

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: Friday, April 18, 1980 10:00 a.m.

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

head: **READING AND
RECEIVING PETITIONS**

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I move that the following petitions be read and received:

1. the petition of Roger Motut, Herve H. Durocher, Francis McMahon, Lucien Maynard, Joseph Moreau, Jean-Paul Bugeaud, and Jules van Brabant for The La Fondation de l'Association canadienne-française de l'Alberta Act; [applause] You don't know how much I appreciate that.
2. the petition of the city of Edmonton for The Edmonton Research and Development Park Authority Act;
3. the petition of Alberta Wheat Pool for The Alberta Wheat Pool Amendment Act, 1980;
4. the petition of Edna Barbara Dial for The Keith Dial Adoption Termination Act;
5. the petition of R. W. Chapman, F. G. Stewart, L. H. LeRiche, R. R. Francis, E. B. McKittrick, H. McEwen, and D. McPherson for The Alberta Foundation Act;
6. the petition of the Prairie Bible Institute for The Prairie Bible Institute Amendment Act, 1980;
7. the petition of Gladys Marshall for The Warren Dean Boyd Adoption Act;
8. the petition of Sherm Ewing for The Stockmen's Memorial Foundation Act.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

Bill 213

The Public Utilities Plebiscite Act

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 213, The Public Utilities Plebiscite Act. Very briefly, the purpose of Bill 213 would be to authorize a plebiscite on the question of public ownership of utilities either at the time of the next provincial election or, should a referendum be held on any other matter, on that occasion.

[Leave granted; Bill 213 read a first time]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I'm particularly pleased today to be able to introduce from the constituency of Calgary Egmont 19 members of the 117th Trail Blazers Scout Troop. They are accompanied by Mr. Dubauskas, Mr. Haase, and Mr. Godfrey. These young men are working on their citizenship badges. They are in the

public gallery. I'd ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure this morning to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, a group of at least 70 students from the Edith Rogers grade 9 class, and their counterpart Quebec exchange students, under the leadership of Mr. Jerry Bayly. I would ask them to rise and receive the *bi-venue a Alberta* from this Assembly.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to be able to introduce a group of students from St. Thomas More school in the town of Fairview. They are accompanied by Mr. and Mrs. Earle Guetin. They're seated in the public gallery. I would ask that they stand and be recognized by the members of the Assembly.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to rise this morning to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 30 students from grades 7, 8, and 9 at McCauley school in the constituency of Edmonton Highlands. As with the group I introduced to the Assembly last week, these are new Canadians, the children of landed immigrants who are enrolled in an English as a second language program.

I think it's appropriate, Mr. Speaker, that we have with us this morning Trail Blazers who are working on their citizenship badge, new Canadians who are in this country by choice, and Canadians from another part of the land who represent a different linguistic and cultural group which is part of Canada. The students from McCauley are accompanied this morning by their teachers Mr. Lea, Mrs. Bardal, and Miss Kennedy. They are in the public gallery. I would ask that they rise to receive the welcome of the Assembly.

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday I announced to the Assembly that the occupational health and safety division had inquired into and reported upon the circumstances which resulted in the tragic deaths of four miners at McIntyre Mines in Grande Cache on February 28, 1980. I was able to report that a review and implementation of certain recommendations would be commenced immediately with the co-operation of the United Steelworkers of America, Local 7621, and management.

I would now like to inform hon. members that I consider it to be in the public interest to appoint a board of inquiry under Section 29 of The Occupational Health and Safety Act. Under the provisions of the legislation, a board of inquiry under this section has all the powers of a commissioner under The Public Inquiries Act.

It is intended that the board of inquiry be a one-person board, and that the government and the parties will have the advantage of a ranking expert in the field of mine safety and mine procedures to fill this important role. The government is already in a selection process, and I anticipate naming the individual who will carry this important inquiry within the next several weeks.

The inquiry will review the circumstances surrounding the tragic deaths of the four miners and the causes of the accident. I expect it will include a review of the existing

report and recommendations of the occupational health and safety division, as well as a full and complete inquiry into all facts and circumstances surrounding the tragic incident. The board of inquiry will then be able to make recommendations directed at any and all changes in procedures that may be needed to increase and assure so far as possible a safe working environment in this mine. It may also be anticipated that the safety of miners generally in the province may be advanced by the recommendations made with respect to this particular case.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Child Care — High Prairie

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. It really relates to an incident regarding a High Prairie foster home which, from checking, I believe the RCMP have investigated and are now determining whether there is a basis for laying criminal charges. My question to the minister would be: when was this matter first brought to the attention of the minister? What action did the social workers take when the matter was first brought to their attention?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the facility in High Prairie is not a foster home. It's a group home owned by the province, and was opened early in 1977. The group home is under contract with a set of house parents. It is the responsibility of the house parents to make arrangements for substitute house parents to cover for weekends, holiday time, et cetera. The substitute house parents must be acceptable to the supervising social worker.

