some development in the world market scene. But that has not happened yet. Therefore the present marketing assistance would be available to any companies that wanted to go to practically any place in the world to do additional trade.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Is the minister in a position today. Mr. Speaker, to indicate what representation, and how extensive, has been made by Alberta businesses to the minister's department expressing concern about the possible move?

MR. JOHNSTON: As I tried to indicate, Mr. Speaker, we have received either direct correspondence or copies of correspondence to the federal government. Those directed to us will be passed on to the Prime Minister, and copies of communications directed by the private sector to the Prime Minister are for our information.

Let's not deny the ability of the private sector to articulate its position. To suggest otherwise, I think, would be unfair.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. I understand the question must be answered by the federal government. But in a position of influence such as the Alberta government has, is the minister on behalf of the government going to articulate an Alberta position to the federal government?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I think there will be an opportunity for us to touch on several areas of concern to the province of Alberta. I'm sure at one point or another in the near term we will be discussing a range of issues. If we assign priorities, obviously that will be one of them, if it appears that that decision will be made and that, as others have speculated, there's going to be some kind of reaction on behalf of some foreign country.

But I think it's fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that at this point we're really dealing in the realm of the futuristic and the speculative. A lot can happen in time, beyond what has been suggested by the leader ...

DR. BUCK: Acting.

MR. JOHNSTON: ... Acting Leader of the Opposition, let's say.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question, if I may, to the hon. Minister of State for Economic Development — International Trade. In view of the Iran conference where funding was made available from the province, I'd ask the minister whether his department or office is in a position to advise us whether that particular office will be making studies of the impact of this proposed move on the business opportunities of Alberta firms that were gained at a conference at least partially subsidized by the province of Alberta.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, we're quite aware of the potential market in the Middle East and other countries being obtained from the exhibition at Bahrain. At the same time, my office has not received a single letter from any of the businessmen in Alberta regarding the discussion point that has been brought up in the House.

DR. BUCK: They don't even know you're there yet, Horst.

#### **World Student Games**

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Recreation and Parks. Would the minister indicate whether he's reviewing the matter of provincial support for the World Student Games proposed for the city of Edmonton, and whether he's had communication from the mayor of Edmonton regarding the matter?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, so far I've had no direct communication with the mayor of Edmonton. But I'd like to point out to the hon. member that this government's commitment to amateur sports has been very extensive in the past few years. It's my wish that this commitment continue.

DR. PAPROSKI: I'm pleased to hear that, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister also indicate to the House whether this support may be in capital or operating areas, or both?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, it's premature to answer that question, positively or negatively. I'm waiting for the mayor to come forward with his proposal, if there is a proposal. I'd wish to sit down with him and discuss

what is necessary, whether funds or facilities. Until that time, we'll just wait and see what happens.

#### **Handicapped Income Assistance**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health, and ask if the government at this time has a date when handicapped Albertans will be eligible for payments under the proposed Alberta assured income for the handicapped.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne indicated the program would hopefully be implemented by the end of the calendar year. I hope the legislation to provide for that program will be introduced very shortly. If it is given assent this spring, the department will of course carry on with its gear-up work. So if everything goes according to the schedule we've outlined, we would be in a position to provide the first benefits for the program prior to the end of the calendar year.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to confirm to the Legislature that the government last week rejected a design prepared by the department for this program?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member like to clarify what he's referring to?

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the question is: is the minister in a position to confirm whether in the last few days the cabinet has in fact rejected a program design prepared by the Department of Social Services and Community Health?

MR. SPEAKER: We're going to have very busy question periods if we start discussing the minutes or proceedings of cabinet meetings. I'm sure the hon. member is aware that that sort of question is not asked in the question period.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question then. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether the government has come to any conclusion on what the income and assets test for the assured income program should be, and whether the present program for senior citizens is the one being used by the government in this stage of their planning?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview would like to get into the debate, and I ask him to be patient. Once the Bill is introduced, we'll certainly get into that kind of discussion.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is it the intention of the government to introduce the Bill during the spring session, or will it be held over until the fall?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure I was very clear on that point in the first question I answered, when I indicated it was our intention to introduce the legislation this spring. Depending on the kind of debate and interest from hon. members of this Assembly, it's my desire to see Royal Assent given, so that the depart-

ment can carry on with its important work of implementing the legislation, and so that the first benefits may flow through prior to the end of the calendar year.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the \$36.5 million allocated in the budget this year an estimate of the program for a full fiscal year or for a period of four months?

MR. SPEAKER: I have some concern about the question. We're now getting into budget debate. If the hon. minister wishes to answer briefly, perhaps that would be in order, but my own preference would be to see it dealt with during the budget debate.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'll put the question in a slightly different way. Is the estimated cost of the program in fact going to be \$36.5 million for a year or for a period of four months?

MR. SPEAKER: It's the same question under a thin disguise, it would seem.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has the government considered any interim program through the department for those physically and mentally handicapped people who need particular assistance before the program comes in at the end of the year?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, it should be understood by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview that those programs for Albertans in financial circumstances such that they require additional assistance from the public are now in place and have been for some time. What we're talking about is something far more imaginative than that; a cap-up, if you like.

When the Bill is introduced, Mr. Speaker, I'll be very pleased to debate the merits of the program with the hon. member. If he wishes to compare it with other provinces, I welcome that.

#### **Social Studies Curriculum**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education. It's with regard to the doubling of Canadian content in the social studies curriculum, and the provisions necessary for in-service training for teachers to teach that new curriculum. Could the minister indicate what steps are being taken at the present time to provide this potentially needed in-service training?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, because I'm having a meeting with the director of curriculum for the department on Friday in order to discuss recommendations made by the Curriculum Policies Board that pertain to in-service instruction. I would prefer to take the question as notice and reply next week in the House.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Could the minister indicate whether discussions have yet taken place with the Alberta Teachers' Association? If not, will they take place?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, two points: first of all, I met, I believe on May 3, with the table officers of the Alberta Teachers' Association. The question of in-service was

discussed at that meeting. Secondly, the Alberta Teachers' Association is of course represented formally on the Curriculum Policies Board by one member, and the teaching profession is represented informally by three teachers. Therefore the teaching profession, both formally and informally, has had an opportunity to provide input to the recommendations of the Curriculum Policies Board that will be under discussion at the meeting on Friday and subsequently.

#### **Oil Development — Suffield Block**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Could the minister indicate whether the Alberta Energy Company plans to produce heavy oil in the Suffield Block?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I will take that question under consideration and respond later.

#### **Rural and Native Housing**

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might respond to a question the Leader of the Opposition asked me yesterday, regarding whether the corporation or the department had contracted a study of housing in Grouard. The answer is no.

#### **Workers' Safety**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question, if I may, to the hon. Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation in this province. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether the department is considering proceeding with the Gale commission recommendation of mandatory joint safety and health committees at worksites throughout the province?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, officials in my department indicate to me that they have completed the evaluation of the present joint worksite safety committees. We hope to be able to see the formation of approximately 100 more before the year's end. This is our goal for this year.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The minister indicated 100 more sites. Is the minister in a position to advise whether those will be designated sites under the regulations of the Act or voluntary sites?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, it is the hope of my office and my officials that most of them will be voluntary. We hope not to have to designate them by ministerial order, but previously some 149 had to be designated. I expect to have to designate quite a number of them.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to advise why there has not been a ministerial designation of a worksite for a period of almost one year?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, in my earlier answer I indicated that officials in my department are assessing the effectiveness of those committees. The minutes of

the joint worksite committees are being reviewed, and once that evaluation has been completed — this is really the major reason for the delay in establishing more joint worksite committees in the past year.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Are any legislative changes contemplated at this stage to permit voluntary worksite committees to have parallel power with designated committees?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that they both have the same effectiveness. The term the hon. member used — I will take it under notice just to see what he has indicated would be the difference in the two committees. My understanding is that both are just as effective at the worksite.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that there is some difference in the authority they have.

My question is whether the minister contemplates holding any discussions with industry and the Alberta Federation of Labour to assess the results of the departmental findings with both sides in this particular matter.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I have had discussions with both sectors already, and further discussions will be held once the evaluation and assessment is compiled.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one supplementary question for clarification, if I may, to the hon. minister. Did the minister give a date as to when that evaluation would be completed?

MR. DIACHUK: No, Mr. Speaker, I didn't.

MR. COOK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister be able to indicate whether he plans to release the report, or the general contents of the report, to the House?

DR. BUCK: It depends on whether he likes the report.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, the report referred to is an evaluation and an overall assessment. I will take into consideration providing the information to the members of the Legislature.

#### **Aluminum Wiring**

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, on June 8 a number of questions about aluminum wiring were put. I am pleased to report information received from the electrical protection branch of the general safety division of the department.

First of all, only one electrical fire in the province has been attributable to aluminum wiring. That generated a very small amount of damage and arose because of faulty installation of the wiring. It's a fact, Mr. Speaker, that overheating can and does occur in junction boxes due to faulty connections, and that happens whether the wiring is copper or aluminum. That's why the box is designed to contain a certain amount of heat. In the instance where there was a fire, paper was hanging over the box in such a way that it ignited.

For additional information of the Assembly, in Al-

berta aluminum wiring is certified only for use by or under the direction of a qualified electrician. However, the additional question was asked about how much wiring is done with aluminum. There is very little at the present time, inasmuch as the price differential between aluminum and copper on an installed basis is not very significant.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the Ontario Commission of Inquiry on Aluminum Wiring has concluded that there is nothing inherently dangerous about aluminum wiring systems, and it recommended that such wiring continue to be accepted for use in residential branch-circuit wiring. So the safety factor really hinges on the quality of the installation.

