

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: Tuesday, October 30, 1979 2:30 p.m.

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

## PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the return to No. 108.

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I'm tabling the report as requested on 114.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and pleasure, to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 100 grade 10 students from Victoria Composite high. They are seated in both galleries, and are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Scragg, Mrs. Unterschute, Mr. Mock, and Mr. Mizera. I ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly two guests visiting Alberta from England. They are friends of the Savaryn family, and on Sunday spent a very enjoyable day with the Member for Edmonton Belmont and his wife at their church of worship. They are seated in the members gallery. They are Nan Sheppard and June Coates. I'd like them to rise and receive the usual welcome of the Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Energy Pricing**

MR. R. CLARK: My first question is to the hon. Premier, on the issue of oil pricing. I raised this issue earlier this session. I ask your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, in allowing me to preface my question by reading two very brief excerpts from *Hansard* which will provide the context.

On October 19 I asked the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources about energy negotiations. He replied:

Any discussions about the content, the proposals, or the details of negotiations are very much against the best interests of the people of Alberta.

The second quotation, Mr. Speaker, is on October 23. I asked the hon. Premier about negotiations between the government of Alberta and Canada on resource pricing. He replied:

I am a strong believer that when we enter negotiations, we for our part are committed to conduct those negotiations on the understanding that they

will be conducted in confidence until they have either reached a conclusion or have been stalemated.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. Premier: what conclusion or what stalemate has developed between the two governments, the government of Canada and the government of Alberta, since those statements, that caused the Premier to revise his policy of confidential negotiations and plead his case before the Vancouver Board of Trade?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the negotiations are still under way. There is no stalemate. But there has been a growing misunderstanding in this country that it is simply a matter for the federal government to establish unilaterally the price at which we would sell our depleting resources. Such is not the case, and I thought it important to communicate that to the citizens of the country.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the Premier. It is not my intention, at least in the course of this supplementary, to debate the Premier's position with respect to the appropriate level of oil pricing. My immediate concern is for the contempt shown to the Legislative Assembly; that in fact, Mr. Speaker, the Premier went outside this Assembly and outside Alberta, and wouldn't answer questions . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the hon. leader wishes to raise a matter of that kind, he might possibly be able to frame it as a matter of privilege. At this point I wouldn't prejudge what the result of that might be. But I don't know of any way in which a complaint of that kind is authorized to be made in question period, because the hon. Premier would be under the same constraints and might not have sufficient opportunity to reply.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then let me pose this supplementary question to the Premier. Would the Premier explain to the Members of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta the statement he made in Vancouver yesterday, that soon Albertans may be paying the world price for oil and gas?

MR. NOTLEY: Why wasn't it made here?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'd be delighted to respond to that. First of all though, with regard to the statement of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I was not discussing negotiations yesterday. I was following through on a document tabled in this Legislature, my statement made in La Malbaie, Quebec, which we tabled at the opening of the fall session. I refer the hon. leader to paragraph 3. I don't recall being asked by the hon. leader, in the three-odd weeks in which the House has been in session, any questions with regard to paragraph 3. I was essentially expanding upon that; that is, the right of the province, the ownership right, as to whether or not to sell its natural resources.

With regard to the question of pricing, I said in Vancouver yesterday, and I'd like to use the precise phrase, that if a fair arrangement is made on oil pricing that assures a steady movement to world commodity prices and no artificial skimming of re-

source revenue from producing provinces — the criteria for our basic position — but if we do not get such an arrangement, this winter Alberta will have to reassess its continued sale of light and medium crude, except upon such a fair price schedule. In responding to reporters afterwards about such a fair price schedule, it should be clear that in that event it would contain the staging in of prices to world commodity value, and it would also contain a situation where we would have a discount on what the average price was in the United States, the so-called Chicago composite price.

There is a misconception of what I said with regard to pricing in Alberta. The actual fact is that Albertans will continue to have the lowest cost oil products of any part of the western industrialized world, as they do today. That would be because, first of all, such fair price schedule would provide a wellhead price below that in any other part of the industrialized world and, secondly, because at the same time it would reflect the fact that we have no gasoline tax and a farm fuel transportation allowance in this province. So with the fair price schedule I referred to yesterday, in the event an agreement were not reached, the people of Alberta would continue to have the lowest priced oil products in the western industrialized world.

I just have to make one qualification to that. If the federal government should develop an extensive excise tax regime, it might be that it would exceed costs in other countries. But in any event, even with that federal initiative, Albertans would continue to enjoy the lowest oil product position of any province in Canada.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to clarify a point the hon. Premier made. When we were discussing prices, did the Premier say that we are looking at the Chicago composite price? Or are we looking at OPEC price or spot price in the world market? What figure are we looking at?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, as we've said, our position with regard to a pricing agreement is that we have been prepared and will continue to be prepared to have a situation where we would stage in towards world commodity prices. As I'm sure was implicit in the hon. member's question, that world commodity price is now not an OPEC price but a price in terms of the open market, because it is clear that OPEC is not now setting the price. But this movement towards world commodity price would have a ceiling, and that ceiling would be the Chicago composite price, which is a melding of the American wellhead price with the cost of imported oil. And to assure that Canadians will continue to receive a price below that of any industrialized nation, the pricing position that we present and the pricing position that we would move to if we moved on our own, would both contain the same ingredients. Those ingredients would be a discount, which I'm not prepared to specify in quantitative terms at this time, below the Chicago composite price.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. Did the Premier, in his discussion with the media yesterday after the speech, give any timetable for Alberta's moving near the Chicago blended price, should an agreement not be reached between the government of Alberta and the government of Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: I apologize for interrupting. The subject matter of the hon. member's question is in order. But questions inquiring about the contents of press interviews are beyond the scope of the question period. Perhaps the hon. member would simply like to ask the question directly without reference to a press interview.

DR. BUCK: If the hon. Premier had made that announcement here, Mr. Speaker, we wouldn't have to use press releases.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, there's no particular problem. I'll put the question directly to the Premier.

Was any timetable given, anytime yesterday, as to when the province of Alberta would move to something near the commodity price, or the Chicago blended price, should an agreement not be reached between the government of Canada and the government of Alberta?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, no. What I said yesterday is that the reassessment would occur over the course of this winter. But the position of the government of Alberta — supported, we believe, by the citizens of this province — is that we're not prepared to sell our rapidly depleting light and medium crude reserves substantially under commodity value for an extended period.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the Premier advising the Assembly that we're looking at some time during 1980 to move to the Chicago blended price? Or is the government of Alberta prepared to look at a staging-in over several years, as has been suggested from time to time by various federal cabinet ministers?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, there are two parts to the answer. First, to reiterate the position, we are of the view that in both events — either by way of agreement with the federal government or by decision made on our own — it would be a staging over a number of years to world commodity price, subject to a discount on the Chicago composite price. As far as the circumstances with regard to the timing are concerned, we would be assessing them over the course of the winter. Whether the action would be taken in 1980 is a matter that would emanate from that assessment.

Just a final word, Mr. Speaker. I want to make our position absolutely clear. We're not prepared to continue to sell our light and medium crude substantially under commodity value for an extended period of time, even if the opposition parties appear to be.

DR. BUCK: That's twisting it around if I ever heard anything.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. What contingency plans has the government of Alberta made with respect to the possibility that the Premier outlined yesterday — at least reports of his comments yesterday — that should an agreement not be reached, and Alberta staged in price increases, and other provinces did not wish to buy at that price, we would simply cut back on production? What contingency plans has the government made at this time to evaluate the impact of such a policy on the thou-

sands of people who are employed directly by the petroleum industry in this province?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, our judgment is that, by the way in which we would carry it out, there would not be an impact in terms of the people employed in the petroleum industry. I'm not prepared to elaborate on the mechanics of how that would be carried out, only to say that I want to make it absolutely clear that it is distortion of the Alberta government position to suggest that we're cutting back on production. We're saying, as we said in La Malbaie, that if you have ownership rights over a resource, and you're not able to say at what price you're prepared to sell that resource, it doesn't strike me that those ownership rights have any significant meaning at all.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. NOTLEY: I would just remind the hon. Premier that people have to buy as well as sell.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier is with respect to discussions that took place in Quebec, where the government of Alberta was quite successful in achieving support, I believe, from eight out of 10 provinces. In view of the success of close consultation last summer, what steps does the Premier intend to take to contact the other premiers in this country to acquaint them personally with the position the government of Alberta has taken and the contents of the Premier's speech yesterday?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, in essence there's nothing different between what I said yesterday and what was contained in paragraph 3 of the statement in La Malbaie. But, on behalf of the government of Alberta, I do hold to the view that we have a resource which it seems is being singled out, if you like, for different treatment than other resources. I think some of the other provinces are aware that it may be Alberta's oil now, but it could be their resource later; and that it is quite clear that it has to be a fair arrangement, and that what we are in fact proposing is a fair arrangement.

We're saying we'll agree to a continued subsidy — now \$15 billion; this year I'm sure it will be in excess of \$3 billion — to stage in the increases to facilitate the Canadian economy, questionable as that might be; to keep a lower price than that in Chicago, which provides an advantage to the Canadian manufacturing and industrial complex; and to accelerate support for the development of oil sands and non-conventional oil. I suggest to the hon. member, and to members of the opposition, that that is a tremendous commitment on behalf of the people of Alberta to meeting Canada's energy needs. I think it goes without saying that that commitment should fairly be met both ways, coming back in terms of our requests for fair treatment as well.

MR. COOK: A supplementary question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Is it the view of the government of the province of Alberta that increases in energy costs will promote energy conservation and encourage Canadians to restructure the Canadian economy to become more efficient, and not force us to subsidize the rest of the country to the tune of some \$15 billion today, and God knows what it will be in future?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, that really goes to the statement signed by the Prime Minister of Canada this past summer in Tokyo. That was the declaration of the six major countries that participated. The agreement made by the Prime Minister of Canada in that Tokyo declaration was to move domestic oil prices to world prices as soon as possible. We can certainly have flexibility on the "as soon as possible". Frankly, I would be interpreting the Prime Minister's position in terms of answering the hon. member's question, except to say that if that's the view of all of those industrialized countries, we should not fool ourselves as to the true cost of the commodity. Obviously, that must be the thrust of the reason for the Tokyo declaration on pricing.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. I want to indicate that my telephone rang off the wall last night after the report of the Premier's statements, along with high interest increases in the past week.

Mr. Speaker, bringing the price of oil and gas up to the Chicago composite price certainly has an impact on the consumers of Alberta, and the implication was that, when this does happen, Albertans would have to pay. I wonder, is that an acceptable trade-off by the government of Alberta of consumer cost versus the necessity at this point in time to bring the price up to or near the Chicago composite price?

MR. LOUGHEED: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the key is what I said in the earlier response. I think the policy objective of the government of Alberta is to assure that oil products and energy costs in total are lower here than in any province in Canada, and for that matter with any of our competitors in any of our base industries. And that's a pretty important objective. We have shown that by our natural gas price protection plan, shown that by the elimination of gasoline tax, shown that by the 12 cents a gallon provision by way of transportation allowance for our farmers. And we will continue to show it. On the other hand, for the heritage of the very people implicit in the question by the hon. member, for this generation, we can hardly sell off at an enormous discount — if that's the hon. member's party's position — the resources owned by the people of Alberta. It would be a tragedy for Alberta if we did that over an extended period of time.

DR. BUCK: You've been doing it, though.

MR. PAHL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary question to the Premier. Would the Premier assure this House that the government of the province of Alberta, notwithstanding its negotiations now, will continue to meet its commitment with respect to the present federal/provincial energy pricing agreement as long as it is in effect?