On April 10, a week ago Thursday, one of the girls — and I might mention, Mr. Speaker, that the facility is licensed to accommodate up to six children, ages 12 through 16. At the present time there are five children in the facility. On April 10 one of the girls complained to a social worker. The social worker took appropriate steps in interviewing one or more of the other girls in the facility, and felt that the allegations made by the girls were of the nature that the RCMP should be asked to make a formal investigation. That was done the same day, April 10.

The RCMP investigation is under way at the present time. I cannot comment on the allegations beyond that point, Mr. Speaker. Once the RCMP have completed their investigation, either charges will be laid or the allegations will be deemed to have been groundless.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Might I say that certainly the intent of my question was not for me or the minister to comment on the allegations, because they are that at this time.

But a more important issue, Mr. Speaker, and a supplementary question to the minister, is: were the individuals who were the substitute house parents in this case approved by the minister's department?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated, in a contractual arrangement like this, it is the responsibility of the house parents with whom the contract is held to arrange for substitute house parents. The supervising social worker approves the substitute house parents.

Mr. Speaker, I might mention again that the standard procedure in a situation where an allegation is made by a

client is that, first, there is a review by the social worker or social workers in a particular area. Pending the information which is obtained at that time, a decision is made by the officials within the department either to refer the matter to the RCMP or the local police for a formal investigation or, pending the kind of information obtained, to believe that there are no further grounds for an investigation.

I'm satisfied that the action taken by department officials on April 10 was, in fact, the right action to take. The primary concern of the social worker is for the care of the children, and our responsibility is in that regard. The investigation is now under way.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister; perhaps I didn't make the last question very clear. In the situation now under investigation by the RCMP, at the time the incident took place the substitute parents were supervising, and not the people who run the group home. My supplementary question to the minister is: were those substitute parents approved by the supervising social worker as individuals suitable to be substitute parents when the people who operate the group home are absent?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had answered that question on the two previous occasions, when I indicated that substitute group parents must be acceptable to the supervising social worker.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Mr. Minister, from that answer it's fair to assume that the individuals who were the substitute parents in this case had received the approval from the department.

MR. BOGLE: I think I've answered that question, Mr. Speaker.

Mine Safety

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation. As a preamble to the question, I'd say we welcome the announcement made by the minister today. But the question to the minister would be this: will the board of inquiry that the minister has set up — just having received a copy of the ministerial statement — focus totally on the very serious McIntyre Mine incident, or will the gentleman, the individual who will be heading up the inquiry, have sufficient latitude to look at the concerns raised by officials of the department, who in fact have indicated that they feel they've been, and I'm being charitable here, severely restrained over the past two years in carrying out their responsibilities?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, the first part of his question is quite clearly indicated in my statement this morning. The other part is a reference to a news item, and I do not wish to discuss it here.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Mr. Minister, will the board of inquiry that the minister announced this morning have sufficient breadth to be able to look at problems in the mining industry in the province — as related to safety, of course — other than just the one incident at Grande Cache in the McIntyre Mine?

MR. DIACHUK: Again, Mr. Speaker, I believe the statement is quite clear that the Grande Cache incident will be investigated. There's every reason to believe that it's anticipated that the safety of miners generally in the province may be advanced by a recommendation made with respect to this particular case.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. What were the reasons that made the government restrict this inquiry solely to the McIntyre Mine accident, as opposed to broadening it so that the inquiry could look at the question of the number of mine inspectors, whether inspections are up to date across the province, and the wisdom of the decision made a year ago about going the route of generalists rather than specialists as far as inspectors are concerned?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, The Occupational Health and Safety Act provides us an opportunity to investigate the McIntyre incident in a public hearing. This is the route the government has chosen. The other innuendoes that the hon. leader is making are quite inaccurate, and I don't believe would even have any bearing on the hearings that the commissioner will be holding to investigate the McIntyre incident. But I repeat, and I stated in the statement, that we are of the opinion and we anticipate that the safety of miners in general in the province may be advanced by the recommendation and the outcome of these hearings.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. During the course of the investigations by the board of inquiry into the tragedy at McIntyre, will the staffing patterns of the mine inspection branch be considered specifically, as well as the salary levels which, I am told by the United Steelworkers of America, had been reduced from a maximum of \$30,000 to \$24,000? [interjections] The question is this: will these matters be specifically assessed and reviewed by the board of inquiry?