#### **Government Hiring Practices**

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, additionally on June 5 a question was put to me by the hon. Member for Clover Bar with respect to a study commissioned by the Alberta Human Rights Commission with regard to opportunities for employment of women.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may have the report. I do not. I understand that the study, at least in its first draft, has been completed by the agency to which it was contracted and has just been received by the commission. I'm not at all clear whether the commission is satisfied with it or otherwise, and certainly I have not been advised when I will be receiving it. So I am unable to give any further information as to when and if it might be available.

#### **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that Questions 104 and 105 and Motion for a Return 106 stand and retain their place on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

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

204. Moved by Mrs Osterman

Be it resolved that the government give consideration to carrying out a study of present and future energy transmission needs, with input from all departments concerned, which would facilitate the development of a general energy transmission plan.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, first I wish it understood that I'm talking about all forms of energy; even highways would fit into the broadest sense of the motion. The transmission of these forms of energy was not perceived to be a major problem until the 1960s, although individual displays of unrest had been directed at compensation allowed and routes taken for pipelines and power lines.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it abundantly clear that I am not necessarily a proponent of energy corridors, but I believe we have evolved to the point in energy usage that it is only fair to our present and future property owners, as well as the general public, that where possible we plan to make the best use of our

land.

Here is a comment from a paper called Energy and Rail Corridor Options, from the Department of Municipal Affairs, 1978:

Planning authorities have no legal mandate to enforce the use of multiple use corridors.

The [Energy Resources Conservation Board] determines some locations, while the [Canadian Transport Commission] determines railway locations. Agencies such as the Department of Municipal Affairs, and local governments can only suggest a locational choice, but not require it.

Mr. Speaker, the need to plan has been recognized to some degree, for studies are available on corridor and restricted development areas.

Various groups have shown interest and concern in planning. For many years, starting in 1966, I chaired a group of farmers who initially became involved in the surface rights area because of the prospect of having their land taken for a high-tension power line. Our concerns at that time centred mainly on compensation, for there was little or no involvement in deciding what route it would take.

The shortcomings of the expropriation legislation at that time could be the subject of a lengthy essay; however, we addressed ourselves to the problems of compensation, and farmers and farm organizations tried to assist in forming legislation that would provide for fairer hearings. In the process, our concerns broadened to include a more fundamental question of land use. This interest was facilitated by a change in legislation that involved the farmers in the process at an earlier stage of planning. We felt this input had an impact on the placement of various facilities.

In presenting this whole question for discussion, my problem is that we, of necessity, have a multi-disciplined approach. The various departments of government, agencies, and private-sector groups involved are almost too numerous to mention. Those of us outside the decision-making process perceive the vested interests in some areas as prohibiting the weighing of various factors in an objective way. A small example of the complexity involved is the fact that 26 different groups, especially in government, were interviewed by an environmental consultant and an Environment Department representative to determine the approach, content, and format of environmental impact assessments, and the role and review of various departments.

Mr. Speaker, from the standpoint of private industry, I'm given to believe that there are now numerous problems in terms of planning in the electrical transmission field, and certainly this will be compounded in the future. Here are some steps usually followed in putting in a major transmission line: one, determine the need for the line. The company's planning group examines load forecasts to determine that the line is indeed needed and, if so, what size is required. This process requires anticipating needs which might not yet exist.

Two, right-of-way planning: a basic map showing all topographical features, natural and man-made, is used to create a base map to which are added soil capabilities, wildlife and protected areas, existing utilities, et cetera. As many as a dozen or so routes are then devised, from which two or three alternate routes are selected. These routes take into account the physical features mentioned above, as well as areas of land that may be reserved for special reasons, such as their ar-

chaeological value. Aesthetic considerations play a role in this process as well.

Three, map submission: the route map is submitted to the Department of Environment and to all other interested government departments, such as Agriculture, Energy, Culture, Transportation, Public Lands and Wildlife, and others. These departments review the alternate routes and offer feedback in the form of criticism and suggestions to the company. Four, route adjustments: the company then makes adjustments to the routes, in light of the government's review.

Five, information packages may be prepared and distributed to the affected landowners, providing them with information on the transmission line and an opportunity to respond to the proposal by means of a questionnaire. Neighboring landowners are also sent information packages, as their properties may be affected in the event of minor alterations. Six, open houses are held all along the route, giving affected landowners an opportunity to air their concerns privately. Seven, based on steps 5 and 6, revisions to the route may be made.

Eight, preparation of application to the Energy Resources Conservation Board: preparation is now begun for the formal application to the Energy Resources Conservation Board. Nine, the application is sent to the Energy Resources Conservation Board and is reviewed. Ten, if the Energy Resources Conservation Board requests additional information from the company, it is supplied.

Eleven, public hearing: the Energy Resources Conservation Board determines the date for a public hearing and serves notice to the public. This notice involves newspaper advertising, and may involve direct mailing to the concerned parties. The hearing itself may last at least several weeks, during which time the landowners are given opportunity to express their concerns.

Twelve, the Energy Resources Conservation Board makes a decision on the proposal, a step which may take up to a year. Ministerial approval must be obtained, followed by an order in council, before construction can commence.

I'm told that often departments don't get around to reviewing the submission for some time. They end up making changes and suggestions at the eleventh hour, holding up the whole process and sometimes making it necessary to go through many of the steps again. Delays and lack of co-ordination along the way raise the spectre of an industry ready to establish itself, which requires a lead time of approximately three years, being held up by a lack of power, which takes five years' lead time for the operation we can call conception to delivery. Power plants take approximately 10 years. Industry's perception is that although cabinet makes the final decision, one of the factors in the elongated time frame is civil servants struggling for control. The Energy Resources Conservation Board has hearings every three years to ascertain future requirements regarding electricity, gas, et cetera, but it must be noted that they make no long-range plan of routes for transmission of the various forms of energy.

Mr. Speaker, another group involved is the Electric Utility Planning Council, which includes representatives of

seven major utility companies in Alberta, with an observing member from Alberta Utilities & Telephones, Energy Resources Conservation



Board, and Public Utilities Board. Member utilities on the council include the cities of Medicine Hat, Lethbridge, Red Deer, Calgary, Edmonton, and Alberta Power Limited and Calgary Power Ltd.

... The Electric Utility Planning Council ... is the organization charged with the responsibility of providing coordinated planning for Alberta's future electric generation and transmission needs. The [Electric Utility Planning Council] is a planning advisory body and does not own or operate any facilities.

Another group is the Canadian Electrical Association. The research and development advisory committee of the Canadian Electrical Association funds research projects in the electric power field. Of special interest are the activities of the transmissions subcommittee. Since 1974, \$1,212,000 has been expended on research dealing specifically with power transmission, including corridor usage. The subcommittee includes in its membership: chairman, P.C. Williams, from Alberta Power; vice-chairman, M.M.C. Collins, from the National Research Council; past-chairman, J.R. Leslie, Ontario Hydro; C. Baril, Hydro Quebec; Dr. J. Beattie, Saskatchewan Power Corporation; N. Holmes, New Brunswick Power Commission; J.G. Iliffe, Manitoba Hydro; and D. McFarlane, B.C. Hydro.

Here is a quote from the committee's 1978 transmission system report and five-year plan:

Increased corridor usage must be achieved both for existing rights of way and for new corridors where land acquisition is difficult, not only from the availability point of view, but also because of the environmental and aesthetic concerns of land-owners and communities. Environmental considerations must be studied and new hot line maintenance techniques may improve line utilization.

Mr. Speaker, the subject of planning has been addressed by many more groups and organizations. Both B.C. Hydro and Ontario Hydro make use of corridors.

Another approach is by designating restrictive development areas, such as in the areas surrounding Calgary and Edmonton. Within these areas, existing agricultural, commercial, and industrial activities may continue; only major expansion of facilities or new activities must receive approval from the Minister of Environment. Of course, I believe a special formula for compensation as a result of the restriction placed upon the land affected, would be implicit in any plan or designation of land.

Mr. Speaker, from the information I have given I hope it will be obvious that the whole area of efficient planning is very complicated. Although all the various agencies, departments, et cetera, involved are doing their very best, we must look at a realignment of the process, in view of our galloping growth and its attendant need for energy. The Energy Resources Conservation Board, in its report Energy Requirements in Alberta; 1977-2006, estimates Alberta's annual energy requirements will more than triple in the almost 30-year period.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the concerns raised, I believe comments made in the tar sands transportation and transmission study are applicable to many parts of this province:

The prospect of impending rapid development ... will generate an unprecedented demand for a wide variety of transportation facilities [make] it

imperative that the future linkage of the resource area with its markets and supply centres be planned in a comprehensive and logical manner. There has been much discussion and considerable debate regarding the feasibility of combining multiple pipelines, electric-power transmission lines, highways, railroads and communication systems in a single right-of-way or corridor. The general consensus is that in the past there could have been considerable financial saving and less detrimental effect on the total environment had more planning and positive action been undertaken in this regard. However, the development of multi-purpose transportation corridors has not taken place due to the inability of a user of such a corridor to initiate the organization and then administer the diverse factors and interests implicit therein.

My hope is that this motion will generate the kind of discussion that will facilitate the move to overall co-ordination and planning and the authority to enforce the plan, if necessary, by a group without a vested interest in any government department.

I would ask this Assembly to support the motion.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a few brief comments to Motion No. 1. I don't think there's really much doubt that a study as described in the motion before us today would be useful, when one considers the problems we've had with power transmission over the last number of years. All one has to do is look back at the controversies in various parts of the province over the construction of high transmission lines: the whole issue of what kind of compensation should be paid, and the various associated problems that arise from this sort of development. Clearly it would be useful to examine the principle contained in the resolution before us this afternoon.

I personally think, Mr. Speaker, that we should be looking at energy corridors rather than transmission lines here, there, and elsewhere. I suppose some people would argue that there is a danger in having an energy corridor *per se*, that it makes us more vulnerable if, for example, we were to face hostility from someplace else in the world. But when one looks at the land-use questions, it clearly makes sense to follow the energy corridor concept.