MR. LOUGHEED: That's a difficult question, Mr. Speaker. The agreement provides for a \$1 increase on January 1, 1980, and concludes June 30, 1980. We are considering that as part of the negotiation, and I wouldn't be prepared to say more to the House at this time.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier would indicate to the House and clarify whether he

continues to hold the position that negotiations shall continue on a bilateral basis between Alberta and the federal government, and whether the lowest oil product costs to Albertans will be maintained in spite of the schedule rising gradually to the world price.

MR. LOUGHEED: Unequivocally, with regard to the second question. That's what I've said twice here. With regard to the first question, yes, the negotiations are still under way, but I think it's important for the public of Canada, not just for those negotiating, to be aware of Alberta's basic thrust, elaborating upon the position stated in La Malbaie, Quebec, in paragraph 3.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo.

MR. KNAAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary to the Premier. Mr. Premier, the federal government has in place the Petroleum Administration Act, which also permits the federal government to set the price of any oil that would move across a provincial boundary. Does the provincial government take the position that the federal government cannot use its trade and commerce power to usurp provincial ownership rights in this case?

MR. LOUGHEED: No, Mr. Speaker. We've never taken that view. Without getting into a legal argument, the position is that once a product moves into an interprovincial, international stream, it is subject to the trade and commerce provisions. However, the question of whether or not a province wants to continue to sell a resource at a price established unilaterally by the federal government that's unfair to the province is a question the province has to face up to, beyond an extended period of time. That is really what the issue is all about.

MR. SINDLINGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question was asked.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to go back to the answer given to the supplementary question posed by the Member for Edmonton Mill Woods and ask the Premier to confirm that, in the course of the ongoing negotiations, the position of the government of Alberta is now that the government expects or is setting as a target an agreement by the end of the winter, as opposed to the expression used in this Assembly earlier in this fall session, I think: the end of this year. I ask the question because it seems we've now had an extension of three or four months in the province's target.

MR. LOUGHEED: No, Mr. Speaker, that's not right. We have an agreement, as I say, that goes to the end of June of 1980. The phrase "this winter" — I have a vague recollection of getting into an argument back in '74-75 on this same issue, as to when winter started or when spring began. I'm not sure; I'll have to check my history. That phraseology is ... Obviously, if we're not reaching an agreement by that time, then we have to decide what our other courses of action would be.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, if I might pursue that with just one further supplementary. Between now and

the end of winter, whenever that may be — March, April, May — the government will be developing, if I could use the term, contingency plans for the eventuality the Premier has mentioned in the last day or two?

MR. LOUGHEED: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that's absolutely right. I would hope we would hear from the opposition parties whether or not they favor the continued sale below value of our depleting resources.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, it should be pointed out to the hon. Premier that only the Premier's government has sold our Alberta oil and gas below the world price, not the former government. [interjections]

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a supplementary question to follow up the question asked by the Member for Little Bow with respect to the impact on consumers, in particular the impact on farmers in this province, in view of the statements recently made by the economists for Unifarm. Will the government at this stage assure the Assembly that the farm fuel rebate will be increased to take higher energy prices into account?

MR. LOUGHEED: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's been a concept that's been very well received by the agricultural community in this province. Whether or not it needs to be increased and, if so, to what extent, would be a very important policy consideration for the government when it's looking at the situation we face. We must keep in mind that our position has to be a common wellhead price position, but within that framework we have some options.

By the same token, our crude oil can be taxed on the other side by Ontario, so that they get more revenue today for their treasury from a barrel of oil produced in this province than we do. Yet they are the ones complaining about the price, which bothers some Albertans; I hope the hon. member is included.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. Premier. The question really relates to whether or not we're going to have assurance from this government that, should we move the price of oil to near the Chicago composite price, there will be a substantial increase in the farm fuel rebate, so that farmers are not cut with a very sharp reduction in their net income.

MR. LOUGHEED: Well, Mr. Speaker, when you refer to the reduction in net income, of course, the facts have belied that. I think the assurance that the hon. member has already received in this House, that the agricultural community of this province will continue to enjoy the lowest cost oil products of any part of the western world, is a pretty fair assurance. As to whether or not we specifically extend the transportation allowance or move in some other way to facilitate those factors, we will assess it as events ensue.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Clover Bar with a final supplementary.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, first of all on a point of personal privilege, I would like to say I find it very distasteful that the Premier is saying we do not support the stand of the government in trying to obtain world prices. I want the record to state very clearly that

I would like the Premier to withdraw that statement, because that is not my stand or that of the members who sit on this side of the House. [interjections]

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question of the Premier. The Premier has indicated outside the House that we, the citizens of Alberta, by not having world prices for our oil have subsidized Confederation to the tune of many millions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Billions.

DR. BUCK: Can the Premier indicate what the figure is by which we have subsidized Confederation by not having world prices?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted that the hon. Member for Clover Bar continues to try, unsuccessfully as usual, to have it both ways.

The position with regard to the figure is a calculation of \$15 billion of contribution.

DR. BUCK: Where have you been?

MR. LOUGHEED: It's very important to suggest that, and that's why we're pressing our position. One would have thought that, if one supported the position of the government of Alberta, one would have been pressing us some time ago — since this House started — with regard to paragraph 3 of the La Malbaie statement and saying, when is the government of Alberta going to take the position that it will no longer continue to do that, in the event that it's unable to have that negotiated settlement with the federal government. It would be very interesting if the hon. opposition party would be specific instead of trying to have it both ways. I should have my opportunity to respond to the comment, Mr. Speaker. "Both ways" implies ...

DR. BUCK: [Inaudible] They have been the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the hon. member resume his seat for a moment.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I'd be delighted to continue, because I know the sensitivity of the leaders of the opposition parties. They would like to have it both ways, and their way ...

MR. NOTLEY: Point of order. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview on a point of order.

MR. NOTLEY: On a point of order. The Premier has absolutely no right to make any assertion about questions relating to energy pricing. Questions have been put in this House on energy pricing, and every answer we've had from members from that side is that we're not going to discuss it because it's under negotiation. They can't have it both ways either, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, if I could have a chance to respond to the points of order ... [interjections] I know how sensitive they are, Mr. Speaker, but if

I can continue with this, it would be important for the people of Alberta to understand one thing with these opposition parties. Do they in fact support the position of the government of Alberta, or do they want to be in a different position, either responding to their federal colleagues or, in the case of the other party, trying simply to say, we have no position?

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. Leader of the Opposition. What we have been having here, of course, is ...

DR. BUCK: A snow job by the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER: ... an example of what happens when the Chair does not intervene when there is irregular debate on both sides of the House. It would seem to me that we could with fairness cut the thing off now, if we were to have a final comment by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, we've seen today what happens ...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. leader is entitled to be heard.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, we've seen today what happens when the Premier refuses to answer questions put in the Legislative Assembly by representatives of the people of the province of Alberta but trots off to B.C. and thinks the Vancouver Board of Trade is more important than this Assembly.

#### Energy Taxation

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to follow up this area of questioning and ask either the Premier or the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources to advise the Assembly as to what review has been made of the royalty structure as a contingency plan, in view of the position of the government of Alberta on higher prices. Is it the position of this government that, should prices rise, the present royalty structure will remain unchanged?

MR. LOUGHEED: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we've given that undertaking, which I'm sure is important to the federal government as well. That undertaking is that as prices rise our present situation of 40 per cent return to the people of Alberta and 60 per cent to the risk explorer will continue. We think it's absolutely essential for the Canadian energy supply that the cash flow to explorers continue, because they're going to be involved in much more expensive exploration and development costs to increase supply in natural gas, non-conventional, and tertiary recovery of conventional crude oil.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the Premier. In light of record profits enjoyed by the petroleum industry, what assurance will the Premier give to this House and to Albertans and Canadians that higher prices will in fact be ploughed back into the search for new oil and new hydrocarbons, and not be shifted out in the form of profits taken out?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, we know the constant view of the hon. member with regard to the private sector in this province, but what is very significant is that the record has been 90 to 95 per cent reinvestment over the '73-78 period. We've suggested to the federal government that if they have to make changes in tax laws to ensure the continuation of reinvestment of that cash flow, we would endorse it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order first, if your ruling is that when members of the Legislature ask questions they are not to provoke debate, the same must also apply to the answers. For the last half hour we've seen one answer after another designed to provoke debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I must draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that very many of the questions asked today have provided ample provocation for debate. The hon. member may recall that his last question started out, "in view of the record profits of the oil companies", and went on from there. [interjections]

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have absolutely no concern about making those questions if we have it on both sides. If it's all open on both sides, that's fair enough with me.

MR. SPEAKER: It's been on both sides. It's a very simple matter. The rules of the question period are quite clear. If we're going to have no further debate in questions, then of course there shouldn't be any further debate in answers.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. In the Premier's answer to my last question he indicated that the government of Alberta would not object to any change in federal taxation with respect to ensuring that higher prices are ploughed back into the search for oil and gas. Is it the position of the government of Alberta that among the considerations the federal government should keep in mind would be a windfall profits tax?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think there's a great deal of difference between a windfall profits tax and provisions to ensure the reinvestment of cash flow in the same activity in which the cash flow was earned. "Windfall profit" is implicitly stating that there should be a revenue tax because those revenues cannot be used effectively in terms of improving supply for Canadians. We think it's very clear that an extensive number of Canadians are concentrating so much on price without recognizing the great potential of this country by way of supply.

It is going to be more expensive to develop enhanced and tertiary recovery of our declining conventional crude oil and to develop our non-conventional and frontier supplies. We have to keep in mind that that cash flow is required. I think it is important, though, that the tax system ensure that if reinvestment is not made in exploration and development activities — in that case new tax measures would seem to be warranted.

### **Workers' Safety — Drilling Rigs**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation. Could the minister indicate what steps his department is taking to investigate the increasing number of deaths and injuries on oil rigs in the province?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, once the conclusive report is completed by Dr. Bryant Stringham of the Sage Institute, we would hope to get some recommendations from that study. In the meantime, officials of my department and the industry have been attempting to increase educational programs to make workers aware of the risks they are working under.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate when the investigation will be completed, and if it will be made public when completed?

MR. DIACHUK: The report is scheduled to be completed by the end of November, at which time I hope to be able to peruse it and even share it with the members of the select committee reviewing The Workers' Compensation Act.

### **ACT Offices**

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Associate Minister of Telephones. It relates to an answer the hon. minister gave to this House on May 31 this year, wherein he said that he would consider as quickly as possible the move of the Alberta Government Telephones offices from Edmonton to Calgary.

My question is: would the hon. minister now like me to contract with a moving firm for this coming weekend for those specific offices?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I don't think the hon. member should get too keen on getting a moving firm this weekend. Certainly we've had the matter under consideration. We recognize the economic impact on Edmonton and the expense to Alberta Government Telephones, but we're still considering his particular question.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. associate minister. Could the minister then give us a date by which time these calculations will be completed and I can inform the moving company that is standing by?

DR. WEBBER: I'm afraid the moving company will not be able to have a definite date, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COOK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. Associate Minister of Telephones could indicate to the Assembly the possible cost of relocating those offices from the great metropolis of Edmonton to the country cousins down south. Secondly, what would the office space cost be? Would there be an increase in costs, given the rapidly growing office complex there?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, it's a hypothetical question, because the consideration hasn't proceeded that far yet.

MRS. CHICHAK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct my question again to the Associate Minister of Telephones. Could the minister advise the House: on what kind of logic, philosophy, or criteria is he even considering such a move?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I think this could be a matter for considerable debate in the House, and I don't think we'd want to get into it at this stage.