MR. DIACHUK: The terms of the review were not identified or released in the statement today. The commissioner has not been announced. When that decision is made, and when the announcement is made in this Assembly — I would only ask the hon. members to await that announcement.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: With all due respect to the hon. member, I think the minister has indicated that his announcement of the inquiry this morning is a preliminary announcement, and further details will be forthcoming. Perhaps the appropriate questions could be asked at that time. [interjections]

DR. BUCK: Oh, come on.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if I may. Perhaps some of the questions dealing with the specifics of the inquiry may be; however, the supplementary question I was going to put to the minister would be in order. My question is simply this: is the government prepared at this stage to give an undertaking to the

House that there will be no change with respect to transferring mine inspectors to the occupational health and safety division until such time as we have the report of the board of inquiry?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview only has to check the records. That change — as he worded — was made back in April 1978. The estimates last year indicated the inspectorate is under the occupational health and safety division. It's not a policy we are waiting to make. The decision was made quite some time ago to place the mine inspectorate, as recommended by the Gale commission, as part of the occupational health and safety inspectorate team in this province.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question to the minister is not the intention, but whether in fact the operation of the mine safety branch will be phased out and brought under the occupational health and safety division *per se*, as opposed to being a separate branch. The question really is: where does that stand?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I believe I've answered that question.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, may I have a supplementary to the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation? Is this board of inquiry going to delay the review and implementation of any recommendations made in the initial report discussed in the House two days ago?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I indicated in this Assembly that some of the recommendations were immediately forwarded to the union and to the management. My officials are scheduled and have full intention to be at the mine again within the next few days. No delay will be seen because of the announced hearing. The program of further safety implementation in the mine will be carried out by my officials in co-operation with the union and management.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary. Has the minister had any indication since Wednesday, the 16th, of the continuing co-operation and approval of the mine workers and mine management in such a review and implementation of the recommendations?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, my officials received support from both union and management in both of these steps, and even in this plan that was announced today in the Assembly. So, to the hon. member, there is full support for this approach.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. This is not a question on what the review is going to indicate; this is a question on the accident that has already happened. Can the minister indicate when the mine where the fatalities occurred was inspected by the minister's department?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I believe there was full evidence in the report tabled on Tuesday. Some 36 inspections were carried out in the mine in 1979. The mine was inspected by the safety committee as recently as a week before the incident. Many of those recommendations were implemented, and my officials received that

report, with the information about the recommendations, on February 28 in the morning mail.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the minister. Can the minister indicate if his department is going to stay with its philosophy that the inspection branch not be specialists but be involved in other aspects of the inspection of other facilities?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, that is inaccurate. I've answered a similar question in this Assembly that the complement of mining engineers and mining specialists on the occupational health and safety staff will be maintained. There is no evidence that my officials plan to change it. It's quite inaccurate.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether he has held discussions with the United Steelworkers concerning this question of the qualification of mining inspectors? Is the minister able to advise the Assembly that the position of the United Steelworkers is very strongly that they want specialized people who have experience in the mines, and that they are concerned about the present trend towards generalists?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I must repeat that, as I've indicated in this Assembly, yes, I have had meetings with the officials of the mining union. They were assured that their concerns had no basis to provide any concern, and they were assured by my officials and myself that the intention is to continue to maintain a staff of qualified mining engineers and specialists.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly what review is being taken by the department with respect to the different features of two Acts, the coal mines Act and The Occupational Health and Safety Act? The key difference is that under The Occupational Health and Safety Act, a company may refuse an inspector to come on without a court order. My question to the minister: in view of the assurance the coal mines Act gives, allowing unfettered entry of inspectors as well as stop-work orders, what review is being made by the department as to possible changes in The Occupational Health and Safety Act to reconcile that difference and ensure full safety for miners in Grande Cache?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I believe I have advised the House that the regulations are being reviewed by my officials and the representatives of the union. Every consideration is being given that in the transfer of the regulations, the concern of the miners and the mine union will be met. That has not been completed because of the February 28 incident. I hope and expect that it will be resumed shortly and that the agreement on the transfer of those regulations will be met. I do want to assure the members of the Assembly that when the meeting was held among my officials, myself, and the representative of the mine union, it was pointed out to them that their co-operation is appreciated, and that there was no intention to weaken the role of the inspectorate. There are provisions in The Occupational Health and Safety Act that overcome the concerns the hon. member has raised.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. In light of the charges that the number of inspectors went down

from 10 to two, can the minister indicate if the inspection has been done on a random basis, or has prior notice been given to the companies when inspections were going to be made?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, it is not accurate that the inspectorate has gone down from 10 to two.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, then maybe the minister can remember the other supplementaries. I gave him the opportunity to make a speech all at once there. Can the minister indicate if the inspections are done on a random basis? Also, is any prior lead time given to the companies before the inspections are made, or are they done without notice?

MR. DIACHUK: There are many occasions when inspections are done without notice. But on many other occasions, when a request is made by either the union or management for an inspection, no doubt an arrangement or a commitment is made when the inspector will be able to get out to that mine or industry. So on that occasion notice is given. But both approaches are taken.

MR. NOTLEY: Supplementary question, if I may, to the hon. Minister of Labour. I believe on Wednesday, the Minister of Labour indicated that his officials had met with both the union officials and company officials. The implication was that safety matters were discussed. Is the Minister of Labour in a position to advise the Assembly that the only efforts of the Department of Labour were with respect to the contract — and that dealt with job posting and seniority — and in no way dealt with the question of safety or the right of workers to refuse to work in unsafe conditions?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, in the preface to his question, I think the hon. member has quite correctly laid out the nature of my response. The hon. member suggested there were implications. I suggest to the hon. member that's the way he read the response.