Mr. Speaker, in many respects it seems to me that the government has retreated from a position which was tabled here, in the fall of 1974 if my memory serves me right. It was the whole concept of the northeastern energy corridor from Fort McMurray right down into the central part of the province. I thought at the time that that particular concept had a good deal of merit. Not only did it contribute to decentralization of industry, which was a good thing, but it made sense to me that when we're talking about transmitting energy, we look at a corridor.

Mr. Speaker, where I think I would part company with the hon. Member for Three Hills, who introduced the resolution today, is with the implicit assumption in her remarks, that the estimates of growth in energy are there and we must deal with them almost as if they were Holy Writ. The hon. member quoted from the ERCB report on the energy requirements of the province. I look at the report prepared by the ERCB for the government in June 1976. It looked at various energy projects in the province. Implicit in that report is the

idea that we're going to see a very high growth rate in energy requirements in Alberta.

At first glance, I suppose that would be a reasonable enough assumption. Some years ago Ontario Hydro was arguing that there would be at least a 7 per cent increase per year until the end of the century. On that basis, various proposals on power expansion were advanced to the people of Ontario. They have now dropped their estimates from 7 per cent to 2 per cent. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the estimates of the power industry would in fact be a little optimistic. Over the next few years, even though the province is going to continue to grow, I hope we would be effective enough in energy conservation that we don't see this continued massive increase in power demand year after year. I feel very strongly that there is a point where this province and the country as a whole are really going to have to get serious when it comes to conservation.

One thing that will probably force us to get serious about this is the absolutely incredible cost of some of these projects. I look over the projects that the ERCB examined, and these are 1975 figures. You look at major developments such as Mountain Rapids, now almost \$2 billion; Dunvegan, over \$1 billion, now almost \$2 billion; similarly huge capital investments required for some of the thermal projects in the province.

Mr. Speaker, no one is denying that we aren't going to need expansion in the future. The question is whether the expansion should be based on the very high rate of increase now accepted as a matter of course among many people in the energy industry — the same type of people who had Ontario projecting huge growth and who persuaded the power corporation in Manitoba to make very substantial investments in power. We now find Manitoba has surplus power. It's fine that they can export it. On the other hand, we're now getting into a situation where investments in energy-related enterprises are going to be much more capital intensive and more costly, and whether we can compete in selling power becomes highly dubious.

Mr. Speaker. I raise this because I think it is relevant to the resolution before us. I would argue that we have to look at the whole question of transmission. There's no question about that. As the resolution suggests, there should be input from the various departments concerned. I would argue as well that there should be input from the public of Alberta. Any inquiry that takes place shouldn't be just a departmental inquiry, but in fact should allow people in the province to make representations as well.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I raised some of these questions about power demand is that I think the resolution in a sense doesn't go quite far enough. Obviously, we should be looking at the question of transmission. But I think we have to take a very close look in this province at the issue of energy demand, production facilities, and transmission in the future. I would like to see a royal commission established, which would undertake a major evaluation of where we're going and what routes we should follow in the next 25 years in Alberta. Implicit in that call would be, I would argue, a number of specific features: first of all, transmission corridors, the feature we are discussing this afternoon, transmission corridors; secondly, the issue of interprovincial power grid. Before we get into talking about \$2 billion investments in dams or major thermal

projects, beyond those presently under way. I want to have a pretty close look at the economics of a power grid. If Manitoba has large amounts of power for sale, it might be far more sensible for us to enter into a long-term arrangement with the province of Manitoba than to get into major expansion at today's capital costs.

I think we have to look seriously at alternate energy. I know that alternate is not overly attractive to this government. The Premier couldn't have been more blunt last fall, when he appeared before the heritage trust fund watchdog committee and virtually implied that alternate energy was somehow a conflict of interest for an oil and gas producing province. I find that strange, because it isn't a conflict for Exxon, which is showing a good deal of interest in it.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us is a place to start. But it seems to me that what we need, and what the public of Alberta has a right to receive from this Legislature, is a pretty clear idea on where we're going in the larger picture, over the next 25 or 30 years. I don't think that having an update by the ERCB every three years on the projections — I respect the ERCB, but to a very large extent I think we're accepting holus-bolus the estimates of the power industry, and one can understand why they would be estimating very substantial increases. Certainly there will be an increased demand. No one is arguing that. But is that increase in demand in the neighborhood of 7 per cent reasonable, or in fact can we in this province — as we must throughout Canada and the western world, in particular — come to grips with the question of conservation and slow down the almost insatiable appetite we have for increased energy utilization.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member's motion is a place to start, but the question is of sufficient importance that I would really like to see a statement from the government on how we propose to go beyond just transmission, looking at all aspects including how effective we can be in improving energy conservation in this province in the years ahead.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the Member for Three Hills for introducing this motion. I also would like to compliment the Member for Spirit River-Fairview for many of the remarks he has added to the discussion today. I don't agree with all of them, and I will come to those points.

The Member for Three Hills has moved that the government give consideration to studying energy transmission, and to having input from all of the departments concerned in order that a general energy transmission plan can be developed.

I support Motion No. 204 and would like to share with the members of this Assembly the views of the constituents of Banff-Cochrane who I know have been affected by the decisions or in some cases the actions or inactions on energy transmission and related activities of private companies and from time to time government departments and agencies.

I believe it's very clear from the comments of the Member for Three Hills that she has a very broad definition of energy transmission. Energy takes many forms. If this study is approved, I think we would also want to look at the transmission of gas and oil through pipelines, the possibility of water distribution systems, major water distribution and storm sewer trunks through regions, possibly highways and

major roads, perhaps telecommunications.

Imagine flying over and looking down at Alberta. If we strip away the buildings, if we look beneath the crops, the grass, the forests, and the rivers, we see a latticework, a sinew throughout Alberta, a pipeline system interconnected in a very intricate and complex system. You could virtually lift these all together. Indeed it connects this province to our neighboring provinces, to our neighboring countries, and even beyond through the oceans. This latticework, this network, is like the human circulatory system, except that we don't have one heart and one brain. There are many nerve centres; many different sources of energy; many areas where we are distributing energy, many different industrial areas, many communities.

The Member for Three Hills mentioned this host of responsibilities: this host of regulatory bodies, approving bodies, companies involved, government agencies at all levels, the users, and the affected landowners. It's very complicated, as has been pointed out. I know we have many safeguards in our system. We have many Acts and regulations; we have procedures. Each new energy system, each new line, is looked at very carefully. But all too often, especially to those landowners affected, the decisions appear to be based on a single purpose: that this line shall go from this point to that, that these transmission cables will be hung in this area, over that ground. The purpose appears to be to put the system where it is best able to be placed for the least cost. Or it may be based on facts brought out by the participants at that hearing, by the company, by the department of government, or by a forecast for that particular system, as discussed by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

We all assume that the decisions are made in the best interests of all Albertans. We hope those decisions bear in mind the presentations made. But we do have competing and conflicting demands for the restricted amount of land in Alberta, over, on, or through which these lines or systems must traverse.

What I'm not comfortable about, and what I hear from my constituents, is that the system establishes an adversary role. For those supposed to be part of the benefiting community, planning appears to occur in isolation. Companies indeed prepare various alternatives, as they should. Governments at different levels prepare plans, as we, the municipalities, regional districts, regional commissions, and so on, should. Each of us may do so based on our perspective of the best situation and the best need. The highway must go from this point to that, with the least amount of vertical or horizontal curvature. The transmission line, as I mentioned, must go from this point to that.

The various participants may even involve different jurisdictions in obtaining their approvals. I believe they do so in an effort to minimize the possibility that they plan in a vacuum. Perhaps some of them even co-ordinate their efforts with the efforts of other participants. But the landowner does not see this.

However, at some point that plan or location is submitted to the regulatory or recommending body. In some cases hearings are held, depending upon the nature of the project or the Act itself. The landowners are then in this adversary position. They do not know if the project is required in the first place. They do not know if alternatives have been discarded. They wonder about the lack of planning, as they see it, and why companies and agencies cannot share transportation or

energy corridors. They question the intent of the proposal. And somehow they have to prove their own case before the regulatory body, so in fact it will look at these alternatives, the quality of the product, and the need for the project.

Finally there is the question of compensation. I agree it is time we had a broad review of our energy transmission needs — in the broad definition presented by the member, energy transmission includes pipelines, trunks, and highways placed over, on, or beneath the ground — so that these corridors can be related to our land-use planning. In this way, they can be related to our regional and provincial needs. Our environmental concerns can be taken into consideration, and our citizens can indeed see that good planning is being given consideration. It's not an easy task; it's not one that can be started and dealt with very quickly. I believe this motion is a very important first step.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Spirit River-Fairview talked about energy demand and conservation. It's true, and I believe this government has been a leader in restraint and has been encouraging the development of the province and energy forms for economic opportunity for all Albertans. But in addition to our own resident needs, we in Alberta are very fortunate to be the envy of all Canada and perhaps even the world. We are faced with the prospect of in-migration to Alberta that is unheralded in Canada. We must plan for the demands and needs of those people and industries that are coming. That is part of this whole process.

I have one final point concerning the motion, with regard to the reference to the "departments concerned". If this motion is approved, I surmise that the Member for Three Hills would indeed wish to see this study involve not only those departments which are concerned but the companies, agencies, and indeed the public. All these need to be consulted and their views known. Each of these lines and systems forms part of an overall pattern, an overall system which has measurable benefits and costs to all of us, as well as benefits and costs not as readily identifiable. The fabric of Alberta and of our own communities, our jobs, our lives, and indeed the quality of our lives is part of this whole story of energy and its transmission.