MRS. CHICHAK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I really wasn't provoking debate. I simply want to have some outline from the hon. minister of what criteria he was using to even entertain such an idea, not to go into any kind of debate.

MR. SPEAKER: An impossible proposition, because to give criteria or reasoning, of course, is obviously debate.

MR. BRADLEY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Associate Minister of Telephones. Given the government's policy of decentralization of government services, would the hon. minister consider relocation of AGTs head office to a location other than Calgary, out in one of the rural points?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I've received that representation in the past from a number of hon. members, and it does create a perplexing problem.

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

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have clarification from the hon. associate minister with respect to our decentralization policy and program. Is it to be the understanding of this House that the decentralization of services means the moving from one area of a complete and entire service being provided, or is it to extend the service to provide it in another part of the province where there is an extensive need?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, Alberta Government Telephones has gone the direction of decentralization by establishing something like seven regions in the province, with seven regional managers. The purpose of establishing these regional managers was to get Alberta Government Telephones out into the province and, in a management way, closer to the subscribers in those areas.

MR. SPEAKER: I regret we're running short of time, and there are still some members who haven't asked their first question. The hon. Member for Clover Bar, followed by the hon. Member for Little Bow.

#### **Firefighters and Policemen Legislation**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the hon. Minister of Labour. Can the minister indicate to what stage the government will take Bill 44, the proposed amendments to The Firefighters and Policemen Labour Relations Act?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, the Bill is before the House, and I imagine it will continue to progress in the normal course of events.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Can the minister indicate if the legislation is proposed to be passed in its entirety, plus its amendments, at the fall sitting of the Legislature?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware that amendments to it have been tabled before the Legislature at the present time, but it is proposed to proceed with the Bill.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Can the minister indicate if he proposes to bring before the Legislature any amendments to that Bill before it proceeds?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, it's a very definite possibility.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate what consultation has progressed within the last week with the minister and the city firefighters' union in the drawing up of this legislation?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I think I could do a good portion of that. I'm not sure this is the appropriate time, inasmuch as the Bill might very well be discussed tomorrow. I would be happy to indicate not that I've had a meeting today with the city firefighters per the city firefighters, but that I've had a meeting with representatives of the firefighters' association of the province.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question. Can the minister indicate if the Bill will be taken to its termination and proclaimed upon assent or at a later date? [interjection] Mr. Speaker, the question has to do with legislation that will be passed by this Assembly and will have far-ranging effects on the people.

MR. COOK: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: I want to know if the Bill will be taken to its termination, given assent, and proclaimed at a further date, or proclaimed on the date the assent is given.

MR. COOK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The debate is purely hypothetical, and the hon. member is clearly trying to have the minister look in a crystal ball. It's not possible to do that.

MR. NOTLEY: If I might put a supplementary question to the minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Let's just take it a little easy. The hon. member is asking concerning the ultimate progress of the Bill. As far as I know, it's proper to ask in question period what the government's intentions are with regard to government Bills.

MR. NOTLEY: Rollie, back to *Beauchesne*.

AN HON. MEMBER: He's got a new edition.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, there is a . . .  
[interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. YOUNG: Do you want the answer?

Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of discussions with a number of parties. It is likely that there will be an amendment, and it is likely that the Bill will proceed with the amendment. But of course I am governed by the wishes of hon. members of the Legislature.

#### **Plains Indian Cultural Survival School**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister responsible for Culture is with regard to the Plains Indian Cultural Survival School in Calgary. The school has been very successful in keeping a low drop-out rate. I wonder if the minister could indicate whether the department is considering further funding of this school at this time?

DR. BUCK: We'll have a half million for you pretty soon.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: We're running close to the time limit for the question period. The hon. Associate Minister of Telephones would like to amplify an answer given yesterday.

#### **Telephone Party Lines**

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Member for Stony Plain asked me whether we would consider a policy change to require businesses, when they move into a rural area and are on four-party lines, to purchase private lines. At present these businesses can purchase an individual line service if they wish. However, I interpreted the hon. member's question as being whether we would consider requiring businesses to purchase individual line service.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of disadvantages to requiring businesses to take the individual line service. First of all, AGT's basic service to rural areas is four-party service, and a premium surcharge is applied to rural individual line service. If this premium surcharge were required, I think in some cases it would act as a deterrent to the small business moving into some rural areas.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, if AGT were to waive the surcharge for businesses, that would be unfair to other AGT customers. So that's not an acceptable alternative. However, AGT tells me that if businesses make heavy use of the telephones in rural areas, it has been the usual practice to move to individual line service. Where possible, when a business on a multiparty line is causing concern to some individual customers, AGT will try to move one party or the other to the other side of the line.

## **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

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

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that motions for returns 115 and 116 stand and retain their place.

[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.

[Adjourned debate June 12: Dr. Reid]

MR. SPEAKER: Before the debate begins, I should explain that we took very literally the resolution of the Assembly with regard to the motion designated for this coming Thursday, and it kept its place on the Order Paper. But of course we're proceeding with the second item.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, since adjourning debate on the motion of the hon. Member for Three Hills some four and a half months ago, several developments have occurred in this province which, if anything, have made the motion even more current.

If you remember, my previous remarks on the motion were mainly directed at the effect of multiple energy and transportation corridors in the forested areas of this province. Events that have occurred in the interim have made the requirement for such a motion much more urgent. There have been the preliminary discussions, mentioned by several people, on an electrical power grid for the four western provinces. Such a power grid is going to cover distances in excess of 1,000 miles from the northeast to the southwest corner and, of necessity, would require the use of what nowadays are referred to as ultrahigh voltage lines. These lines would require major rights of way in several areas of this province and would certainly aggravate the problem, mentioned by previous speakers, for the agricultural areas of the province.

In addition to the power grid, we still have the possibility of Foothills Pipe Lines constructing both a natural gas and an oil pipe line from the Alaskan border through the Yukon, British Columbia, and several hundred miles of both forested and agricultural areas of Alberta. Those of us who took part in the Berland-Fox Creek forestry hearings heard several proposals which would involve the construction of some quite heavy duty log-hauling roads, also through the forested areas and foothills of the province. As if those facts do not produce enough problems in the north-western and western areas of the province, we also have the West Pembina and Elmworth oil and gas fields.

So the resultant network of access and distribution corridors shows that — whereas the motion is addressed to present and future needs, it looks as if the future is coming at us at an increasing rate. It would appear,



therefore, that this motion has become even more appropriate; the matter is becoming urgent in some ways. I therefore strongly urge that this House support the motion, and do so with some urgency.

MR. MAGEE: Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Motion 204. This motion asks for a study to be made by all departments having a concern in or about transmission of energy in all its forms, to arrive at a general energy transmission plan. This is a tall order, as our whole fabric of life in this province, with its cold winter climate, is affected.

We have come a long way from huddling over a campfire and stoking a wood-burning stove to obtain warmth, and from obtaining light in the darkness of night from a flickering candle. So the new forms of energy are vital to us all. The transmission of these various energy forms is an integral part of our present way of life. At the same time, food is just as vital as heat and light. Its production should be considered with as much vigor as the other life-sustaining elements. Mr. Speaker, in these exciting days of growth, population, and emphasis on industrial diversification and decentralization, and consequent demands for energy in all its forms, we must be careful to keep a proper perspective so the transmission of this energy does not interfere with agriculture, particularly in our high-production areas of black soil, which unfortunately surround our high-growth urban centres.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that we debate this motion now, as last week was Agriculture Week in our province. Many people will still be stimulated to give a few thoughts to our food supply than they otherwise would during the balance of the year. With this in mind, I direct hon. members' attention to just one phase of energy transmission today, the effect of high voltage hydro lines on agriculture.

To set the scene, Mr. Speaker, presently there is a network of transmission lines throughout this province in excess of 88,000 miles or, if you will, 140,000 kilometres. All these rural lines crisscrossing our country are above ground, and they are in three forms: the single-pole line, the double-pole line, and the steel-tower lines. Now, while nearly 75 per cent of single-pole lines parallel legal boundaries and roads, double-pole lines and steel-tower lines are located off the road rights of way and wander across the countryside. It has been claimed by the hydro companies that have negotiated these line rights of way that they did not want to build next to highways and roads because they would rather have a more permanent structure away from these main arteries; also because of the limited space available in 66-foot rights of way, which many of our country roads have.

Notwithstanding the single-pole locations having less interference with agriculture and cheaper land acquisitions for the utility companies, to save construction costs these companies still have preferred to operate across the country as the crow flies. Mr. Speaker, while this is commendable to some degree, in my opinion, this does have to be considered against the offsetting losses that are borne by farm operations. It should be noted, hon. members, that it takes approximately one-half acre of land for each tower that goes across the country. On most quarters there are about three steel stands. So this would indicate that, in effect, we absorb one and a half acres of land for each quarter on which these transmission lines cross our country.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the angling of these lines indicates a further loss of land than is presently absorbed by the towers themselves, in that the angles sometimes cut off corners of fields. And as they go across the contours of the country, it is oftentimes very difficult to operate the very large machinery that farmers use nowadays.

For instance, a recent survey indicated that an average of a 55-foot wide piece of cultivating equipment represents a considerable overlapping, because of the fact that it has to meander through the field around these tower lines. This overlapping operation greatly affects agricultural productivity. When seeding, during cultivation period you can oftentimes cultivate your land into too loose a condition, and with the rains that fall, and so on, it will set to hard-bake the ground and preclude the seeding coming up. In other cases, because of double seeding you create a condition whereby you have too many seeds penetrating through the ground to reach good maturity. Of course, when you're overlapping with chemical treatments you oftentimes reach the stage where you are treating a crop with too much chemical preparation, and consequently have a retarding effect on its growth. It is estimated by many that there can be a yield loss in these areas of overlap around the tower lines from 8.5 and 18.8 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to overlap of this equipment going around these towers, there is the converse situation, in which you have poorly cultivated areas because of the areas missed entirely. Consequently you have a rapid growth of weeds immediately adjacent to these tower lines, with weed infestation out from the towers themselves. In some cases, this will go out an additional 50 or 60 feet from the structures. This could decrease the yield in these affected areas by up to 10 per cent. In crop value estimates taken, I think, about two years ago in this province, it is considered that each acre of improved land has a crop value of about \$65 per acre. Basing it on this, it should be considered that for each tower running through our country there is a loss to agriculture of about \$5.90 per tower, due to these overlapping and poorly cultivated conditions.

In addition, as these lines go across good black soil and so on, there are construction losses that go on into the future. The equipment necessary to dig the holes for the supports for these towers and poles digs up soil from below the ground, and it's spread across the surface. Not being top soil, this often hard-bakes and creates loss of productivity, even though some sowing might take place between the towers. So there is an additional loss to our arable land through the construction of the tower itself. Of course, it goes on further to disrupt our shelter belts. There is a disruption to the fences, drainage conditions, irrigation ditches, and things of this nature. So this is quite a significant factor as well, Mr. Speaker.

There is another significant loss as the line crosses cultivated land. These structures greatly reduce the working [spaces] of the cultivating equipment and the sowing operations as conducted by the farmer. It should be remembered that, while the size of the average farm has greatly increased in the last 65 years — something over three times, so the average farm now has 900 acres — population growth coupled with a loss of farmers — a migration from the rural areas into the urban centres — we now have quite a transposition of people taking place. Of course, it is left that

farmers must work much more land much faster, in order to continue to provide the food that the urban dweller requires.