My response clearly would be dealing with the interpretation of the collective agreement. That's the responsibility of the departmental officials. As I indicated in my response that day, there are a number of committees, and I believe one of them is a safety committee. But the direct responsibility deals with the ongoing interpretation of the existing collective agreement.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We've had a considerable number of supplementary questions on this particular topic. There are also a considerable number of hon. members wishing to ask questions. Perhaps we could have a further supplementary by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, followed by a supplementary by the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, and a final by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is to either hon. gentleman, the hon. minister in charge of workers' compensation or the hon. Minister of Labour. To go right back to the question I asked on Wednesday with respect to what steps the government is taking to assess the concern of both the United Steelworkers as well as workers employed in the mine, who've indicated concern that if they refuse to work in conditions

they consider unsafe, in fact they take the chance of getting fired. My question really relates to what steps this government is taking to assure people in that sort of situation that there will in fact be legislative protection. For example, is the government reviewing the Ontario legislation that specifically sets out very clear rights for people not to work in unsafe conditions? [interjections]

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member must know, as I think it's very much public information and as I believe I've indicated in the House, that The Alberta Labour Act is presently under review. I have received a large number of submissions. I have to confess that I have not reviewed them all; they're being reviewed by departmental officials. If in fact that is a component of the submissions which have been received, it will be addressed, hopefully over the months before the fall session.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation. I wonder if he would be able to advise the Assembly how many operating underground coal mines his department is required to inspect.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, that is part of the information the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked for yesterday. I will be in a position to answer that more fully early next week.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a last supplementary question to the minister. Mr. Minister, page 2 of the ministerial announcement indicates that the board

... will then be able to make recommendations directed at any and all changes in procedure that may be needed to increase and assure so far as possible a safe working environment in this mine.

My question, Mr. Minister: why is this board of inquiry being so limited that it would not be able to look at the way your department carried out its responsibilities and then make recommendations in that area? Why is this board of inquiry being kept out, prevented from looking at that area?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I believe I've answered that question.

MR. R. CLARK: You have not.

MR. DIACHUK: This is part of the announcement that will come when the board of inquiry is announced.

MR. R. CLARK: You've already said it can't look at that area.

MR. DIACHUK: The incident occurred at McIntyre Mines, the representation was for a board of inquiry for McIntyre Mines, and that is what the government has announced today.

Vehicle Registration

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Solicitor General. It refers to the new mail-in registration procedure for motor vehicle licensing. Now that the deadline for mail-in applications has passed, can the Solicitor General indicate to the Assembly how successful the mail-in campaign has been?

MR. HARLE: I'd have to take that question as notice and respond next week.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. From information I've received, only one-third of the registrations have been done by mail, and many independent sales outlets did not lay on extra staff because of the new directions. Would the Solicitor General indicate whether his department has developed a means to expedite the impending walk-in crunch at the end of this month?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I can respond to those questions next week.

MR. PURDY: I'll ask another supplementary, so the minister may be able to respond on this. In 1973 I was instrumental in having the financial responsibility cards proven when a person applied for a licence. But now, with the mail-in program, this is not taking place. Can the minister assure this House what controls are in place to ensure that the insurance policy numbers supplied are in fact up to date and paid?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, the whole purpose of the information is to have such a record so that it can be followed up either on a spot-check basis, or should a particular incident come to the attention of the officials that an inquiry should be made.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, with 1.6 million ...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is being allowed considerable flexibility in the matter of preamble, but if he has a further supplementary, if he'd be explicit he could put it.

DR. BUCK: Put it on the Order Paper.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, then the supplementary to the minister is: can the minister assure the House that all motor vehicles registered will have valid pink cards?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I think it should be realized that a pink card is a document that is extremely easily forged. I certainly cannot give the guarantee that all the information is accurate. That's part of the regulatory process and, as I have indicated, spot checks will be made.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't indicating about forged cards; I was asking ...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Perhaps the member would like to put a direct question.

Nurses' Strike

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. It's a question to clarify an answer previously given by the minister. Aside from the appeals procedure which is available to hospitals in this province, is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether a specific assurance has been given to the Alberta Hospital Association that any settlement of the present nurses' strike would in fact be financed by the last-dollar funding of the

province, without having to cut back other types of service? I raise the question in view of the minister's statement in the House on March 25 indicating that "the location, co-ordination, financing, and administration of health care facilities are the responsibility of the ... Department".

Has there been a specific assurance to the Alberta Hospital Association that a settlement arrived at through the collective bargaining process will be financed without having to cut into other operations of the hospitals in the province?