In some cases we must accept trade-offs. But wouldn't it be easier for us to accept these trade-offs if we knew that the total story was available, or that the major trunk system had to go in that location, the major highway system in this location, and the major power transmission in another location, for various reasons that are part of the studies?

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to indicate my support for the motion brought before this House today by the Member for Three Hills.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of this resolution as well, and to endorse the comments of the members who spoke prior to me.

In my remarks I'd like to concentrate on one area, so I don't raise any items that have already been raised. My remarks are from the experiences I've had in the last two years and from the experiences my constituents will likely face in the next year. We had been faced with a 240 kV transmission line from Calgary to Lethbridge, the route to pass directly through my constituency. In the early stages of discussion, the feeling was that the line should cut diagonally across rich farmland, across land people had cleared all the obstacles from, and

through land that could be developed into pivot irrigation systems: very valuable assets for individual owners across the province. That situation occurred.

My constituents are presently facing a second request for a 500 kV transmission line from the Langdon area to the B.C. border. Again, this line will cross through very rich farmland and irrigation areas, and disrupt the communities.

Two very unfortunate things happen. One is that the farmers in that area are innocent victims. All of a sudden they receive a letter on January 19, 1979, saying Calgary Power is proposing a transmission line. Immediately they are all upset. During the election campaign I heard story after story about what was going to happen to them, the effects of the line, and why they have to face this type of problem.

The earlier line, which is now fixed and is being constructed between Calgary and Lethbridge, created the same kinds of problems. Two routes were proposed: one diagonally and one on a right-angle basis. The final route selected was on a right-angle basis, but again it travelled through rich farmland and irrigation districts. It did something else. It caused tensions between local communities, local people. They said, why do I have to take it and they don't have to? Do they have some political pull we don't have? Is somebody getting money under the table? All kinds of negative feelings occurred with people who really didn't ask for the problem in the first place. The questions they raise are: why us, and how are we going to be compensated?

I think an energy corridor, a predetermined route where the transmission lines will go, would certainly solve many of these problems. In light of that, I can only speak in support of the resolution before us. The sooner we determine those routes, the better. I think it's totally unfair to the people who have these towers and lines crossing their land at the present time.

The second point I want to make is the cost to people in the rural areas of Alberta. The hearings for the second line, the 500 kV transmission line, are to occur later in June. Each and every one of those farmers is saying: one, how can I leave my farming activities at this time of year; two, do I hire a consultant or a legal person to present my case? They're faced not only with taking time but many, many of their own dollars to fight something they didn't really ask for. Nor are they going to directly benefit from it. I'm sure those costs are not considered for the farmers in receiving compensation.

For example, the farmer group that fought the proposed diagonal line in the first application put forward \$30,000 out of their own pockets to present their case. No one is going to compensate them for that \$30,000, and it was something they didn't really ask for. The same thing is occurring again. I think, one, we place a problem on people who really don't ask for it and, two, it's money out of their pockets and they don't directly benefit.

One of the solutions I think we should look at and the government should work very quickly toward is the establishment of energy corridors, so this problem doesn't occur and recur in the province of Alberta.

MR. FJORDBOTTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak in favor of Motion 204 this afternoon, and I commend the hon. Member for Three Hills for its submission.

I'd like to say that the transmission of energy,

whether it be above ground or underground, is a growing problem in Alberta, being that we're such an energy province, and it's a problem that must be faced. I strongly feel that the sooner it's done, the better the people of Alberta will be served.

I agree with the comments of the hon. Member for Little Bow, because I received the same representation on the 500 kV power line that is going from Langdon, south through the Crowsnest Pass, and hooking up with B.C. Hydro. The same comments about the concerns were made to me during the campaign.

It brings to mind that a few years ago we gave my young daughter a bicycle. We got it for her for Christmas. On Christmas Eve I was down there, took it out of the box, and tried to put it together. There was no instruction booklet. The parts were all there, but the instruction booklet wasn't. I'm pretty mechanically inclined, so I proceeded. When I had gotten fairly well completed, I couldn't understand what I had built, because it looked like a kamikaze plane that had returned from a successful mission. If we don't have some planning in our energy, we might end up with the same sort of package.

I'd like to bring up one question on this point that I don't think has been adequately answered; that is, that the general purpose of an energy transmission line is to serve the public. I'd like us to consider, whenever possible, why can't we put corridors through public lands? When you consider the amount of this province that is public land — I think right around 70 per cent of the province is publicly owned. If, whenever possible, we could put transmission corridors through public lands to serve the public, it would seem to make sense.

We're going through private lands. Like the hon. member before me has stated, these people are wondering what they own when they own a piece of land. The oil and gas underneath the land belong to the province, the energy companies have the right to go across the land to get the minerals, and the pipelines have their right of way. A power line goes through, and they stand and say, what next?

I don't want to leave with you the impression that I'm saying we should reroute all power lines through public lands. But I think we have to address this issue, look at all the options, and keep in mind the sacrifices we're asking from individuals when a power line, a gas line, or anything else crosses their land.

Irrigation farmers: the hon. member has stated before me that when you consider the cost to level land and put in a pivot, to hear you have a transmission line coming across your land doesn't make you very pleased with the system. I have questions in my mind about a sprinkler running next to a transmission line. Is it okay? Is it dangerous?

How about the medical and biological effects along a power line? I understand studies have been done both pro and con, and I think they could be implemented in a general study. I also wonder why we can't put power lines underground. I'm given to believe that it costs up to 20 times more to put them underground, but is that a thing we should be looking at?

Other questions come to mind: shall we build lines with higher carrying capacities so we don't have to have so many? Should we co-ordinate all forms of energy transmission in one corridor? I wonder about power lines being close to other transmission lines, like gas lines. I suppose a lot would depend on the

power line type, the design, the current, the terrain, and the soil type. And the best route for a pipeline might not be the best route for a power line. These are all technical questions, need a little bit of research, and touch the jurisdiction of many departments.

I have many reasons for supporting this motion. I think it's always good to have a general plan of what you're going to do in the future. We know for sure that our energy needs are not going to decline. We're going to have higher demand, and it's going to multiply. When we put power lines across, we have to consider: are we reducing acreage that can produce food? Can we do something to reduce the inconvenience and disruption to people's lives? Can we provide a feasible energy transmission system by taking everything in its context?

Mr. Speaker, I'm convinced we can do that, and it gives me pleasure to support this motion.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege this afternoon to rise in my place and also support Motion 204. I want to thank the Member for Three Hills for bringing this motion forward. I think it's timely that we as legislators address ourselves to the problem. I've listened with interest to the other members expressing their views, and most of them are mine.

The Member for Banff-Cochrane brought out the creation of an adversary position when proposals for new transmission lines or pipelines are brought before a hearing. I think there's a responsibility in government, where possible, to anticipate situations of this nature. That's why this motion is receiving so much support in this Legislature today. I think the individual caught in an area that a pipeline or power transmission line is going through feels pretty alone on his rights and whether there are alternatives to the problem.

By its very nature, Mr. Speaker, agriculture occupies most of the good land in this province, from the point of view of easy access for pipelines or power lines. I think we have to recognize that we're not in a position to create agricultural land to any great extent, only in limited areas. I think the initial cost of installation is not necessarily the only thing to be taken into consideration when the location of a power transmission line or a pipeline is being considered.

We've seen the diagonal crossing of good agricultural land and the net results of this; it's already been mentioned this afternoon. We all realize there's an additional cost to travel on the square, Mr. Speaker, but I think we have to recognize that that cost has to be borne by all the people of the province who are going to get the benefit of that particular transmission of power.

From an agricultural point of view, a diagonal heavy transmission line precludes the use of sprinkler irrigation and makes it more difficult for the large machinery being used in most of our agricultural areas today. I think the people of Alberta as a whole have to recognize that the additional cost of creating transmission lines that do not diagonally cross good agricultural land is a cost we have to expect to pay.

I think we would recognize this if our road systems were not designed primarily to travel on the perimeter of land as it's divided in this province at the present time. If all our roads ran the closest possible direction to the nearest trading centre as they did originally, we would find that our farming methods would have to be

changed considerably.

I can remember — and I'm old enough to do that, Mr. Speaker — when the road to town in the area I was raised in used to take the natural path of the closest way and the nearest direction possible to reach that destination, and how upset my father and all the neighbors were when they suddenly fenced it up and we had to travel on the road allowances. That was a considerable inconvenience. We accepted this grudgingly, because it made us about two miles farther from town than we originally had been. It seems humorous today to look back at something like that. But when we're transmitting power, we have to remember that those power lines are there for a very long time, and the sacrifice that has to be made in the use of that land from an agricultural point of view as a result of that is something that isn't going to go away. It should be remembered that agriculture is still one of our prime industries in this province. We should recognize that they, too, are prepared to make sacrifices for the betterment of the whole province, but there has to be a limitation on how much we can expect.

I feel that other forms of transmission in this province deserve consideration. Personally, I think we're spending a lot of money on our underground telephone systems that consistently are causing additional costs whenever municipal bodies have to rebuild the roads they're plowed under. Unfortunately, sometimes they plow in a new underground telephone system only to find that a year later they decide to build that particular road. Many thousands of dollars are involved in scrapping that piece of line and building a new one after the road is built.

Unfortunately, I see the same thing happening again. It happened within 20 miles of the city. They scrapped the telephone line, rebuilt the highway, and put up a temporary line along the fence line. And when they're finished, they're back putting the telephone line in the ditch again. I don't think this is good policy. I think it should be reconsidered. Certainly if it was originally put at the fence line, it would be out of the road for any additional road work in that particular area.