It should be noted by hon. members that we are now moving into the area of equipment being up to 85 feet wide. This has gotten to be very common in cultivating and sowing equipment of late, and consequently it's going even beyond the average of 55 feet I used earlier in my text. So one must remember that when a piece of equipment extends 42 feet or so from a centre line, it's very difficult for a farm operator to sit on one of these high-powered tractors, moving now at a speed of 8 to 9 miles per hour, and be able to gauge his distance from these towers. Consequently, trying to cultivate around and under the towers and lines in a zigzag motion, he must leave even wider expanses in order to avoid collision. I hold out to hon. members that when you have a tractor that now has the power to pull 85 feet of cultivating equipment — we are now talking in the area of 450 horsepower — if collisions did take place, of course, there is a great chance not only of greatly damaging the equipment but also of pulling the structure down, with very drastic results to the operator.

Of course, many of these lines were formerly placed 40 to 50 feet out from a road allowance. Now, with equipment being 85 feet in width, with large wings and so on, they cannot be operated in one particular segment. In other words, you have to operate them at 85 feet, and consequently there is insufficient space left between the road right-of-way fences and the tower lines. So farmers have to go out with smaller equipment to cultivate around some of these present transmission lines. As many of our lines are presently located, this is a great inconvenience to the farmers.

Mr. Speaker, aircraft are also coming into use by the farming community to do the work. It's now a matter of record that in 1978 40 licenced air contractors were engaged in the operation of weed and pest control, and now crop seeding and fertilizing. These applications are becoming very common in our farm operations.

Of course, air contractors don't like to fly around transmission lines. Unless they're the daredevil type, they certainly don't like to fly under them. When many of these conductor lines are only 30 to 35 feet off the surface of the ground, it becomes very hazardous to aircraft operators. As a consequence they have to fly parallel to the lines. If these lines run diagonally across the field, this necessitates much more flying time when trying to fertilize or provide herbicides and pesticides for that farm operation. So naturally there's an added cost for the farmer if using aircraft for these various agricultural pursuits.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

One of the other big factors is the operation of sprinkler systems throughout the southern area of our province. It's growing into various areas, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, many factors can create trouble in using sprinkler irrigation methods. The mechanical movable system, for instance, would mean that in many cases a part of the system has to be taken apart if a transmission line runs diagonally across the field, in order to even operate the irrigation equipment in close proximity to that line. With the central pivot system it's almost impractical to use it, because in many cases you have a

0.25 mile lateral line working around a central pivot. So it takes into effect areas up to 0.5 mile in circumventing its system. This becomes most difficult if transmission lines do cross fields on a diagonal line.

Of course a considerable amount of care must be taken when using sprinkler systems to make sure there is adequate grounding for these high transmission lines to prevent people getting electric shocks and the creation of magnetic fields and so on because of water coming in contact with the conductors in the line.

To combine all these factors, Mr. Speaker and hon. members, some estimates have been done to indicate the average annual loss as a result of steel towers transversing a quarter section of land. This annual loss ranges from \$78 with a double wooden pole line to \$105 for steel per quarter in operating around them. It would indicate that there is a considerable loss factor to farmers when having to operate around these lines.

Recent surveys by farmers who have power lines bisecting their fields indicate that they certainly would prefer not to have them. However, if they do have to have them, they certainly feel that these lines should follow the quarter section lines in our province as closely as possible, preferably at the edge of the road allowances, even though there is an added cost in construction and so on. As a result of having the towers located there, the one strip of inoperative or poorly productive land, would be at a minimum in all their operations.

To date there are no ultrahigh voltage lines in this province — that is, lines that handle 765 kV capacities — which they have in other parts of this country. They have not been built, but lines are being proposed in this province in the 500 kilovolt range. They've been proposed down through the '80s, and there has been discussion about one south of Calgary at this time. Of course these are all alternating current lines. Presently about 8,500 miles, or 13,600 kilometres, of high voltage lines are in this province, primarily on steel towers, but they're all of the 230 kilovolt rating.

Of course there are some cost savings in having ultrahigh voltage lines. An ultrahigh voltage line of a 500 kV capacity costs about three times as much to build. However, it will carry up to six times as much electric energy, a considerable saving to the electric companies in being able to build this line. However, with alternating current apparently this increases greatly the biophysical impacts associated with electrical transmission. Some of the things that should be considered with these very high voltage lines are electric shock from contact with the conductor, the effects of corona, which has hardly been experimented with to any great degree, and the effects of the electric and magnetic fields that are going to develop around these lines as they run through the country. This doubling of voltage in the lines is certainly something that should be studied and we should be concerned with.

At the moment there are no apparent safety problems with high tension lines as we know them today. Certainly farm operations can be safely carried on and people can live close to them in complete safety.

I have personal experience in this field, coming from the Toronto area of Ontario. I had an uncle who made a practice of leasing the ground under Ontario Hydro power transmission lines, in some cases feeding into Toronto. As I remember, a line from the northeast had five lines side by side as a corridor of electrical trans-

mission lines. My uncle had a few hundred acres of this land leased, as I recall. He had it cropped to vegetables — market gardening. In the course of market gardening operations, he had many, many people out there working under the lines during electrical storms and whatever. There was no damage that I ever heard of to anyone — horses or anything else — as a result of working under these transmission lines, even in rainstorms and thunderstorms. As we know them today, they are safe. I would like to make that point. However, when one looks at much higher voltage, it should be checked out.

Another way of transmitting electrical energy, Mr. Speaker, is to go to direct current high voltage lines. Apparently less biophysical effect could be apparent with a direct current being transmitted across the country rather than an alternating current. However, there is an added expense. At each end of the system, transformers and equipment that will convert it back to alternating current for general consumer use are required, because all our motors and our systems throughout the country have been developed on an alternating current basis. Consequently, this would be a factor. So if we find that the biophysical effects are too great with high voltage alternating current lines, go to the direct current high voltage line. But we must appreciate the fact it will cost more money.

One other thing should be considered in the transmission of electrical energy; that is, to conduct it underground. Of course this is not new in low voltage lines in our cities. We distribute electrical energy throughout our cities, towns, and villages with underground circuitry. However, to handle high voltages is another thing. Whether there's been a breakthrough recently I haven't been able to find out in my researching of this situation. But with our high degree of technology in the world today, it would seem to me we should be able to find a means of being able to transport electricity underground. This would have a great effect on reducing the problem agriculture has.

Mr. Speaker, while I have talked today of only some of the problems farmers face with the growing proliferation of power transmission lines, this is only one of the man-made methods of moving energy. Others include railways, highways, and gas, oil, and chemical pipelines. They too all present their individual problems to the farmers whose land they cross, and, in many respects, prohibit getting the most productivity from our farmlands.

I certainly endorse the motion put forward by the hon. Member for Three Hills for this government to take another look, in light of the knowledge of all the new technology we have and the changes in the geographic locations in our various sources of energy supply. As we're all familiar with the new sources of oil in the Athabasca area and so on, and the possibility of having electrical transmission come from our far north, the Snake River and so on, it's certainly time that we take another long look to determine whether we will continue using our present system, with single lines generally crisscrossing our country. Or do we go to multiple transmission lines, not only for electrical transmission but also for the many other transmissions of energy that we need in order to carry on our way of life at this time?

Sir, I would like to suggest that hon. members give great consideration to approving a study so we can come up with the best possible solutions for our pro-

ducers and end-users alike.

Thank you.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I rise in the Legislature to speak for [Motion] 204. The current land-use problem of transmission lines and prime agricultural land being in conflict is acknowledged by both Calgary Power and the Department of Agriculture. Through their cost/study analysis they realize that the cost to farmers is quite substantial when transmission lines dissect their properties.

The root of the problem dates back a few years ago when land was less expensive, when farms, equipment, and production were relatively small and, moreover, when most farms were mixed operations. Most land was fenced. When small parcels of land were rendered untillable by transmission lines, cattle would graze on the remaining grass and weeds in the fall after the harvest. As far as this went, of course, this made these particular towers available for extra forage. Today in prime farming areas the land is too expensive to graze cattle. Most farmers who harvest salable field products do not graze cattle. The majority of the successful farmers today are specialists in only one or two very similar facets of agriculture.

In years past many farmers were pleased to receive a few dollars for power line rights of way situated diagonally across the land. Little did they realize that the future of farming, farm equipment, and energy transmission needs would change radically over such short periods of time. Twenty years ago how could the farmer envisage a 75-foot wide, deep-tillage cultivator, a 90-foot weed sprayer, or a 48-foot seed drill? Utility lines increased dramatically the cost to individual farmers who were forced to farm around the towers.

It can cost a farmer \$40 an acre to spray a quarter section with an herbicide that will kill quack grass. If he had to negotiate a dozen or more towers, the cost of double spraying would be significantly higher. One farmer I contacted advised me that he invested over \$90 per acre per year on wild oat chemical alone over a 12-year period. That represents a financial outlay of over \$90,000. It is difficult, if not impossible, to drive a sprayer within 50 feet of a tower at 12 miles per hour. To slow to 6 miles per hour, Mr. Speaker, the cost of spraying would double. And the time expended to make these changes would be considerable since it is necessary to adjust manually 40 nozzles on a sprayer for an alteration in speed. In wet springs the sprayers and other implements can make ruts over a foot deep in neatly seeded fields. It takes only one excessively sloppy area to halt operations completely. The only solution to this spring problem is to hire a plane. However, farmers with transmission lines do not contemplate this avenue since the spray pilots won't even consider the job, regardless of the price. The farmers then sit down and tell themselves that the \$480 in compensation they receive for a dozen towers will make up for the loss of 20 years of previously good weed control as the fields become fully reinfested. This is all a consequence of missing one year of spraying.

Mr. Speaker, we must realize the advances made by farmers such as those in reversing trends and abolishing old farming practices that removed half of the humus from the soil in 60 short years. In order to assist further our farmers, we must not permit degradation of farmlands and capital losses. Profits must be made through volume farming with very large, cumber-

some, but absolutely necessary equipment. Obvious to anyone, regardless of how far removed they are from the farming scene, is the fact that this equipment and power transmission towers are incompatible with the maintenance of successful farming operation.

Power companies should no longer be permitted to use least cost strategies for construction when good farmland is involved. Even if compensation to the farmer is substantial, we must be cognizant of our responsibility to future generations of farming Albertans. Increased compensation in certain areas is a necessity. Alternate routes around prime farmlands are even more important. This may increase costs to all users. But is it not only fair that all users pay the cost rather than individual farmers subsidizing all users?

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we must work to ensure that we can protect and further our renewable resources. We should endeavor to assist our farmers in this important matter. We must develop some sort of plan to protect this important community, the farmers, and our most important renewable resource. I would strongly urge the House to support this motion.

Thank you.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity this afternoon to engage in the debate with regard to Resolution 204. I'd like to congratulate the mover, the Member for Three Hills, on bringing this resolution forward to the Legislature at this time. I believe a very timely discussion is taking place with regard to the question raised in the resolution in the spring and now this fall. A number of members have raised some very important questions with regard to this resolution. I'd like to congratulate them, and I would particularly like to support the comments this afternoon by the members for Red Deer and for Rocky Mountain House with regard to the effect of electrical transmission lines on agricultural lands and the operations of our farmers and ranchers. I think it's very timely that we consider a resolution such as the one put forward today, in particular with regard to the effect on our public and private lands, and present and future considerations with regard to energy transmission. I think the approach which the hon. Member for Three Hills has suggested will go a long way towards resolving some of the outstanding questions on this issue.

With regard to the study suggested in the resolution, I'd like to comment on the parameters we should be looking at, some of the needs and requirements. We should be looking at not only the question of energy transmission lines but at locations of the electrical generation facilities in the province, the type and nature of electrical generation facilities we're contemplating — whether they be coal fired, hydro plants — and whether we should be importing electrical energy to sustain our needs in the future. I think this is an important consideration. Should we actually be locating some of our electrical generating capacity closer to the demand points, rather than farther away? Then the question arises of the construction of these energy transmission lines down the road to the centres which require the energy.