MR. RUSSELL: Well, Mr. Speaker, the way that question is put is so full of ramifications that the only answer I can give is: no, such assurance has not been given and could not be given under the circumstances outlined by the hon. member. I can only point to the past record in similar circumstances, where I think sufficient funding has followed either settlements that have been arrived at or budgetary appeals that have been considered by the department.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Given that the nurses are now out on strike, is the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, or perhaps the Minister of Labour, in a position to indicate to the Assembly whether negotiations or discussions are going on and will be going on over the weekend between the Hospital Association, the nurses and, I would assume, government officials?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, the situation is that the mediation staff are on call and available to the parties. Efforts were made late last evening to review again, to see whether the parties could be assisted in any respect.

Mr. Speaker, I can report to the House that, as I expressed yesterday, because of the nature of this dispute, the fact that considerable public inconvenience is involved, I felt it incumbent on me to assure myself by speaking directly with the presidents of both associations and such others as they cared to bring with them to my office, to explore any possibility of assistance that could be provided. I can assure the House that, to the best of the information provided to me, we had exhausted every mediation possibility prior to strike. We are still available to assist the parties on request at this time.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister, without trying to become involved in the details of the negotiations. Can the minister indicate to the Assembly whether at this time meetings are planned today or over the weekend between the two groups?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I cannot so indicate. As the hon. leader would recognize, mediation involves the voluntary participation of the parties. That then puts me in a position where I'm never sure whether the parties will request assistance.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then to put it to the minister this way: since the nurses walked out this morning, have requests for meetings come either from the hospital officials or from the nurses?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I have no information to that effect.

Hazardous Chemicals

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transportation and to the minister responsible for Disaster Services. Can the Minister of Transportation indicate if there have been any consultations with the major rail lines in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary, and in the Fort Saskatchewan area, as to the assembly of tankers carrying hazardous chemicals? Has the minister been in touch with those three areas to see how the assembly is organized?

MR. KROEGER: No, Mr. Speaker, my department hasn't. The Minister of Economic Development might want to comment, or perhaps the Minister of Municipal Affairs, relating to Disaster Services.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I would have to check with the director of Disaster Services on the specifics of whether he's had discussions with the railways with regard to that single matter.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister responsible for Disaster Services. Has it been brought to the minister's attention that, as it was being assembled, a tank car of chlorine at the Dow plant in the Fort Saskatchewan area hit a soft spot on the rails and nearly capsized? Was that incident brought to the minister's attention?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I don't recall that specific incident having been brought to my attention. I do get a report from time to time from Disaster Services. However, I would again be prepared to check with the director of Disaster Services to see if that particular incident was brought to his attention.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, since the 2,4-D incident, has the minister been able to ascertain if any guidelines are in place at this time as to the movement of hazardous chemicals by road, how they should be transported, packed, and identified?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, in fact yesterday we were discussing the concept that has been under discussion for some time involving federal legislation with regard to the transportation of hazardous goods. Indeed, there are not the kinds of regulations in place now that many who are involved in this area expect there should be. However, I have been advised by the director of Disaster Services that his advice from federal Transport officials is that they expect the Bill, which was referred to yesterday, to be introduced into the House of Commons within the next few weeks.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to that I should say that Disaster Services was not called with regard to the incident of the 2,4-D spill the day before yesterday. If I understand it, the Edmonton city fire department was on the scene and at some point in time did make a call to Ottawa. Disaster Services has a complete manual on how to handle spills of that nature, including directions and instructions with regard to 2,4-D. Had they been called, they would have been able to provide accurate information immediately.

I should say as well, Mr. Speaker, that they may not have been called because officials at the scene were aware of what the chemical was and felt they knew how to handle it. However, in view of that, I've asked the direc-

tor of Disaster Services to contact officials of the city of Edmonton and the Edmonton city fire department, to make sure once again that they're aware of the services provided, which are very extensive in terms of emergencies such as that.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. While we're waiting for the discussions with the interprovincial jurisdictions, can the minister assure this Assembly that there can be an immediate investigation and recommendations as to the handling of containers being trucked within the province at this time?

MR. MOORE: Well, Mr. Speaker, the matter of the transportation of dangerous goods, which we've discussed at length, certainly involves more than one province. We have goods that originate in other parts of Canada, indeed in the United States, by truck, rail, various modes of transportation. I thought it was clear that we had taken a decision that this matter needs to be regulated on much more than a provincial basis. Obviously it doesn't do a great deal of good for one province to have one kind of regulations, and one another. Indeed, it would cause a lot of problems with respect to the transportation industry.

So we have been insisting for some time that a national policy be developed with respect to transportation of dangerous goods. This government has had a lot of input into that policy. It obviously takes some legislation, which as I indicated yesterday has been delayed some time because of two successive federal elections. But I'm assured now that it's back in the works again and will be introduced in the House of Commons, probably in early May. So we are proceeding, I think, as fast as we possibly can, under the circumstances of having to get agreement from a good number of provinces and other authorities, as well as the government of Canada.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Might the hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn have permission to revert to the introduction of visitors?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, at the request of the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry, who is unavoidably absent from the House at this time, I've been given the opportunity to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, a group of 50 special guests; namely, a number of students from Archbishop O'Leary high school, and students from the province of Quebec who are here on a bilingual exchange with the students from Edmonton. They are in the company of Miss Weston, Mr. Symrozy, and Mr. and Mrs. Paris.