I think we have to consider a long-range plan for power transmission and pipelines around our major cities and centres. I feel that the Mill Woods situation, where the city has expanded over an existing power line, is a real threat to the people in the area. I think we're all concerned about it. I think [we need] some long-range planning around all our growing centres, so there's a systematic location of all forms of energy transmission that can properly be put in place, and the city around it will be planned in a manner that it will not have to be dug up and replaced in 10 or 15 years' time.

I think the motion is timely. I hope the rest of the members will give it consideration, and that possibly some form of planning can start that will serve us all in the years to come.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I had some pretty distinct views on this subject prior to listening to the other comments that have been made today. I'm not too certain how absolute I am on those views at this point in time. Nevertheless, I believe this motion is very important. To illustrate that importance, I'd like to relate it to agriculture, energy, and transportation.

There's no question in the minds of any of us here that agriculture is the primary industry for Alberta. Indeed, agriculture is the most important industry for Canada. I say that not because it employs people, creates activity in our economy, or earns foreign exchange. I say that because agriculture is a primary activity of the human race. Without the pursuit of agriculture and the fruits we gain from that, we wouldn't be here today. We have to have food to live.

We're blessed with the natural resources for development in that area, and we're blessed further by the presence of energy in Alberta and in Canada. Without the abundance of energy we have, we wouldn't have the abundance of agricultural products. Therefore we have people who can devote their attention to agricultural pursuits, and at the same time free the rest of us for other lifeblood pursuits in the economy.

The importance of agriculture and energy are brought together by transportation. We have agriculture in one place; we have energy in other places. The thing that binds the two together is transportation. We're not talking just about the transportation or transmission of electrical energy. We're talking about the transportation of all types of energy: all the hydrocarbons, such as coal, oil, natural gas, whatever else you might think of.

When we start talking about transportation, the subject of transportation corridors comes up. We already have transportation corridors in Alberta. However, most of them are of the single-use variety. What's being suggested here today is that we consider the development of multiple-use transportation corridors. Where that makes a lot of sense on the surface. I'm not too sure it makes a lot of sense underneath.

There are a lot of problems with multi-use corridors. One is that there are different origins and destinations for those things we wish to put through corridors. Designating a multi-use corridor and mandating that all things be transported through that corridor can sometimes be a very costly decision. I'm just not too sure how many extra costs in that sense our economy can continue to bear. Things like that, inefficiencies, lead to things like inflation in our economy. They're unproductive efforts.

A member across the way indicated that there are a lot of non-productive efforts in our economy. He pointed out that 43 or 46 cents of every dollar are spent on government services. These things don't help the effective and efficient use of our natural resources.

Another problem with a multi-use corridor is that there are different needs. Different things that have to be transported have different needs, and they have different requirements in terms of design and construction. It makes planning almost impossible. A multi-use corridor results in excessive construction in one location. There are conflicting schedules between uses of that corridor. There's a basic incompatibility between those things that would use multi-use transportation corridors.

Finally, as one member already pointed out, the designation of all transport modes to one corridor entails a great deal of risk, in that if there's a disruption of services, it's a disruption not only to one item but to all items within that corridor.

In speaking about this motion. I can see there's a general apparent need for some sort of transportation planning, corridor planning, or whatever you would like to call it. However, there are inherent problems

which inhibit the implementation of something such as this. My concern is with government involvement in transportation planning. I mentioned three general areas when I began to talk: agriculture, energy, and transportation. I can look at each area and see instances where we've had problems when government involvement has displaced private initiative. There's been inefficient use of resources we have, and our attempts to meet objectives have been ineffective. In terms of agriculture, I don't see any government buying or running a farm. We've left that to the individual farmers, and I think they've done a very good job.

Energy is a very difficult area. It can be divided into two areas: one, development and exploration; and second, marketing. I'd like to [make] particular reference to the petroleum industry. Some governments in this world have felt they can get involved and do the job better than the private sector can. It's true there's not too much uncertainty and risk once you've got something developed. For example, once crude oil or natural gas is found, it's not too difficult to go out and measure the need for the products that can be derived from petroleum and natural gas, the processing of natural gas for petrochemicals, and the refining of petrochemical products. Anybody can do that, and not much risk is associated with the manufacture of those things. The risk involved is in going out, finding the things, and developing them in the first place.

One government in South America, Brazil, felt it could undertake all this on its own, and nationalized its petroleum industry. They soon found it wasn't as simple and easy as they thought it would be. They haven't found any oil for the last 10 years. They've changed their tack and said: private enterprise, come back and do these things.

Another example of this can be found in the transportation industry in Canada. It's cited quite often. In Canada we have two of the longest railroads in the world, CP Rail and CNR. One company is privately owned; the other is publicly owned. Public ownership came about, I might add, because of poor government planning. In the early 1900s, up to 1927 and the 1930s, many governments embarked on railroad construction, because it seemed apparent that that was the solution to the problems: we can't leave it up to private enterprise, because they're going to build a track here or there that may not serve this or that need.

We can say with a great deal of confidence that of those two railroads, the privately owned one, is the most efficiently operated railroad in the world today. That's acknowledged and recognized. On the other hand we have the CNR, which is one of the most inefficiently run railroads in the world today.

The point I'm coming to in regard to this motion is that although there appears to be need for planning, I suggest it be planning of a different type: not planning that would entail government involvement where individuals or firms who wish to construct these things are mandated to go in this or that direction, but involvement in three ways, and I draw these observations from the comments I've heard this afternoon. The first concern seems to be in regard to the involvement of those directly affected when it comes time to develop a transmission line or some sort of transportation corridor.

I might mention that most of the transportation facilities, most of the infrastructure for transportation in Alberta, are now in place. Most of the highway

network is set up. Most of the railway system is in place. No new rail lines or highway links are going to be built in Alberta. Pipelines go underground and in my opinion, once they're constructed, they're not obtrusive to anybody pursuing their normal course of activity in that particular area.

From the comments I've heard today, only the construction of power lines seems to be a problem. So in regard to a motion of this type. I would hope, first, it would lead to more involvement by the public directly affected by the construction of a transmission line or any mode of transport facility. There ought to be some provision for those people to be involved in the decision-making process.

The second concern I have seen raised today is in regard to compensation [for] people directly affected by construction of such a facility. It only seems fair to me, and I think everyone else would agree too, that there ought to be fair compensation. The question raised today was: how is that compensation decided, and what's the magnitude of that compensation? If this motion could lead to resolution of that problem, I think the motion is well worth pursuing.

The third observation I would make from the comments today is that the regulatory process definitely needs streamlining. The hon. member to my right pointed out that one must go through a multitude of agencies before regulatory approval can be gained. I think that in the public interest there is a definite need for regulatory approval, but on the other hand we must ask ourselves if this approval has got out of hand.

An example of too much regulatory approval in the recent past has been the consideration of the Mackenzie pipeline. That pipeline went through hearing after hearing, and before board after board, and finally everyone threw up their hands and said, oh, to heck with it. It took only three months for somebody to give approval for an Alaska Highway pipeline. We must bear in mind that the regulatory process definitely needs streamlining, but it must not compromise the ability of people to have a say in the decision-making process. At the same time it must not seriously inhibit or impede the progress and development of these transmission things.

Those are my three observations in regard to the comments made today: first, involvement in the decision-making process of those directly involved; second, fair compensation; and third, streamlining of the regulatory process.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, the motion before us today is very important, if we are not to have utter chaos in the transmission of energy from the source to the consumer. It is unfortunate that energy sources are generally far removed from population centres, so that we have numerous gas lines, pipelines, and power lines — and now perhaps even water lines — crisscrossing Alberta. Mr. Speaker, I would like to use my constituency as an example of lack of planning. I hope the Member for Calgary Buffalo will pay particular attention to the problems we have with underground pipelines, which he thinks cause no problems once they're installed.

When oil was discovered in Drayton Valley in 1953, production was the key. There really didn't appear to be any need for planning. The oil was miles out in

wilderness sparsely settled here and there. As a hamlet, Drayton Valley did not have the municipal authority, the muscle, nor probably even the inclination to plan. Therefore the oil wells were drilled, and pipelines were strung from the site to the battery and from the battery to the plant.

But Drayton Valley is no longer a hamlet in the wilderness. It's a town of 4,500 people. The financial burden resulting from the existing maze of pipelines is a cross no town should have to bear. Risk is involved too when oil and gas lines are within the boundaries of the town. Mill Woods is an example of that.

In Drayton Valley a pump sits just up the hill from the senior citizens' centre, and the flow line running from it carries 1,400 barrels a day. One of the oil companies charged with maintenance and operation of oil lines around the town worries about this kind of situation. They would feel far safer with pipeline corridors, but the cost of moving those pipelines is prohibitive.

A new 34-acre subdivision is now being developed. There are two lines. One has been incorporated into the park, so it doesn't have to be moved. The other runs 1,200 feet diagonally across the land, and it's costing \$18,000 to move it, \$15 per foot. In the end, the consumer will pay \$200 per lot. If pipeline relocation costs are \$18,000 for 34 acres, then the pipeline relocation cost on a quarter section would be \$100,000. When we build streets and roads, every line has to be dug out, the last 4 feet by hand. Relocation costs are from \$8 to 40 cents per foot, depending on the line. In local improvements in the town of Drayton Valley, over \$1 million has already been spent on pipeline relocation.

Mr. Speaker, I use this as a concrete example of what lack of planning does and the costs involved. The motion that governments "give consideration to carrying out a study of present and future ... transmission needs [facilitating] the development of a general transmission plan", is an excellent one. Energy transmission is now taking the line of least resistance, regardless of other land use. And I agree with the Member for Wainwright that the diagonal way is not always the best way.

The means to carry out systematic and conscientious planning of energy transmission is already available to us in The Energy Resources Conservation Act of 1971. In Part 1 Section 2:

The purposes of this Act are ...

- (e) to secure the observance of safe and efficient practices in the exploration for, processing, development and transportation of the energy resources of Alberta.