I believe we also have to look at the question raised by the hon. Member for Rocky Mountain House: is the least cost solution the best long-term solution with regard to use of our lands? We must look not only at that but at the lessened effect over the longer term with

regard to the use of lands and where these routes should go. The question of a study must also include the routing of pipelines, both gas and oil.

I'd also like to have included in any future study of this matter the question of a western electrical grid. Again I raise the question: looking into the future with regard to fulfilling our requirements for electrical energy, can the need be sustained by a western electrical grid, particularly generation of power in Manitoba?

The question of a corridor policy — right now this resolution is looking at electrical transmission. Shouldn't we also be including highways, railways, gas and oil pipelines, telecommunications, and product pipelines? When we look at a corridor policy, these should all be considered. I'm not generally convinced that we can group all these transmissions — whether they be highways, railroads, electrical, or gas and oil pipelines — along a single corridor.

I look at the situation in the Crowsnest Pass, in the constituency I represent. We have a CPR main line and Highway No. 3. We presently have three electrical transmission lines, plus an approved 240 kV line, plus a proposed 500 kV line. We have two gas pipelines, a 36-inch and a 42-inch, plus the contemplated Arctic gas pipeline, plus the usual telecommunications corridors through the area. In a very narrow valley, this number of rights of way side by side adds up to almost a couple of thousand feet. But in the Crowsnest Pass they crisscross all over the place, and the result is a heck of a lot of alienated land in a very narrow corridor. Perhaps wiser planning in the past would have dictated that all these different transmission lines wouldn't necessarily have congregated on the one point and had the effect they have had.

I raise the question, too, which I think the hon. Member for Red Deer alluded to, with regard to security of supply. What happens if the gas pipeline explodes and takes out the 500 kV transmission line, the CPR line, and the highway? That's a possibility. You are then cut off with regard to transportation, also access to electrical or gas and oil supplies. So the question of a corridor must also consider security. With regard to a corridor policy, we must also look at whether electrical transmission lines are compatible with gas and oil pipelines from the viewpoint of induction of current, which may have an effect on the underground pipelines.

Another question I'd like considered with regard to the parameters of any study on this question is the impact of such transmission lines on historical resources. They certainly should be included. In my own constituency, I look at the impact of Calgary Power's proposed 500 kV line on the historic townsites of Lille. [interjections] I appreciate that hon. members in the Assembly are familiar with the historic townsites of Lille. It's very dear to my constituents that it be preserved in its present form, and that future energy transmission needs and lines don't have a further impact on that area, particularly increased access of people prior to preservation of that very important historic site. So I make the plea that future studies include the question of historical resources. I must also outline that the Arctic gas pipeline has been scheduled to go through the Lille area. I believe a lot of the local people's concerns have been handled with regard to that pipeline's going near Lille. The local feeling is that the pipeline, if possible, shouldn't go near Lille,

but if it does, a number of safeguards be looked at.

I've raised the question of alienated lands. When you have a number of electrical, gas, or oil transmission lines crossing a particular parcel of land, as has been indicated earlier it raises a lot of concerns about agricultural operations. The hon. Member for Red Deer has also raised the question of the biological effect of high voltage lines; the question of compensation.

A very important area that has to be looked at is how we arrive at these decisions on future electrical transmission needs in the province, the forum in which it is conducted. The costs of interventions: should costs be awarded to interveners? I look at our smaller communities, our agricultural communities, in terms of their presentations to public hearings by the ERCB on these questions. They certainly are expensive. I know we have room within government policy to reimburse such interventions, but it certainly is one area that has to be looked at very carefully.

A question which has been put to me by a number of my constituents with regard to the current hearings on the 500 kV line of Calgary Power has to do with the location of such facilities on public land versus private land. I guess we have to take into consideration the best agricultural use of private lands, and the best use of the public resource, the public land. The question put to me by my constituents is: where it is in the public interest, should we not be locating these energy transmission lines on public rather than private lands? They argue that in terms of the flow of energy, the benefit of such transmission lines flows to all citizens. When the benefit flows to the public at large and there are alternative routes for these transmission lines on public lands, they feel they should be located there. The private lands should not be further alienated when the benefit flows to the public at large. These are the questions my constituents have put to me, and I support their concerns.

In particular, we come down to the resolution before us. The resolution suggests that such a study should receive input from all departments concerned. I would like to suggest that when we approach this question of future energy transmission needs and lines, where they are located and the question of electrical generating capacity and energy, we should go to a broader forum to get public input from a number of citizens and interests throughout the province, that such a forum should include a technical component — perhaps the ERCB is best able to provide that sort of background — that industry's viewpoint be considered, that interests of the public at large be considered, and representation from local governments and various public organizations such as Unifarm, the Association of Municipal Districts and Counties, et cetera. So I would suggest that a broad public forum, similar to the Land Use Forum perhaps, be established to look at this question so that information can not only be put out there for the public to better understand the questions involved but that they also have an opportunity for input.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge the passage of this resolution. I strongly support it, and urge other members to do so.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on the resolution. Prior to doing so, I wish to table for members of the Assembly the terms of reference to the study that will be conducted. I'd indi-

cated in the question period last week that the ministers of Environment and Agriculture, the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife, and I had spent some considerable time in developing terms of reference for a study of transmission lines.

Mr. Speaker, the motion by the hon. Member for Three Hills is timely. The debate that took place in the Assembly on June 12, as well as the debate today, has been just excellent, of a very high calibre, with very many useful suggestions and comments. It displays a good knowledge of some of the problems occurring with respect to the development of electrical corridors and other energy corridors within the province. I assure hon. members that the contents of *Hansard* for both June 12 and today will be provided to the officials' committee, and the suggestions made by all hon. members will be given careful consideration.

It would be difficult for me to deal with every single suggestion. However, upon reviewing the terms of reference of the committee, I think members will find that a great many of the concerns are addressed. The Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest indicated that there should be an opportunity for broader input than strictly from the officials. That is provided for in the terms of reference; perhaps not in the sense he intended, but there is the provision there for broad input.

It's important that this study go on as quickly as possible, Mr. Speaker, because of the question that has arisen — and it's a growing concern to many Albertans — of how we determine the process for locating transmission lines. The question of the potential for undergrounding: the Member for Red Deer suggested that there may be new technology in this area. At the moment there isn't the technology that would allow us to bury high-voltage power lines; however, this may come. Technology in design of towers is developing where, rather than having the many guy wires or multi-pedestal towers, single-pedestal towers are being developed that minimize the effect of power transmission.

As we look into the future for the next 20 or 30 years and if we anticipate the growth in electrical energy requirements of the citizens of this province at, say, 6 or 7 per cent per year as electrical energy displaces other forms of energy and simply by the growing utilization of electrical energy, we have to come to grips with how we develop our ability to move this energy around the province. It requires us to develop an integrated system so there is good back-up and security of supply. There are a number of reasons for this. Right now we operate with a stand-by capacity within the province of about 30 to 35 per cent. If we could improve our reliability and our security of supply, there is a possibility to operate our generating plants at a higher level; in other words, instead of 65 per cent, perhaps to operate them 75 per cent, which would provide improved economies of scale and would ultimately benefit the citizens.

I again indicate to members of the Assembly that this motion put on the Order Paper by the hon. Member for Three Hills is timely. Last week there were questions by the Member for Lethbridge West concerning the city of Lethbridge and the situation with respect to the possibility of brownouts in that city as a result of delays in construction of the 240 kV line from Calgary to Lethbridge. That's of real concern.

This study that is to commence immediately — members should not be under the impression that it can

interfere with what is going on at the present time. There are applications. We don't want to interfere with the progress under way in terms of applications that are before the Energy Resources Conservation Board. So it's very important that we move as quickly as we can in developing policies that will improve the situation in the province with respect to energy transmission. The terms of reference, as members I think will have them distributed to their desks, indicate that we have asked the interdepartmental committee to report to us by March 31, 1980. I'm hopeful they can do this in order that we can develop policies that will serve the people of Alberta. The committee simply cannot repeat other studies that have been done or are being done by other groups. So we've asked them to review the study commissioned by the Surface Rights Board, the civil group, which a number of members have read, as well as to co-ordinate their efforts with the resource integration committee, as they have ongoing work with respect to energy transmission.

A number of members have mentioned the changing agricultural practices, changes in the type of equipment, the concerns with respect to irrigation land. Members have expressed an interest in advanced technology that may be useful in minimizing the effect of transmission lines. I think all these suggestions are useful and will be taken into consideration by the interdepartmental committee.

I would like to join with the other members in urging that we pass this motion put on the Order Paper by the hon. Member for Three Hills, and again assure members of the Assembly that their remarks, contained in *Hansard* of June 12 and today, will be provided to the officials in order that they are given every reasonable consideration.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with members who support the resolution moved by the hon. Member for Three Hills. I think it's particularly appropriate at this time, with the discussions relative to the vulnerability of our society on all energy matters, including electrical energy. I enjoyed very much the participation by members on both sides of the House on what I would perceive to be virtually an urgent matter. We've just heard from the Minister of Utilities and Telephones, which I think specifically is an indication that the government appears to be endorsing in a rather significant way the carrying through of the resolution, if it's passed.

I would like to comment, Mr. Speaker, with a word of caution. Matters such as this have been considered many times, only to have the inevitable result that when we see democracy in action the best of plans and intentions appear to get bogged down through the exercising of that very essence of democracy; that is, resorting to the court system.

I can't help but recall that not many years ago in the constituencies the Member for Lethbridge East and I represent, through the result of a judgment and the decision made by the corporation of the city of Lethbridge, they decided to sell the power plant and enter into long-term agreements with the provider of energy, namely Calgary Power. When that decision was made, Calgary Power made a decision that to provide the long-term energy requirements of the city of Lethbridge, they would have to apply for and get agreement to run an additional transmission line from

Calgary to Lethbridge, essentially from Janet to Lethbridge. Application was made to the Energy Resources Conservation Board, and they had ample opportunity for hearings, both by proponents and interveners. They came to a conclusion, recommending that transmission line in July 1977, whereupon Calgary Power could begin construction to answer not only the immediate needs of the city of Lethbridge but indeed the needs of long-term increased growth.

So here we are approaching Christmas 1979. That matter has not been resolved yet. It's in the courts of the province of Alberta. I don't quarrel with the interveners who object to the fact that it's going to traverse their lands and perhaps interfere with their irrigation equipment. I think the court system is there to resolve that matter.

I guess what I'm questioning, Mr. Speaker, is the role of the courts. In this day and age, approaching the '80s, when we have everything else and we insist on expediting matters that are important to our municipalities, surely the time has come when we can have some influence on the court calendars. To think that this matter has now dragged on almost two and a half years tells us something about the way the court system in the province of Alberta is functioning.

Mr. Speaker, although I support very strongly the move by the Member for Three Hills and the arguments made in favor of it, I would urge all members to give a little consideration to the fact that when these studies are carried out — even though the government may put in place a system of priorities whereby certain things should be done — let us not be naive enough to believe that the court system of this province will not impede the very best plans and programs instituted by this Legislature.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the hon. Member for Three Hills have permission to close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In closing the debate I am certainly appreciative of all hon. members who have participated in this very important debate, both in June and today. The hon. Member for Edson said it was timely back in June, and it's even more timely now. I believe that's probably the understatement of the year. The caution raised by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West is well taken. I hope that out there in the communities there isn't a misconception, and the minister alluded to this, that a study undertaken now will have an effect on anything that's running its natural course at this time.