I have been requested specifically by that hon. member to say to the guests from Quebec and to all the others, *bienvenue a l'assemblee*. I'm going to become bilingual yet, Mr. Speaker. I would ask that all our very special guests please rise at this time and receive a cordial welcome from the Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**
(continued)

Hazardous Chemicals
(continued)

DR. BUCK: May I ask the hon. minister my last supplementary now?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

DR. BUCK: To the hon. member who made the introduction: when you have three languages that's called three, you know, *trois*. [laughter]

MR. NOTLEY: That's Clover Bar French.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister responsible for Disaster Services. My question was: in light of the fact that chemicals are being moved that farmers will be using in the next two or three months, can the minister assure this Assembly specifically that his department will be looking at the movement within the province within the next two or three months? Because that's when the problems occur — basically like the incident that happened where the stuff just fell off the truck. Can they look at that? I don't think that requires federal discussion, Mr. Minister.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, as many hon. members know, movements of 2,4-D throughout this province are very, very extensive during the period of May, June, and July. I would undertake to review what has been done by Disaster Services. But if the hon. member is suggesting that we can put in place regulations that we can enforce with respect to the movement right to the farm, and from there into the fields and all the things that occur, it's simply not possible.

DR. BUCK: Just reasonable things.

MR. MOORE: We expect people to use good judgment.

The incident that occurred yesterday was handled quite well in the end. I think hon. members know by now that the possibility of water contamination and so on was indeed considerably overstated. That doesn't mean to say we shouldn't have stricter enforcement on other chemicals that are a lot more volatile than 2,4-D. That's the aspect I'm perhaps more concerned about than the spillage of 2,4-D, because other chemicals used in the agricultural industry of a different nature, which are much more harmful, are hauled in a similar fashion.

Diesel Fuel Supply

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. It concerns the diesel fuel supply within the province. Can the minister assure the Assembly that there will be sufficient diesel fuel available within the province to meet the demand over the next few months?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I don't know that I can go so far as to give an assurance of the type the hon. member has asked for. I can advise members of the Assembly that we have reviewed the diesel fuel supply situation, and we do not anticipate a problem. But that, of course, assumes that all the facilities, the processing,

and so on that are in place function as we hope and anticipate they will.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Will the minister tell the Assembly if there's sufficient diesel fuel available to meet the needs of Alberta farmers in the upcoming crop year?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, at the present time I have no indications that there will be any restrictions on farmers in planting the spring crop.

Pine Bark Beetle Infestation

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, and shows just how broad his responsibilities are. Arising from the questions on the pine bark beetle infestation in southwestern Alberta and possibly in the Cypress Hills, I believe, my concern is with the fact that lodgepole pine is such an important species economically. Does the department have any measures in force at this time to ensure that logs and firewood from the infested area are not transported around the province, thereby spreading the infestation?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond first of all to the reference to an infestation in the Cypress Hills area. We have carried out inspections there, and while there were a small number of trees with some infestation, remedial action is being taken. We don't anticipate a further problem there.

With respect to the spread of the infestation, the hon. member is quite accurate that there is a particular problem there during the months of July and August, which is the period when beetles are on the wing, as opposed to being in the bark. [laughter] We are taking steps to limit the movement of infested trees during that period.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, as a result of very concerned representations from the Members of the Legislative Assembly in that area, we will be holding some information meetings in an effort to acquaint the public with the risks and to seek their co-operation in such things as the movement of firelogs and things of that nature during that period of the year.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The time for the question period has expired. I have already recognized the Member for Calgary Forest Lawn. If the Assembly agrees, perhaps we might expect a very brief question.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Cultural/Recreation Facilities

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I wish I could give the Assembly that assurance. My question, in English, to the Minister of Recreation and Parks relates to our major cultural/recreation program. To the minister: given the fact ...

DR. BUCK: He's Ukrainian, John, ask him in Ukrainian.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Thanks for the help, Walt, but I work alone. [laughter]

To the minister: given the fact that the city of Calgary has reported that approximately \$1.8 million in worthwhile community projects have had to be turned down in 1980 because of a shortage of funds from the major

cultural/recreation grant program, can the minister advise what specific steps he's taking to ensure that such needed projects as community halls and recreational facilities will be able to proceed in our province?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, back to the member, in English. Yes, the MCR program was developed some six years ago. It outlines a program of \$100 per capita to all communities. Some communities other than Edmonton and Calgary can receive \$100 per capita in any one given year. The restriction on Calgary and Edmonton with regard to that is that they have to receive on a per capita basis of \$10 per year, and last year we had to have a special warrant for some \$5 million to take care of these two major cities.

I have not looked into extending the program beyond the \$10 per year per capita for the cities of Edmonton and Calgary, but we are looking to consult with them this coming year and see if we can work a more equitable position. The problem stems from the point that most cities and most communities in the province are trying to get as many MCR programs under way because of the high cost of construction and high interest. That's why we're anticipating more projects being presented to government than usual.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: A very short supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise whether or not he has assured communities and municipalities in the province that the 10-year program, which was launched in 1975, will continue beyond 1984?