Planning is essential, as is local involvement. I agree with the Member for Banff-Cochrane that the adversary system is wrong. Hindsight is marvellous, but we can no longer penalize future development by our lack of foresight.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, with her motion the hon. Member for Three Hills has, in my view, exposed the tip of a very large iceberg. Although I'll confess some pessimism at the idea of instituting another study, I'll try to chip away at a small tip of that iceberg by discussing to some extent the need for information bases that will relate to better planning, which has been referred to particularly by the hon. Member for Drayton Valley.

I think the motion is really a symptom of a larger

malaise; that is, the proliferation of rules, regulations, branches, agencies, and authorities that are generally referred to as bureaucracies and their red tape, with little apparent progress and perhaps some regression in the decision-making regarding the way that energy in all its forms is transferred from its point of supply to its point of demand. A measure of this malaise is the generally accepted assessment that in the scheduling of major oil sands mines or heavy oil extraction plants, a full 24-month delay is anticipated in order to respond to and to wait for government reviews, hearings, decisions, various appeals, et cetera.

Mr. Speaker, we all appreciate that these are elephantine projects, but even an elephant, my biologist friends tell me, to use the phrase of the hon. Member for Three Hills, can manage the job "from conception to birth" in 20 to 21 months. I suppose the degree of uncertainty the elephant reserves for itself at some point may depreciate my point that governments do the same thing. It's of course tempting simply to say that if we had fewer bureaucrats, perhaps we could have less time for the decisions made by these bureaucrats. Although that's a thought we shouldn't let slip away from us, I think we have to remember that governments establish and provide mandates to bureaucracies to fill needs identified by citizens in the areas of protection, regulation, or adjudication.

Mr. Speaker, the central area I would like to address, relevant to the motion, is information bases related to forward planning, which I think we need, and to a lesser extent the accountability of regulatory agencies. The decisions made by government agencies within their legislative mandate, we can reasonably expect — and I think our experience proves us out — are rational ones made on the basis of factual information. Problems arise, in the form of delays and perhaps bad decisions, when the facts are not available or when the decision-maker's facts or information base is incompatible with another decision-maker trying to decide on the same issue.

Before I elaborate on the need for a land-related information system and how it will overcome this problem. I should point out that these two deficiencies had a major role in the Mill Woods pipeline rupture and explosion in March. Because a great deal of information from a large number of sources is involved, a computer is almost a necessity. Within the province there are 60 agencies with 300 land-related areas involving data collection. This information, in order to be useful in decision-making has to be both available and compatible. For example, if you're trying to translate the effect on wildlife populations that has been gathered by the Department of Recreation and Wildlife on a watershed basis, it's pretty tough to translate that into the impact along a pipeline right of way without a common geographical base.

The common geographical base for the management of information of land-related data useful for the resolution of problems is called a 3-degree transverse Mercator co-ordinate system for survey control points in the province. The need to make these 300 land-related systems and files congruent to each other is so that, in the case of a pipeline, you can make a selection using the information on present pipelines, refineries, gas plants, forestry, wildlife, urban areas — which is of very much concern to me — roads, land values, agricultural uses, and other relevant information. Through computer programming, you can then se-

lect an optimum route or series of optimum routes.

This concept is not 1984, where you have a gigantic computer, everything goes in, and who knows where it'll come out. It's rather a situation where all the information we're dealing with is in the public domain, and each agency involved would have its own system, appropriate to its own needs in terms of size and access, but would be organized on the common geographic grid system so it would be compatible and instantly available to one agency or another that was required to make a timely decision with respect to, say, a pipeline or transmission line.

This common data base and information exchange won't eliminate all the problems dealing with land-related questions regarding energy transmission. The hon. Member for Wainwright would certainly appreciate that in a lot of cases some of the poor planning done by one agency is simply because they don't have time to ask the other agency when they're going to put in their telephone lines versus when they're going to widen the road, and if they asked the question it would take them six months to find out. If it's all computer accessed, that sort of problem might not be eliminated but would certainly be reduced.

The other thing is that in addition to providing that timeliness by having a common grid, we'll be dealing in a situation of apples and apples as opposed to apples versus oranges, if you're trying to come to a rational decision.

Back to the case of Edmonton Mill Woods: if this system had been in place, the pipeline damage may have been avoided simply because the pipeline would have been better located. And once the rupture had occurred, the location and technical details could have been immediately displayed on a computer console.

Mr. Speaker, the technology to provide this information is available. It's partly in place within our government departments. I'm pleased to see we have a front-bench minister with responsibilities in this area, and I'm sure that with the will to do it, we'll see better co-ordination and better availability of information within government departments.

The other point I want to address briefly is the accountability of regulatory agencies. Mr. Speaker, this point would relate to the recognition that tremendous cost is associated, to use again the biological framework, with the gestation period of almost any project. In other words, time is money, whether a land developer is waiting for subdivision approval or a farmer is waiting for an adjudication from the Surface Rights Board.

In terms of a streamlining process, the Member for Calgary Buffalo might appreciate the idea of establishing a reasonable time period for a decision or required action on the part of any agency. If that agency didn't meet its budgeted time frame without a valid reason, it would forfeit its right or pay a penalty to the serious applicant for any delays. To really hit where it hurts. I suppose you might take any associated penalties out of their manpower budget.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if that was on the topic, but I'm an 'incrementalist'. I don't think we can change these things overnight, but I think most decisions are better made with a common information base. I hope that that sort of thought might be carried forward with this motion.



MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what I can add, after the excellent contributions this afternoon. Many remarks I intended to make have been made, particularly by the hon. members for Macleod, Little Bow, and Banff-Cochrane. I've heard all the remarks they made; I've heard them in spades, plus a few more. It's not much wonder, because they border on my constituency, and the people there have a lot of the same concerns and problems. My remarks will be mostly about the pipelines and corridors in the Highwood constituency. They have a lot of concerns there about them, and I share their concerns.

I personally looked at a pipeline right of way that went down the Happy Valley and the Chain Lakes west of Nanton — beautiful country out there. It took many meetings, phone calls, and inspections to convince the people doing the work that they should abide by the regulations in putting in those types of lines.

I might make a gentle suggestion to the minister that he have his department put a few more teeth into the people in the area, to be able to control some of the things that went on there. After all, much of the land that particular pipeline went through has been owned, carefully nurtured, and looked after with pride by the good people who live there. Many of them are descendants of the pioneers who opened up that area, and they have a real pride of ownership and stewardship of that land. To have it defaced by incompetent workmen is rather a tragedy. They're reasonable people. They're willing to share the responsibility of having pipelines and so on.

In fact, I liked the remark of one young rancher. There are numerous proposals for the 500 kV Calgary Power line. He looked at one proposal and said, I don't like that, because it goes across my property. It only affects me. But I can't complain about it. The other proposal affects 13 people, so I won't complain. That's the type of people who are out there, and I think we owe a little something to help them out and take care of them.

They have some concerns about the power line going from Langdon to the southeast corner of B.C. One of their concerns is: is the large station at Langdon necessary, or could it be put someplace where it's not quite so damaging to the ecology and to the agricultural land? Also, the people who have acreages are concerned at having it go through their places.

They're also concerned as to why it can't go through Crown land. That land is owned by the people of Alberta. This power line is for the benefit of all people in Alberta, and in Canada as well. They're not looking to get it out of their area and put through the territory of the hon. Member for Little Bow. They'll accept it if there's nowhere else for it to go. But their main concern is: why can't it go through Crown land?

I support this motion, and I'm pleased that the hon. member brought it in. I've enjoyed the remarks made to this point. I know the people of Highwood will be very interested and pleased to know that the hon. member brought this motion in, and that there has been a lot of support for it here this afternoon.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to take part in the debate on the motion brought in by the minister — the Member for Three Hills. She's so eloquent, maybe she should be a minister.

We are dealing with a very important problem and, in spite of the fact that I'm not a great believer in big government, I feel the study is justified. It's a problem that covers an area where the individual is, to some extent, helpless. It really is well within the confines of what I feel government should be doing.

Most of the people who have spoken have been from agricultural areas of the province and, I think, have very effectively put the legitimate concerns of farmers whose agricultural areas are being progressively and almost systematically cut up by pipelines, highways and, increasingly nowadays, transmission lines for electrical power.

As I've said before, I come from a constituency which has very few farmers. Rather like the Member for Calgary Buffalo, I think I represent primarily the consumers of agricultural products. That doesn't mean we're not concerned, because I think the member and I would both like to continue eating in the manner to which we have become accustomed, being Albertans. We have a fairly liberal consumption.

I would disagree with the Member for Calgary Buffalo on one point. He thinks all the railway lines and highways and most of the pipelines in Alberta have already been built. It's only a matter of 10 years since we built 150 miles of railroad right through the northern part of my constituency. Although it's not through prime agricultural land, it was a fair-sized project and involved quite a large area of the province.

As I've said, so far the members for the rural areas have been talking largely from an agricultural standpoint. I would like to bring up a completely different aspect; that is, the effect the building of railways, highways, pipelines, electrical transmission lines has on the forested areas of this province. I represent about half of the Eastern Slopes.

If you fly over the Eastern slopes from north of Grande Cache to Calgary, as I have done, and you look at those forested areas, you realize what an enormous effect we have had, not by cutting wood for lumber or pulp but by the development of transmission lines for energy, for roads, and for access. The amount of productive forest land involved if you put a pipeline, an electrical transmission line, and a highway through a given section of land can make the remaining trees almost useless commercially. You leave between those rights of way narrow strips of trees which are completely uneconomic to salvage. In any case, in the course of putting those lines through, you have destroyed maybe half the timber in that area.