I could mention all the different aspects of the debate that people have raised. I think the hon. members have addressed this problem from every conceivable angle, from personal experience and from experiences their constituents have had. Certainly I, for one, have tried to address what I thought was a problem on behalf of companies, in terms of electrical transmission and the major problem we have in bringing to fruition any plans made in that field.

Mr. Speaker, I will close by thanking hon. members for their participation in the debate and urging them all to vote in favor of this motion.

Thank you.

[Motion carried]

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 June 12: Mr. Stromberg]

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, last June, I had the opportunity to adjourn debate on the motion of my desk partner from Currie, but at that time I did not have the opportunity to congratulate the member for bringing forth this motion. At that time I was of the opinion that perhaps we've had too many studies of our senior citizens over the years, and to what avail?

One ongoing study was not mentioned. Each year the federal government holds a conference on leisure time — I believe it's at Banff. Mr. Speaker, leisure time is the time of our retired people. Each local government in Alberta is asked to send representation, which my city of Camrose has always seen fit to do. This conference on leisure time certainly pointed out that we can do two things. If this congress becomes a reality, I hope they would look at the leisure time problem and how best to educate our population, how best to educate our senior citizens on how to handle their leisure time.

There's quite a difference between a man who has been encouraged, given some help, and trained to, say, grow a rose garden, and one who spends all his time in the corner bar. But I've been of the opinion: let our senior citizens decide for themselves. My goodness, they have tremendous talent and tremendous experience. I find that whenever I talk to them and offer suggestions, they're way ahead of me. They know what the heck to do with their own time. They know what to do with themselves. As a matter of fact, they've got more ideas than people in our age bracket have.

AN HON. MEMBER: What age bracket are you in, Gordon?

MR. STROMBERG: Approaching a younger age. I notice some members across have passed that younger age and are now going into second childhood.

If this congress becomes a reality, perhaps they could look at some alternatives. Several years ago I had the opportunity to be in *la belle province* of Quebec and to get into the real Quebec, the eastern townships. One thing that really impressed me was their attitude toward their grandparents and parents. I doubt that anywhere in my travels there was a family where the grandparents were not part of the total family. I recall, Mr. Speaker, that at a meal when the grandparents approached the table, the children all stood up and inquired as to the health of *grand-mere* and *grand-pere* on that day. The son operated the business and was head of the household in name only; the parents were with that family. I think it's a fantastic experience for

children to grow up with their grandparents.

I don't know what's changing our attitudes, Mr. Speaker, the present-day generation and its attitude towards our elderly. What's happening now? The kids get married, move away, get an apartment, and come back twice a year, Easter and Christmas, to show their grandparents their grandchildren. It seems that the attitude of our generation today is to get rid of old people as fast as we can. Get them away in senior citizens' homes or lodges, anywhere, but not a part of the family group. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that this congress would really address itself to that area.

Thank you.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, the number of members of this Assembly who have seen fit to speak on this resolution gives some indication of its timeliness. I would like to join with those other members of the Assembly who have commended the hon. Member for Calgary Currie for bringing it forward. Certainly the quantity of speakers gives some indication of its import, and the quality of debate has been there.

I suppose we have heard a full range of points of view as to the appropriateness of this Legislature approving Motion No. 201. I've taken considerable interest in reviewing the comments of other members. For example, I think of the comments of the hon. Member for Red Deer, who expressed concern that many reports are in place now and the feeling that we need to look at the increasing average age of Albertans on an ongoing basis rather than as a one-shot deal, as I believe he expressed it. I think he also spoke very well and knowledgeably about the prospects of an institute of gerontology, which would have that kind of wide-ranging and continuing approach. I would like to add my support to the notion of that type of institute. That's certainly not to suggest that this motion isn't without considerable merit.

I also very much enjoyed the remarks of the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight. I think he can be aptly described as a political gunslinger who shoots from the hip, and that has added considerably to this Assembly over his many years of service to this province. His discussion of this particular resolution was certainly no exception.

AN HON. MEMBER: Arthritic hip.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Arthritic. Fortunately, we have in the Assembly medical practitioners who are prepared to offer assistance if arthritis is the problem.

However, I would like to speak specifically of the comments of the hon. Member for Calgary Fish Creek. I think that when he talked about the role of the family — and, in fairness, I think the hon. Member for Camrose was speaking in somewhat the same vein — he hit a very responsive chord with this member. There's an incidence in the society we live in today of, all too often, an inclination to say, let's let government do it. There's a very tragic error in making the assumption that government can do things better than we as individuals or we collectively can. This is a classic instance where we have to be very careful that in any actions this government takes, we don't detract from the importance of the role of the family. The family is the critical factor in this Alberta society I've grown up in. I certainly wouldn't want to see the importance of the family diminished in any way, and I

think other members of this Assembly share that view.

I would like to make a couple of comments with respect to the whole area of senior citizens, on a couple of areas where I feel this government can look to doing an even more effective job than we have in the past. The first is the Alberta assured income plan, which was brought into force, to the credit of this government, in 1975. I think it has served our seniors well, but the fact of the matter is that we're looking at a supplement of approximately \$45. I think it may be very much in the interest of senior citizens and of all citizens in this province, in terms of our commitment to the people who built this province, to take into account the effect inflation has had on that supplement in the intervening four years.

I'd also like to comment on the issue of mandatory retirement, which was previously raised by a number of speakers. I think we should express some real concern about putting out to pasture members of our society who happen to reach that supposedly magical age of 65. I share with other members of this Assembly great concern about whether we should have in place legislation that prevents people who wish to remain active and gainfully employed from doing so. I think the bottom line is that it should be a question of freedom of choice; we should let the individual make that decision. I believe the hon. Member for Calgary McCall gave us a very effective historical perspective on this issue.

The third issue I'd like to say a few words about is home care. As I understand it, over the last few years we've heard a great deal of discussion in this House on the question of home care. I've heard other hon. members speak very glowingly of the representations made in this House by the former hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo. I commend all members of this House who have endorsed the program of home care as a concept.

As a member of this Assembly, I am of the belief that we should look to expanding that program very extensively and in the very near future, for a variety of reasons including a very straight economic one. The fact of the matter is that when we have senior citizens who would prefer to remain in their homes and their communities but are simply unable to do so because they are unable to carry out those basic maintenance tasks, we're going to lessen the cost of care for our seniors if we are able to give them assistance. And we certainly have the resources to do so in this province. So it seems to me that quite apart from the philosophical arguments in favor of home care, there's a very practical one there. I know the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health is exploring ways in which we can expand the program, and I urge him on.

Having made those few comments on areas where I feel we can do an even more effective job for the citizens of this province, I would like to toss a bouquet to the government, something which some hon. members would suggest I do all too rarely. [interjection] That bouquet relates to the recent announcement of the provincial government with respect to the reduction to 25 per cent from 30 per cent of income charged of senior citizens in self-contained units. I know that even the hon. members of the opposition agree with that position of this government.

Having made those statements, Mr. Speaker, I am of the school of thought that there is a proliferation of studies in all areas of government. There is a decided

tendency on the parts of governments and well-meaning individuals in our society to send off any question for study by a committee of some form or other. I have to admit to being a sceptic, in the first instance, when it's suggested that we need another study. Whether it's couched in terms of a congress, committee, or whatever, I start from the basic position of having to be convinced.

Having now listened to the very excellent arguments presented on both sides of the issue, and to the very compelling arguments of the capable Member for Calgary Currie, I have come to the conclusion that we need some input here, and that input is from the seniors themselves. All too often in government, I think we find ourselves acting with the best of intentions and making decisions on persons perhaps without obtaining the degree of input that we should. As I say, having heard the wide-ranging debate on this issue, I think we should bear in mind that a number of organizations specifically dealing with and involving our senior citizens exist and are operating in a very active and effective way in this province. Those of course include the Senior Citizens' Advisory Council, the Alberta Council on Aging, and numerous other very effective organizations.

It's my belief that you'll find a common thread running through most of these organizations and with senior citizens generally. That common thread, Mr. Speaker, is that we'd like to help ourselves. That's what I find seniors in my constituency saying to me.

Bearing in mind what I perceive to be a philosophy that our seniors have — and a philosophy that I hope is carried on in subsequent generations, namely of self-help, I submit that before arriving at a final determination on this resolution before the House, it would be incumbent upon this House to seek the views of organizations such as the two I have named.

Having made those comments, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave on that basis to adjourn debate on Resolution 201 until such time as that input can be obtained. I think we can use that information very usefully to arrive at a final and proper determination on this matter.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn have permission to adjourn debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

213. Moved by Mr. Notley.

Be it resolved that the Assembly direct the Minister of Environment to direct the Environment Council of Alberta to conduct public hearings into the environmental effects of the petroleum exploration and production industry.

[Adjourned debate June 14: Dr. Reid]

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid I'm behaving like a jack-in-the-box today. This was not my intention when I started; I'm sure somebody will agree with that.

In view of the fact that I had only just started my remarks when we adjourned debate on this subject some four months ago, I'd like to recap briefly some rebuttal remarks I made at that time, which were subsequently misinterpreted by some people.

First, in relation to the reforestation of seismic lines



which have been cut through forested areas, the point I made was that it is pointless to replant those areas, which are very long, narrow strips of ground, if the replanted trees are going to be grossly out of phase with the surrounding forested area. It's not going to be merchantable timber when the rest of the area is cut. It's probably going to be destroyed during the cutting process, and those lines are really good for nothing except grazing for wildlife.

Secondly, with regard to the delay in the report of the Environment Council chaired by Dr. Dancik, due to Dr. Dancik's illness, and the fact that during that delay the government had asked for proposals from industry on the Berland and Fox Creek forest management areas, it must be obvious from the time it has taken the committee and the government to get to the present stage of decision on that forested area that there was certainly no attempt to pre-empt the report of the Environment Council in asking for proposals at that time.

Mr. Speaker, my remarks on the motion are going to be limited to the effects of the oil and coal industries on the forested areas of the province. Those important forested areas, as we all know, support what is even now a very important industry to the economy of this province and, since it is based on a perpetually renewable resource, an industry which will play an increasingly important part in the economy of the province in the decades and centuries to come. I'm making these initial remarks to emphasize the importance of this industry, so people will not think that my subsequent remarks are minimizing or ignoring its importance, since I really feel I cannot support the motion as it has been presented by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Within the last year we've had the report of the Environment Council of Alberta on the forest industry. It's this green book, which we all have copies of. It's a report which was somewhat delayed, as I've already said, by Dr. Dancik's illness. Bruce Dancik and the other members of the Environment Council appointed on this particular subject are certainly among the most knowledgeable people in this province on the forest industry. They've been involved in the industry in its broadest terms, and I think they've done an excellent job of identifying the problem, delineating it, and quantifying to a considerable extent the economic cost to the forestry industry up to this point of both oil exploration and development and coal development. In fact if there is a problem with the report, it may be that they are somewhat too much biased toward the trees because of their expertise, interest, training, and experience.

The members of the panel: Dr. Dancik, as you well know, is a professor in the Department of Forest Science, a forest geneticist and ecologist; Mr. Reynolds was in the logging and sawmilling industry; and Des Crossley, who is a personal friend of mine, had, until his recent retirement, been the chief forester for over 10 years for what at that time was the largest forest-based industry in the province, what used to be called North Western Pulp & Power.

These people are not to be criticized because of any particular interest and, perhaps, bias they may have had toward the trees. I'm making the point that they would give as strong a case for the forest industry and the effects of energy exploration and development as anybody in this province could.