MR. TRYNCHY: Well, I haven't assured the people of Alberta that that will happen, but I'll look at it and take that question under advisement.

MRS. EMBURY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that so many of our communities are having difficulty with operating some of the facilities, could the minister indicate if there has been any consideration of more assistance in operating grants?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, that's an important question. I'd like to elaborate somewhat, even though we're past the question period, if I may. Over the ...

DR. BUCK: Order, Mr. Speaker. All those questions can be answered very readily in the estimates, and we're coming to those estimates very, very shortly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would suggest that the hon. Member for Clover Bar has a legitimate point of order. I would think that [not recorded]

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS (Committee of Supply)

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

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

**Department of
Energy and Natural Resources**

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, there might be two or three more areas that I might raise, rather than general questioning, before we get to the specific votes, if that's agreeable. Mr. Minister, one of the areas I wanted to ask last night and *notice* that I didn't was this question of the decision by the federal government and the minister, Mr. Lalonde, to invoke the force majeure clause in the pricing thing as far as synthetic crude oil is concerned. Without trying to, shall I use the term "unjustly" intrude into the discussions which were held, Mr. Chairman, I think it would be helpful and certainly informative to the committee to know whether in the one discussion that was held between Alberta and the federal government — the first meeting between Alberta and the new federal government — Mr. Lalonde indicated that the federal government was going to move in that direction.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, to answer that question I think it would be a question of interpreting his remarks. During the discussion we held, he did say that the federal government was reviewing that question, was reviewing the matter. I indicated that I was interested in being kept advised of developments. The next communication I had from Mr. Lalonde was a telephone call saying the decision to invoke it had been made. The call was being made as a courtesy, by way of prior notice before the public announcement would be made by him. So the information I received was that the government was reviewing it, and that was followed by a statement that they had reached a decision to invoke it and would be announcing it in the immediate future.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Mr. Minister, on either that occasion or since, has Alberta received from the federal government any delineation as to the thinking of the federal government which lead them to arrive at the conclusion to invoke the clause?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, no, we've not received any outline of their reasoning or thinking why they reached the conclusion they did, that the circumstances had arisen which were contemplated by the clause. We've received no argument, in effect, from the federal government as to what lead them to their decision.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Mr. Minister, one of the arguments that has been presented — at least that I've been subject to, would perhaps be a better way of putting it — is that some of the people in the federal bureaucracy were successful in convincing the federal government that from the standpoint of future tactics, if they didn't take the action they did they would find themselves in certain legal complications if they ever wanted to invoke this section in the future. I recognize this isn't the place to get free legal advice, even from the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, but at the same time, Mr. Minister, has that point of view been considered by the department? Is the minister in a position to indicate whether that point of view has been put forward by any federal officials in discussing that with Alberta officials?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, I'm not aware of any discussion that have taken place between federal officials and provincial officials on that question. With respect to

legal reviews, of course, we would have that in hand. But I simply want to draw to the Assembly's attention that while the clause has been invoked, the price increases that would flow through under the current arrangement will continue to flow through, according to the federal minister's statement, while discussions or negotiations are going on with Alberta. I would expect that the question of future pricing for Syncrude and Suncor would be one of the items on the agenda in the upcoming negotiations.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No further questions?

Agreed to:

Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services:

1.1.1 — Minister's Office \$192,286

1.1.2 — Associate Minister's Office

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, perhaps this might be as good a time as any to ask two or three questions of the associate minister. Mr. Associate Minister, for a number of years now a feeling has been pretty prevalent across the province that, to put it very bluntly for a Friday morning, the fish and wildlife division get, and have for a number of years — not all of them during the '70s either; some before that — a pretty short end of the stick when it comes to government budgetary consideration. Mr. Minister, I know that last year in the course of estimates, there was some indication by you that that would be helped out this year. I notice that there's somewhat of an increase in those appropriations. But specifically, Mr. Minister, what success has the associate minister had in that area? What plans does the associate minister have as far as strengthening the fish and wildlife division of the department?

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you're all aware this past year the wildlife division was amalgamated with the Department of Public Lands and Wildlife. It's proven to be extremely successful, in that now we're able to co-ordinate our land use and wildlife activities. With regard to what is happening, I would think that we have many extremely positive programs either being implemented or on the drawing board. I think one of the most successful ones we are in the process of putting together is the regionalization of the wildlife branch. We've divided the province into six zones or regions, and we will have a regional wildlife officer who will co-ordinate all the wildlife activities in that region. We feel that such a move will make for greater efficiency: we'll be able to have closer contact with the people; many of the decisions will be made at the local level; and there will be an overall benefit to fish and wildlife, the hunters and fishermen, as well as co-ordinating with other departments.