The multi-use corridor approach is a very tempting proposition. Certainly, you can do that with some things. It is quite safe and rational to put a highway, an electrical transmission line, and possibly the natural gas line to a town along a relatively narrow corridor. None of the three will affect the others to any great extent. The problem is that if you put additional lines, such as the one that gave way at Mill Woods, too close to other vital transmission lines, and you have an accident such as in Mill Woods, you are going to disrupt major highways, in many cases the only highway. You may disrupt the only electrical transmission line and the only gas line. So communities at the end of those corridors are going to be deprived of road access, electrical supply, and natural gas in one fell swoop.

That's not to say I'm against the multi-use corridor, but I think it has to be done very carefully, so that in the process of getting rid of one problem we do not

create an even greater one. It has to be done with intelligence and forethought.

I can give you a fine example of the disruption of forested land. Most of you who have travelled to Jasper have probably seen but not noticed it. Through the Obed hills we have the Canadian National Railway, Trans Mountain Pipe Line, a Calgary Power major electrical supply line for the town of Hinton, and Highway 16. There are places where those four corridors run within a mile of each other. You can't see it, because of course the trees intervene. But when you fly over it, it's incredible that anybody could have allowed that to happen.

As I said, the Member for Calgary Buffalo may well be mistaken that we have built all the roads, railway lines, and major pipelines in this province. If we continue in the same haphazard manner, we may well find the forest industry coming back to us wanting larger areas for the existing facilities and preventing us from getting other forest development, because useful wood isn't available anymore.

Mr. Speaker, another concern I have, and it's been expressed by several speakers in this debate, is the almost impossible situation the individual affected by a projected transmission or pipeline is in nowadays. Legal fees are going up just as fast as other things. I'm not trying to pick on another profession and their potential for extra or balance billing. But the thought of taking on Calgary Power or a major pipeline company is formidable to most of us. It certainly is to me. I notice the [motion] suggests, to "facilitate the development of a general energy transmission plan". I hope there would be some provision in that plan for an authority which would enable people to be involved in the process of deciding on routes, without too much direct cost to those individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I've expressed several concerns in a somewhat incoherent fashion, because they skip back and forth. But these are legitimate concerns in addition to some of those expressed by other speakers. My main concern — and I will repeat it — is that as well as affecting agricultural land, the use of many corridors through the forested areas of this province could have a tremendous effect on one of our renewable resources. I would like to protect that particular concern of mine.

In view of the hour and the fact that there is other business this afternoon, I would now like to adjourn debate on this motion.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

201. Moved by Mr. D Anderson

Be it resolved that the government of Alberta give immediate consideration to convening a congress on our aging community to deal with the impact of the increasing average age on Alberta. The congress would include legislators and prominent Albertans from all walks of life

Be it further resolved that the said congress establish a committee which from the findings of the congress will formulate suggestions to the government recommending ways to deal with the economic and social problems associated with aging

[Adjourned debate May 29: Mr. Magee]

MR. MAGEE: Mr. Speaker, it is with some divergent views that I stand today to present my contribution to the continuing debate on Motion 201, as presented to this Assembly on May 29 by the hon. Member for Calgary Currie.

Mr. Speaker, I consider the subject matter of this motion of great interest to all. During the recent election campaign in this province, through knocking on doors and visiting senior citizens' lodges, nursing homes, and auxiliary hospitals, the members of this government and the members in opposition all came upon conditions and individual circumstances that brought home to each that we are all aging. In a short period of time, the majority of us will in fact become senior citizens, reach the age of 65, as for some reason that seems to be the magical age at which this transition takes place.

Mr. Speaker, in preparing for this debate, and in addressing myself to the first half of the hon. member's motion, which calls for the establishment of a congress to accept input from all sources on the subject of aging and compile yet another report, I have come to the conclusion, and recommend to this Assembly, that we should not convene a congress at this time, but instead should concentrate our efforts toward implementing or rejecting the results of numerous reports which exist and which continue to come from many sources: concerned individuals, social action groups, and government councils.

I would point out to the hon. Member for Calgary Currie, and to others who have spoken in support of this motion to date, that this government has made a very concerted effort during the past eight years to put into place mechanisms to handle this mass of information. Mr. Speaker, I had little appreciation for the magnitude of the job prior to preparing myself for this debate. In fact, it has crossed my mind that eye drops should be sold in litres to assist one's eyestrain when reading the volumes of information that exist today on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, a provincial Senior Citizens' Advisory Council was appointed early in 1976 to advise this government on matters pertaining to older people. Its membership of 20 includes people from all walks of life, younger as well as older persons, professionals, and senior administrators from five departments who are charged with the responsibility of administering the majority of needs of senior citizens. These are Advanced Education and Manpower, Housing and Public Works, Recreation and Parks, Social Services and Community Health, and Hospitals and Medical Care. In addition, a Member of the Legislative Assembly sits on this council. The director of the Senior Citizens Bureau of the Department of Social Services and Community Health acts as secretary, and the resources of the department are available to this council. This council has presented two annual reports, implicit in which is a wide range of recommendations to a number of cabinet ministers.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I think it would be worth while to read to this Assembly a statement of philosophy which sets the guidelines for the work of this council:

The Council believes that old age should be a time of satisfaction and fulfillment.

Like persons of all ages, older persons should be

able, within reason, to select their own life styles, influence and determine their future, and have an opportunity for meaningful involvement. They should be able to enjoy a sense of security from appropriate health and social services and be assured of financial and other resources that enable them to share in a rising standard of living. They also have a responsibility to be as self-reliant as possible and contribute to the well being of society.

Even though the later years may bring physical and social stresses, the Council believes that they can be a time of productivity, growth, and self-realization.

To ensure this, three basic themes should form the foundation of government policy, services and their delivery:

- (1) provision for maximum independence and choice;
- (2) encouragement of continued participation in family and community life;
- (3) involvement of senior citizens in the planning, development and assessment of services.

The Council is convinced that it is in the interest of all people that the positive aspects of aging and old age be stressed. Through programs and policies which encourage activity and contribution, senior citizens can be a vital component of the social fabric of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, this government has paid a good deal of attention to the reports of this council. Many of its recommendations have recently been implemented. In addition, the Alberta Council on Aging has had considerable influence on social policy for the aged in Alberta. The major voluntary organization of seniors and those interested in them, it was founded in 1967 by the Alberta delegates to the 1966 Canadian Conference on Aging. Through the years, with continuous meetings and resulting resolutions to the Alberta cabinet, it has gained considerable political clout. Since 1975, due to its volunteer efforts and advice, it has been recognized by this government as worthy of an annual operating grant so that it could use paid leadership.

This council publishes a newspaper, the *ACA News*, on a regular basis. It has developed a number of reports, studies, and publications, not the least of which are a rural transportation study, a rural senior citizens' centre study, and a survey of continuing education programs for seniors. As well, it is providing a bibliography of literature on aging available in the province.

Beginning in the early '70s, Mr. Speaker, it has taken a strong social action stance. It consistently promotes the development of more community services for the elderly, such as housing, home care, in-support services, senior citizens' centres, and better nursing home care. The Alberta Council on Aging has a board of 30, elected by its membership in various parts of the province. It fosters co-ordination among seniors' groups and services, and ensures that seniors are interested and have a voice in their communities and with the government. It monitors, initiates, and reacts to the needs of programs for seniors. It is independent and plays a strong social action role, using the media to promote its aims and goals.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to give the members of this Assembly some philosophy adhered to by the

Council on Aging in its quest for fulfilment of its goals. This message was contained in a short position paper presented in 1965 by a task force on aging:

Surely the older members of society deserve our respect in a tangible form. It should be remembered that the future prosperity of the country is assured by present investment in social and industrial capital. This is only possible if there is some way in which current consumption is reduced in favour of such savings. The present degree of affluence was assured by such savings in the past. This was due to the work and the relative degree of under-consumption which prevailed when the present geriatric age group was in charge. Most of the poorer members of the geriatric community contributed to the present prosperity both by labour and by under-consumption. Thus they have a moral right to share some of the benefits of our current relative degree of affluence. Unfortunately, because of inflation, the most provident among them are forced to continue their contributions to the future generation through systematic depletion of the value of their retirement incomes.

MR. SPEAKER: I apologize for interrupting the hon. member, but I think we're running into difficulty with regard to reading speeches, whether they be one's own or someone else's. Of course if they're one's own, they are affected by the ordinary rule. If they happen to be the speeches or opinions of others and are quoted at great length, that has the effect of having people who are not members of the Assembly debate in the Assembly. That is, of course, something which should be limited to elected members.

MR. MAGEE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With respect, sir, I have one more sentence left in this particular quotation:

Surely we must provide better for their needs, especially when they are not as able to help themselves.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the words of this task force have been heard by this government. It has shown in many tangible ways the results of that task force. However, this government is not resting on its laurels. It continues in its efforts and its policy of recognizing that a growing number of elderly people will be counted among Alberta's population in the next 20 to 25 years.

The hon. Member for Calgary Currie expressed considerable concern that a shift of the age groups in Canada would create problems for the taxpayers' continuing ability to provide services in the years to come, and that the proposed Alberta congress would address itself, among other issues, to studying this problem. My objection to the first half of the hon. member's motion, Mr. Speaker, is that a congress is a one-shot effort to resolve problems. I hold out to members of this Assembly that during the forthcoming years government studies should go on continuously. This can be accomplished by the establishment of an institute of gerontology. It would be my recommendation that this possibility should be studied further before acceptance of the hon. member's motion.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that a task force is now ready to reveal its findings on this subject in a report to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. So no doubt we'll be hearing a good deal more on this proposal in the near future.