The problem, as they've essentially pointed out, is that the effects of these industries — although they may be short-term during the time that they are producing those effects — are upon a growth cycle that is 80 years long. For this reason it can be as long as 80 years before the effects of their interference in the growth cycle are corrected. The reason for the problem, of course, is that in Alberta's climate trees don't grow as quickly as they do in some other places. It takes 80 years to grow a tree in this province; in Brazil it can be done in 20 years.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

As the council has stated, the area of productive forest that has so far been involved with oil exploration and development in the history of that industry in the province has reached a very significant percentage of the area that has either been cut, or cut and reforested, by the forest industry in the same length of time. This is not a new problem at all. As I said, I've listened to Des Crossley for the last 20 years discussing the increasing concern he had of the encroachment upon forested areas of the non-renewable resource extractive industries.

Mr. Crossley has shown photographs he has taken himself and maps, which have demonstrated very well the sometimes catastrophic effect these extractive industries can have on the forest industry. On page 29 of the report, the ECA has used one of his maps, figure 1 as they call it, showing the network of seismic lines that can be developed during the exploration phase. In figure 4 on page 34, they show the details of what happens if the seismic activity results in exploration and, if that exploration is successful, in the development of an oil or gas field. These two processes — the seismic exploration, and the development of the subsequent field, if one is found — have completely different effects upon the forest industry. As I've said, seismic lines have a temporary effect only on the land of the seismic line itself. If the trees cut for the seismic line are too far out of phase, as I've said, we lose that as productive land for timber for the remainder of that 80-year cycle.

The biggest problem is when an oil or gas field is found and developed. We then get into a situation somewhat similar to the situation we were discussing under the previous motion this afternoon, where the network of seismic lines, roads for access to oil well sites, power lines to those oil wells, and the network of pipelines to collect the gas or oil from those wells, chop up the area to such an extent that you're left with small islands of trees essentially isolated from each other by these rights of way. These islands of trees become completely uneconomic to develop, because of the cost of either putting weight-bearing structures over the pipelines, or having to go around the power lines, which are usually too low for the very large trucks to get underneath. The result is that the total area of the gas or oil field is taken out of productive forest area for the duration of the life of that oil or gas field.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to digress somewhat from the strict meaning of the motion as the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview presented it, and discuss the other energy extractive industry which involves the forested areas of the province. At the moment that industry, be it either metallurgical coal or thermal

coal, is hanging under a bit of a cloud, in that the market for both kinds of coal is somewhat restricted. The reason is that the vast majority of the coal produced in this province is, at the moment, exported from the country. Not that we don't use coal in this country; we do. But for some peculiar reason, both the Ontario government, through its subsidiary Ontario Hydro, and the Ontario steel industry, for what they regard as good reason import their coal, metallurgical or thermal, from the United States of America.

This doesn't make much sense for the total economy of this country. It means we are expending foreign reserves, seriously affecting our balance of payments situation, to import a completely combustible resource, none of the product of that combustion being exported. Ontario Hydro's thermal-generated electricity is all used within the province of Ontario. And the steel industry of Ontario almost historically has not been an exporting industry, its total product being consumed within the country.

I think it would make good sense for both those industries to show some fiscal responsibility as far as the balance of payments of this country is concerned, and look for the supply of their coal requirements within the country. If they did that, it would certainly increase both the exploration and development for metallurgical coal. Of course, the effects upon the thermal coal industry in this province would be quite dramatic.

The situation of coal leases in this province is shown in some detail in figures 5 and 6 of the ECA report. It shows that most of the areas where coal is to be found are within the forested area.

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but it does seem that we're getting quite far from the intent of the resolution. I think the hon. member is entitled to have the resolution debated in its terms. If we pursue the question of coal exploration, then it would be unfair to prevent any subsequent speaker on the motion from similarly going onto another topic.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I'll get back to the subject of oil exploration, then.

As you can understand from my remarks, there's no doubt about the problem the oil industry has produced for the forestry industry. I think it's been very well delineated by four experts in the province. The answer to those problems is not going to be found by further public inquiries or hearings. I think the public hearings that were held by the ECA committee have shown the problem in its entirety. It's extremely well documented, and really requires no further delineation. I have to presume that, when he brought the motion up and introduced it, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview believed that such hearings would come up with the answers.

In view of the complexity of the problem as it has existed historically to this time, and in view of the fact that it may increase in severity, it really is a matter of looking at the regulations as they apply to the seismic industry at the moment. There are regulations about the width of seismic lines. Recently it has been compulsory for seismic exploration people to salvage the wood: to cut it, clean it off, and stack it, so it can be retrieved the following winter. There are regulations about hand-cutting of seismic lines in ecologically delicate areas, and within some 100 yards of national park boundaries. There are regulations regarding the

use of helicopter techniques for seismic exploration. In fact, the regulations already exist. It is more a matter of enforcing those regulations, and possibly making them a little stricter, so we do not have further encroachment upon a perpetually renewable resource industry by a non-renewable resource industry.

As a result of the Environment Council's report, I'm sure members of the Department of Energy and Natural Resources, who have these powers both within the forest and energy divisions, are going to pay a little more attention to using the powers to ensure that the forest industry is not further seriously affected by the effects of oil and gas exploration and development.

Mr. Speaker, having originally thought about this subject intending to speak on it some four months ago, in June, and having thought about it considerably in the intervening months, I really can see no benefit from further public hearings. We almost certainly would hear the same evidence given by the same people. It would be a complete reiteration of the public hearings held by the ECA. For that reason alone, I feel that I cannot give any support to the motion as it's been presented.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to rise and participate in the debate. I'm glad to see the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview back in his place. I was disappointed a while back. I thought he wouldn't be here, and I was almost suspecting his intentions. [interjections] I had thought I would have to ask the members of the official opposition to relay my feelings on his motion to him. I see they're sadly depleted too; however, I'm sure the Member for Bow Valley would have been happy to carry my message, not only to his own leader, who adopted the position of the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, but also to carry my views to the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, should he leave before I finish. [interjections] Having created a messenger, I suppose he can leave any time.

Much of what I would have said has been said by the hon. Member for Calgary Glenmore, who spoke on this motion when it came to us in the spring, and just now by the hon. Member for Edson. I think both made excellent contributions to the debate. I was impressed by the fact that the Leader of the Opposition, presumably on behalf of his entire coterie of Social Credit members, supported this motion. I was surprised. I guess politics does make strange bedfellows; it's very strange in this case.

I think back to the election last March and the position of the official opposition, at least of one of the candidates, I believe in Calgary Currie, who ran a very expensive, very high-profile campaign. One of his major platform planks was less government, less interference with the private sector: that sort of thing. He didn't succeed in getting elected, but certainly it was a position of that party. I'm surprised to see them now identifying with this motion, which I think has very little going for it. I guess it's an example of that party trying to have it both ways. We heard some spirited debate earlier this afternoon on parties that try to have it both ways. I think what we're seeing this afternoon in support of the two groups is more of that.

I think back to a couple of years ago — this has to do with my view that the socialist party continually wants hearings when there's nothing else to do; when there's a question, anything's uncertain, or any issue comes up, the first thing we cry for is some sort of

hearing and this is no less. I think back two or three years when the Berger report was studying the question of the Alaska gas pipeline that was then proposed and is still proposed, urging the government of Alberta to hold Berger-type hearings on that pipeline here in Alberta at that time. Again, I'm sure it was supported by the official opposition.

I ask members of the Assembly: wouldn't we look funny continuing with the dialogue of that type of hearing as to whether or not the Foothills pipeline should or shouldn't go through Alberta and what impact it would have on us? Wouldn't we look funny having that kind of hearing at this time? If they were required, yes. But in my estimation, they're not.

In fact, one of the banes or problems of industry in recent years has been overregulation by government. I think the oil industry has generally done a pretty good job of performing its responsibilities. Certainly, it needs controls. There are many, many controls here and elsewhere. But it is probably an industry that is more studied to death than any other, and I don't think much of the study is productive.

I think of the types of hearings we have right now. We have hearings on reserves in Alberta, then the same process goes on in Ottawa. We have technical hearings on every aspect of the industry and local hearings on oil sands and heavy oil developments, probably all of them necessary. But I suspect it's time we did an evaluation of all the hearings, an inventory of them just to see how many are overlapping one another and how many are in fact necessary.

It's a great thing for lawyers, accountants, engineers, and all those in private practice and business to farm themselves out to the oil companies, hundreds of dollars a day, it goes on for days, weeks, and months on end. I know people who almost live in Ottawa attending hearings dealing with the oil industry. The cost has to be astronomical, and it always comes back to the consumer. I think of other types of hearings here in Alberta, and again I think there are probably situations where we should assess how many of them are really required and whether we should be carrying them out. I can't think offhand of any we don't need, but I think it wouldn't be bad to do a little study.

Reading one of the local daily papers last night I came to an item that said, "Gov't controls cited for choking energy hunt". Well, it may or may not be accurate. It's by Joseph Warren, a technical consultant to Gulf Oil, and he's dealing with the situation in the U.S. I don't think this situation pertains here in Alberta; it may in parts of Canada. I know it doesn't in Alberta, because of the high level of activity here in our province. That came about as a result of a number of important initiatives by the government, not the least of which has been our energy incentive programs, several aspects of which I need not go into at this time.

I suppose one should ask the hon. member who sponsored the motion what type of information he wants, and what would be the purpose of the so-called public hearings? In closing the debate, I hope he might enlighten us on that. The motion itself is taken verbatim from recommendation 24, page 130 of *The Environmental Effects of Forestry Operations in Alberta* by the Environment Council of Alberta. If I might read it, Mr. Speaker, just to refresh the Assembly:

The Minister of Environment should direct the Environment Council of Alberta to conduct public

hearings into the environmental effects of . . . petroleum exploration and production [activity] . . .

Wide open: every aspect of exploration and production; in fact, the total energy industry.

Again I ask, just what would be the purpose of the inquiry? Mr. Speaker, if you're going to have hearings on a matter like that, obviously the energy companies; the oil and gas exploration production companies, are going to have to participate fully. I suppose they're going to have to respond to whatever assertions, representations, and allegations; whatever happens at those hearings is going to have to be responded to publicly.

If you look at Alberta, the exploration/production activity in this province, starting with the southeast shallow gas areas, the heavy oil areas up a little further north, over into the mountains, the foothills, the farmlands, and the muskeg areas of the north: a different environment and scenario for each area. Then couple that with changing climatic conditions from spring to summer to fall to winter, some hot, dry months, some wet months, some winter months. Can you imagine the length of time these hearings would have to go on if they were to have any practical impact of doing an assessment of the industry? Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity I doubt they would ever terminate. I really wonder what the conclusions would be and what practical impact they could have on what is going on here in Alberta.

It's been referred to by the other members on this side who have already spoken to the question, but probably we should look at what this government has done. We look at the development of the Department of Environment by this government in 1971. As established, the department has key responsibilities for protecting the environment in all the several geographic areas of the province, in all the different seasons we have. Mr. Speaker, I think they've done a very good job in that area. They're very watchful. They perform a watchdog operation on the industry, and I think they've been very responsible to the consuming public, the people of Alberta.

Again, what else has this government done? We have the Energy Resources Conservation Board and their responsibilities by legislation. If you look at the purposes of *The Energy Resources Conservation Act*, Section 2(d), one of their responsibilities is:

to control pollution and ensure environment conservation in the exploration for, processing, development, and transportation of energy resources and energy . . .

Mr. Speaker, they have continuing hearings. Every time a new project is on the drawing boards or proposed, the energy resources board does an assessment of it. If they think a wide-open, public hearing is necessary, they go into it. If they think a smaller, private hearing is appropriate, that is what happens. But between the Department of Environment and the Energy Resources Conservation Board, I think we are fully protecting our environment. Not to say that changes can't or shouldn't be made from time to time; that is the responsibility of those organizations and, of course, everyone here.

I suppose one should also comment on the industry itself. I think the industry has been very responsible. Through the Canadian Petroleum Association, the Independent Petroleum Association, the geophysical association, and others, they are very cognizant of the

concerns of the people of Alberta about the environment, and I think have been doing a tremendous job of managing their responsibilities.

I should refer to one other thing, Mr. Speaker. That brings me back to the support of the official opposition for the motion, and how misguided I think that is. I look at the report of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, and one of the items there is land reclamation. I think the members opposite, who are so concerned about what is happening to the environment, as we in fact are, were somewhat remiss, because the several million dollars we're spending in land reclamation have to do with reclaiming old gravel pits, strip mining areas, and waste disposal areas: all areas that were neglected under a previous administration.

DR. BUCK: Tell us about the ECA, Stu.

MR. McCRAE: I'm proud that we're doing that, Mr. Speaker. I just raise that as an example of how little was done in the past.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

DR. BUCK: Tell us, Les.

MR. SCHMID: Tell him to shut up over there. [laughter]

MR. McCRAE: Just for the record, Mr. Speaker, those remarks were not mine. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister seems to be an accomplished ventriloquist.

MR. McCRAE: I am sure he is very accomplished in that and many other areas, Mr. Speaker.

I'm sure a number of other members want to get into this debate. In closing I would like to say that I don't think a case has been made at all for the calling of a public hearing which, as I have indicated, would have no time frame on it. It would be wide open; it would have to rove from area to area looking at different geographical areas and climatic conditions. I think it would be one of those open-ended things that would be a haven for professional people and others who so often attend public hearings and make representations which have to be responded to. Mr. Speaker, I guess that's the problem. If you just have hearings, let those who are of a mind to go there and do their little thing, and leave it unanswered, fine. But in these important times, with energy being the key thing on all our plates, it just couldn't be ignored.

The oil industry, the energy industry, has probably the most important responsibility of any industry in Canada, perhaps in North America, and possibly in the world; that is to explore, find, and produce the energy that we need ...

MR. NOTLEY: Tell the farmers that.

MR. McCRAE: ... that will assist the farmers — the hon. member makes a good point — in performing their equally important responsibilities of feeding us. But we certainly need the energy, and I think by and large the energy industry has done a responsible job.

Here in Alberta we are blessed with efficient departments: the Energy Resources Conservation Board, the

Department of Environment, and of course other departments have indirect responsibilities in these areas. Co-operatively, I think they can do the job. I think the oil patch has shown that it is geared to finding the reserves. I think they're targeting for self-sufficiency towards 1990; that is, with the co-operation of all people, and we shouldn't be impeding them by calling for what I would think an unproven need, a hearing that would go on and on and on. Equally I think this government, through its departments, deserves the congratulations of this Assembly for the very fine way they have been protecting the environment and encouraging the oil industry to do its thing and do it so well. [interjections] It is so healthy here in Alberta that I don't think we want to impede progress with the suggestions by the official member of the opposition and his bedfellows over there, the official Social Credit Party.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: With that speech you may get to be a full minister.

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to stand in my place this afternoon and indicate to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview that I am utterly unable to support Motion 213. I have many reasons for that inability, but today I would like to refer specifically to the two essential implications of the motion: one, the inadequacy of this government's concern for the environment and, two, the inadequacy of the industry's performance and attitudes in the area of environmental protection.

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make three points. One, this government is much concerned regarding the subject of environmental protection; two, the petroleum industry is comprehensively regulated; and three, the petroleum industry's performance and attitudes are, in my view, most commendable.

If I could just comment on this government's concern, as well as the comprehensiveness of the regulation of the industry in Alberta: let there be no doubt that the petroleum industry in Alberta goes about its work under a very exacting system of planning, inspection, permits, reclamation rules, and so on. This might be of interest to you, sir, as well as to the hon. members in the Assembly today: I brought with me a table of contents from an industry publication that deals with the subject of environmental legislation. This is a very thick publication that simply summarizes the legislation in this province that controls the work of the industry in Alberta. The table of contents alone is eight pages and the subheadings relate to over 40 pieces of legislation that control and regulate the work of the petroleum industry in the province. That was simply a comment on the quantity of that legislation and attendant regulations.

It might also be appropriate, Mr. Speaker, to comment on the extreme variety of operational matters that are affected by existing legislation: such things as licences and permits; exploration approvals; guidelines and limits on exploration field operations, drilling, completing, and servicing; casing equipment; and so on. A host of subjects, a host of operational matters, are already most comprehensively regulated.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to refer to one other publication. This is not an industry publication but a government publication produced by the Department

of Energy and Natural Resources and entitled The Resource Handbook. Just two excerpts at random, Mr. Speaker, to make the point. Listen to the specific detail of the regulations in Section 1, which relates to the subject of operating guidelines, specifically geophysical operations:

1. Geophysical lines may be constructed by either flare cutting or windrowing, but must not exceed 8 m in width.
2. When detours are required the geophysical line must be hand cut to a width not greater than 3 m.
3. Unless otherwise approved by a forest officer only hand cutting is permitted on either side of a stream or river and within 45 m of a lake shore.

If I may be permitted, Mr. Speaker, one other reference to this departmental publication, [the section] entitled "Basic Requirements":

1. The top soil should remain undisturbed by dozer-blades whenever possible and only minimal reclearing of existing lines is authorized.
2. Work may be suspended in the event of adverse weather conditions on any exploration activity until field conditions improve allowing work to resume.

And one more.

All ribbon, other flagging and miscellaneous materials used along exploration lines must be gathered and properly disposed of as directed by a forest officer.

It would be very unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, if hon. members concluded that industry performance and attitudes regarding the environment are merely a knee-jerk reaction, merely a response to legislation and regulation. I'd like to make the point today that industry performance and attitudes in the area of environmental protection spring largely from industry initiative and not solely in response to legislation and regulation. To illustrate that point, a number of industry organizations and associations were created, not by law and not by response to law, but out of corporate recognition of the importance of the area. One example of many possibilities is the Petroleum Association for Conservation of the Canadian Environment. This association, conceived a number of years ago — perhaps a decade ago — and chartered in 1971, is supported by about a dozen major companies and has environmental protection as its fundamental objective.

Canadians, of course, have become accustomed to one of the highest standards of living in the world, and there's no doubt that those standards of living are closely keyed to the abundance of our natural resources and their exploitation. Yet the operation of the industry and the use of related products from the industry obviously have the potential for environmental damage. The recognition of this potential has given rise to this association, PACCE, and a host of others like it, which have logged many hours in support of this objective. One statistic may be of interest to the members today. In the last year members of PACCE committees devoted over 36,000 man-hours to furthering the petroleum industry's environmental objectives and recommending action within the industry.

In making his motion the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview made a number of remarks that really can't be supported by me or indeed by logic or facts.

One of these of course is his recurring reference to portable seismic operations. If I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the hon. member that portable seismic techniques are no adequate substitute for conventional seismic methods, on the grounds of either prohibitive costs which are associated with such portable techniques or indeed their basic effectiveness.

Could I just make one historical point. It may be somewhat strong, Mr. Speaker, to say that the Nisku reefs in the Pembina field couldn't be adequately mapped with portable methods. But it certainly is not unfair to say the reconnaissance program that discovered those reefs would not have been done portably because of the prohibitive costs involved. This obviously would have had tremendous economic consequences for the province of Alberta.

When the hon. member introduced his motion he commented that: we would "ask for more stringent conditions on exploration and development as far as the oil industry is concerned". In this request, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the hon. member does a gross disservice to both the Alberta government and the oil industry in this province. Might I add that I regard it as a classic illustration of ideology getting in the way of reality.

I would like to conclude these brief comments today, Mr. Speaker, with the rhetorical question: is there perhaps too much regulation as regards the oil industry's operations in this province? Might it have been a more appropriate motion to advocate a study into what could very well be construed as excessive regulation in what I regard as a highly competent and valuable industry? For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, and many others which time does not allow me to expand on today, I simply cannot support Motion 213.

Thank you.

MR. L. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to Motion 213 I had to go back and refresh my memory just a little on what the issue really was. Then I wasn't too clear after I read the motion. The motion reads as follows:

Be it resolved that the Assembly direct the Minister of Environment to direct the Environment Council of Alberta to conduct public hearings into the environmental effects of the petroleum exploration and production industry.

Now to me this means that before any exploration can be done in Alberta or before any pipelines can be laid or any wells can be drilled, you must hold public hearings.

The hon. member then went on to outline what he believed to be the specific problems. One was the width of the right of way, from 60 to 100 feet in green areas compared to a smaller right of way in urban areas. I believe everybody here knows that there's a great deal of difference between laying a gas line down a roadway in an urban street and putting it through a forest. I think they need a little extra room when they're working in those conditions.

He's also concerned about the cut lines, that seem to him to go here and there without rhyme or reason, taking up land and forest products unnecessarily. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that cut lines are necessarily all bad. Yes, they do take up some acreage, and they do use up some forest products. But they also open the way for agriculture and recreation. Even the forestry industry itself sometimes uses the cut lines for roads.

In speaking to the multi-use of land, the hon. member says:

What I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, and what I think the ECA report suggests, is that multiple-use [of land] doesn't mean you have a series of land uses in every province. It means ... [you] have to zone the areas ...

I admit it would be nice if we could zone eastern Alberta, and say we were going to have all our petroleum production in eastern Alberta, western Alberta for forestry, southern Alberta for farming, and central Alberta for coal — maybe our excess gas up at Spirit River. [interjections] But these industries by their very nature cannot be zoned or restricted to any given area, because they are only in the area where they're found.

Farmers have a philosophy that they never worry about something they can't do anything about. An example of this is the weather. On a farm you take the weather as it comes. I believe this philosophy is quite appropriate in this area. We can't change or do anything about where our petroleum is found. But if you agree — and I'm sure everybody here does — that we must develop this industry for the good of Alberta and Canada, then we must develop it where we find it. We must do the best we can to see that that development does not interrupt or disrupt other industries. We do this by input, by co-operation, and by understanding all the industries concerned. Certainly we must have input from forestry and from the petroleum industry. We must also have input from agriculture and reports like the ECA report. But then, Mr. Speaker, it becomes the responsibility of this government to make the final decision, based upon what they believe is best for Alberta and for Canadians as a whole.

Being a farmer from an oil producing area, I admit that there are going to be changes in land use, and that there are going to be some problems connected with this. But they are very minor when compared with the importance of the petroleum industry to Alberta and to Canada. They are minor even compared to the

electrical grids that run across this province and through farmlands. I believe pipelines cause much less trouble than the electric grids, as was debated here today. Yet all of us here today know, whether we admit it or not, that if we're going to develop the petroleum industry and a western power grid, we must have joint use of land; we must have multi-use of land. If we don't, who gets the first priority? Forestry? Petroleum? Surely with co-operation we can make good use of our land and still develop it and all our resources. You don't gain that co-operation by putting unnecessary restrictions on one industry, and that is what would happen if this motion passed. Every time an oil company would want to drill a well or proceed with exploration, it would be forced to hold public hearings and to abide by zoning regulations. I believe this would place an unnecessary restriction and delay on our petroleum industry without accomplishing anything, except to pit one industry against the other. I would like at this time to urge the Assembly to vote against this motion.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the hour, I would like adjourn the debate.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the House will not sit this evening. Tomorrow in Orders of the Day we will go into Committee of Supply and consideration of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, until such time as Your Honour conducts the annual meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

[At 5:32 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]