An Alberta institute of gerontology is seen as a body that would not duplicate the work presently being carried out by the Alberta Council on Aging, the Senior Citizens Bureau, the advisory council, the local service organizations now handling senior citizens' centres and home care, or any other body in Alberta or Canada. Instead, Mr. Speaker, the institute should be a body which could be called upon by the Alberta Council on Aging and government advisory bodies for data, guidance, and expert help, and for advice on co-ordinating mechanisms for the delivery of services. These experts' analyses could go on and on through the years, keeping a watchful eye on demographic trends and alerting all private, public, and government sectors to the need for change.

As well, Mr. Speaker, the government has recognized that despite the large numbers and great variety of programs and services now provided for senior citizens, improvement can and should be made. Consequently a special caucus committee has been established to assist, by making recommendations to caucus, in matters pertaining to senior citizens. Certainly one of the major concerns of this committee, sir, will be addressing itself to the future as well as to the present, to ensure that comprehensive programs are initiated now, to keep a high profile for the concerns of Alberta's senior citizens, not the least of which are home care and home help, to ensure that the majority of its citizens 65 or older who wish to remain in their own homes may have every opportunity to do so.

My concern, Mr. Speaker, is that formation of a congress at this time could have the effect of slowing down our progress as we wait for the results of further studies. Therefore, my suggestion to this Assembly is that we move ahead with the programs we have in place, designed for action now, and that for a few months we ponder and then decide on the advisability of putting an institute of gerontology in place whose subsequent advice would be founded on research.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment my hon. colleague the Member for Calgary Currie. Through his initiative in presenting Resolution 201, he has instigated this debate and has again focused everyone's attention on the need for continued study and planning to ensure that this important segment of Alberta's population moves along in direct proportion to the enjoyment of the good life available to those under the age of 65.

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I rise in my place today to lend my qualified support to Motion 201. At the outset, I make the point that I feel very deeply that Alberta is a great place to live, but I feel the need to be somewhat reassured that Alberta is a great place to grow old in.

At the risk of stating the obvious, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the point that problems associated with the process of aging are obviously not confined to Alberta or to our time. These problems have existed from time immemorial. On the other hand, public awareness and concern are of comparatively recent origin. I'm advised that increasingly more research on the subject of aging is being done by government bodies, academic groups, research groups, and universities. I understand that some departments of social science are making curriculum changes incorporating new courses of study in the area of aging. Legislators too, obviously including my colleagues in this House, are becoming increasingly interested and

involved in the subject.

I'm encouraged by the motion brought forward by the hon. Member for Calgary Currie, but my support has one qualification: congresses, like royal commissions, sometimes become alternatives to rather than springboards for further action. I'm sure the hon. Member for Calgary Currie envisions the latter in advancing his motion.

Mr. Speaker, before I comment briefly on the aging process, I want to respond to the comment made by the hon. Member for Little Bow in previous debate on this motion. I must admit I was puzzled by his reference to this government as being an aging government. I'd like to express to the hon. member that the budget speech, among other documents and other actions, offers abundant evidence of vigor and vitality in this government. In addition, I feel somewhat constrained to caution the hon. Member for Little Bow that he ought not to confuse wisdom and intellectual capacity and vision with senility, as he apparently has.

We tend to regard the aging process impersonally until some of its symptoms appear in our own lives. To state the obvious again, ours is very much a youth-oriented society. While making nervous jokes about our advancing years, we often emulate the younger members of our society. I think that's an Alberta phenomenon too. Our frenetic search for euphemisms like "pioneers" and "senior citizens" is but another result of our resistance to the concept of aging. The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that regardless of these euphemisms and other escape mechanisms, all of us will grow old.

A further complication in the psychological aspect of aging is that our self-concept is often a more important index than our chronological age. Who is older, I ask this House: the 60-year-old who feels 35 or the 35-year-old who feels 60? In our society, 65 is most frequently used as the index of when old age begins. But at best, Mr. Speaker, it's a very rough index. An excerpt from a recent issue of the *Banque Canadienne Nationale* monthly letter on this question of when old age begins came to my desk recently from the Senior Citizens Bureau. The marginal notation has the caption, *Redefining Old Age*. If I may quote a very brief excerpt, sir, the article argues our society has rejected old age and the elderly and has created hardships for other people, and it implores us:

... to adopt a new philosophy of life in which self-realization is no longer conditioned by a person's response to external influences but by the will to live fully, to find fulfillment in leisure, creativity and culture.

Reference has been made by a number of my colleagues to the trends which appear to be developing in the broad subject of aging and which merit consideration by this Assembly. The number of aged in Canada and in Alberta has increased at a faster rate than our total population. The elderly now form a bigger proportion of the total population than ever, and that trend is likely to continue. It is a trend that has important social and economic consequences and that we as legislators simply cannot ignore.

In recent days, Mr. Speaker, I've given some thought to what might comprise an appropriate agenda for such a congress, if it were to be convened in Alberta. I would like to suggest that our consideration of convening such a congress include these four subjects: one, housing; two, retirement problems and

planning for retirement; three, exploitation of the aged; and four, the role of the family. If time will allow, I would like to make a brief comment on each of these agenda suggestions.

Three months ago the Premier made two important announcements related to the subject of housing. The first of these related to a program in which a new \$500 level was established for senior citizen renters' assistance grants. The second related to the Alberta pioneers' repair program. He announced that senior citizens who had already received assistance under phases one and two of the senior citizen home improvement program would still be eligible for a new Alberta pioneers' repair grant of up to \$2,000. The senior citizens in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, and indeed in my own family, have told me how much they appreciate these two housing-related programs. It's a priority subject with them.

The suitability of living accommodation becomes even more crucial for older persons because of the proportionately greater amount of time they spend in their homes. Some older people spend almost every moment of their last years at home. I'm sure each member today has constituents who fit into this category. Few factors have as much potential for promoting well-being of the elderly as safe and comfortable housing. Therefore, I suggest that it would be a good conference topic.

My second agenda suggestion is retirement problems and planning. I'd like to comment on the dilemma of retirement and the leisurely life expected of retired people, and how it contradicts the pervasive work orientation that surrounds them in their retirement setting.

Of course, life expectancy is increasing in Alberta, as it is elsewhere on this continent, making retirement a more common phenomenon in society. It might make sense psychologically to raise the retirement age, a subject I hope to return to on another occasion. There are economic and sociological pressures to hold retirement at age 65, or even to lower it. But retirement does represent the challenge of a new way of life for most Albertans, despite those pressures.

The man or woman who has spent 40 years or more in the labor force is suddenly handed a gold watch and told to go home and relax. That represents a most difficult adjustment. The man or woman who has devoted his life to a career frequently has nothing to substitute for it once it's been denied him and, for many, relaxation is an unknown art. I might make the same observation of many of my colleagues in this House. I suspect that recognition of this dilemma, Mr. Speaker, was part of the government's reasoning in its plans to upgrade or extend drop-in centres for senior citizens' organizations.

May I make a third and final reference to an announcement made by the government earlier this year:

Beginning April 1 ... [a] program has been proposed in response to the large number of letters, petitions and briefs from senior citizens which have been received by the government during the past year.

This led to an announcement of increased financial assistance to these groups and drop-in centres. It drew this comment from a spokesman for this government:

These drop-in centres for our senior citizens play a key role in providing a focal point for social, cultural, and recreation programs in the

community.

I'd suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the proposed or theorized congress does materialize, retirement problems and planning merit a most exhaustive analysis.

Now the subject of exploitation of the aged has not had the study and examination it merits. Although it appears to be less of a problem in Alberta than in other parts of Canada, exploitation of the aged should be considered in any serious examination of the problems of the elderly. Because they're so highly vulnerable, older people are increasingly irresistible targets for exploitation. They constitute a lucrative market for burglars, confidence men, swindlers, and quacks.

Their vulnerability derives from a number of factors. Those in social isolation and loneliness can be taken in very easily by feigned friendliness shown by strangers. Many live in the older areas of the city, not far from higher crime rate areas. Of course, many live on small, fixed incomes and become particularly vulnerable to proposals pitched on economic grounds. I suggest the proposed congress should explore every possible method to reduce, the incidence of such exploitation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, during this debate I'd like to suggest there's been a significant omission. I don't know that a single reference has been made — astonishingly — to the role of the family in the problems of the aged. Speaking personally, sir, in my elderly years, as much as I would appreciate society's or government's institutional programs, none has the potential to satisfy my deepest emotional and psychological needs like those of my children and their children. In an age when there's such a tendency to slough off to government what should be done at home or by the family, I would urge that if the congress is convened, it attach a priority to the very subject of what Alberta's families can do — not what government, academics, or bleeding hearts can do, but what families can do to alleviate the problems of the aged.

May I conclude my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, by repeating my opening comment in support of Motion No. 201, that Alberta is surely a great place to live. Let's reassure ourselves — and perhaps this congress is the way to do it — that Alberta is a great place to grow old in.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, you and I are getting old. And I believe you have the distinction, sir, of being the longest reigning Speaker in Canada. I suspect you will go down in the Guinness book of records as the longest reigning Speaker in the British Commonwealth.

Mr. Speaker, we are getting old. To bring home the point, a week or two ago I had the opportunity to stop at the drive-in, or the drop-in centre in Camrose. [laughter] I met a Camrose businessman in his late '80s who was complaining to me not of his age but of his business schedule. He couldn't get young help. The young help wasn't worth a darn, everything was going to pot, and so forth and so on. I asked him, at age 87, "Why aren't you using your son? Why isn't your son president of your company and taking over some of the workload?" He replied, "Oh, the darned kid just retired at 65." I think we are starting to grow younger.

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

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: While it may be highly irregular for me to comment on anything said by the hon. Member for Camrose, perhaps I should say, just so that innocent readers of *Hansard* may not be misled, that the longest

serving Speaker in the British Commonwealth was a former Speaker of this Assembly, the late Rev. Peter Dawson. I think he served for 26 years.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will resume debate on the budget.

[At 5:29 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]