I would like to point out how successful we have been in our pheasant hatchery program in Brooks. This present year we're targeting to have a release of 80,000 to 100,000 birds. With the program going on there to increase the number of pens and hatching facilities, in a few years we're looking at a total of over 200,000 birds. So, indeed, we are doing a lot in this regard to increase the pheasant population.

As well at Brooks we have quite an extensive Canada goose hatching program. I was down there the other day. They have 24 nesting pairs, so they will have a greater release than they have ever had before for establishing

colonies of geese throughout Alberta. We've had success in this regard up in the Kenilworth area of my constituency, where this past year I think there was a total of at least 60 mating pairs nesting.

One of the things we're looking forward to is a report to be presented this spring by the select committee of the Legislature which was set up to look into fishing in the province. In regard to sport fishing, we are presently in a position where the Allison Creek brood stock station will be built. We've established a habitat division to look after habitat problems within the department.

Overall, I would think that our increase in this past year has been extremely dramatic. We're looking at co-ordinated land use planning. We have people who are interested not only in the grazing aspect but also other land uses. Our committees will be set up to make sure we make the fullest benefit and utilization of our Crown lands.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, being somewhat facetious to the minister: lest we get on a wild goose chase here, we'll wait until we get to Vote 6 and become more involved there.

Agreed to:

1.1.2 — Associate Minister's Office	\$126,783
1.1.3 — Deputy Ministers' Offices	\$430,211
1.1.4 — Government Relations	\$150,048
Total — Central Support	\$899,328

1.2.1 — Budget and Accounts	\$1,868,017
1.2.2 — Personnel Services	\$1,461,430
1.2.3 — Drafting Services	\$167,576
1.2.4 — Records Management	\$1,955,352
1.2.5 — Executive Director — Administrative Services	\$65,267
Total — Administrative Services	\$5,517,642

1.3.1 — Administrative Support	\$109,853
1.3.2 — Economic/Financial Services	\$697,174
1.3.3 — Information Services	\$1,374,448
1.3.4 — Computer Systems	\$394,335
Total — Policy Analysis and Planning	\$2,575,810

1.4.1 — Legal Services	\$93,289
1.4.2 — Scientific/Engineering Services	\$1,774,034

143 — Energy Resources Research Fund

Mr. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, might I ask the minister: Mr. Minister, I'm not sure this is the exact vote, but what is the status of the federal funds that have been made available for energy research in the province? I recall some work was done at the University of Calgary in that area. What's the status of that fund now? If I also recall accurately, there was some kind of deadline as to when this money had to be allocated.

Mr. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, this is the correct vote. I should explain why there was a vote of about \$8 million last year and no vote this year. That really is a question of budget timing. Ordinarily we would deal with this funding by way of special warrant. But last year the budget came in so late that we had already provided the

funds by way of special warrant. So of course they were required to show up in the budget. Despite the different presentation and the absence of the vote this year, there has been no change, really, in that energy resources research fund. It will continue to function as it has in the past, but because of its nature we fund it by special warrant.

The second part of the question was whether there's a time line on it. I'd have to check that, Mr. Chairman. I'm not sure there was a time line. My memory is that it was an amount, as opposed to a time line as to when it had to be spent. Members of the committee will recall that the funding for that arose from, I think, our first oil pricing arrangement with the federal government.

Mr. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Perhaps Mr. Minister could clear the question of time line by means of memo. Also, what portion of the fund has been allocated, and perhaps the larger projects that have been commissioned to date?

Mr. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, there is a rather extensive list of projects funded by the energy resources research fund. I'm not sure I can quickly pick out the major ones. We're doing a great number in both non-renewable and renewable energy. Some of the larger ones in renewable energy would be solar and wind energy research, the efficient heating of buildings. On the non-renewable side, some of the larger ones would be computer modelling technology in respect of oil reservoirs, enhanced recovery of conventional crude oil, an energy resources data system, and hydrocarbon research.

Those would be the major operating items although, as I say, a large number of items are funded. It is anticipated the capital items will be funded. The largest would be an energy resources research building, which will be primarily for coal research. We haven't got a final number on that, but that would be a major building.

Mr. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I take it that this is public information? Are copies available of all the funds that have been allocated?

Mr. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, I'd have no difficulty making them available and will do that.

Agreed to:

1.4.3 — Energy Resources Research Fund	—
Total — Advisory Services and Research	\$1,867,323
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$10,860,103

Vote 2 — Resource Evaluation and Planning:

2.1 — Program Support	\$470,213
-----------------------	-----------

22 — Resource Evaluation

Mr. PAHL: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fairly substantial increase in the resource evaluation vote, I wonder if the minister could tell the committee whether that would accommodate the increased emphasis on land-related information systems as outlined in the budget and in the Department of Treasury estimates.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, with the tremendous amount of development taking place, we've found it necessary to increase the staff needed to do a thorough

examination of the use of the lands. When industry comes in we want to have ideas as to the impact it has on other resources such as agriculture, forestry, wildlife, environment, et cetera.

MR. PAHL: Thank you. The question was more specific as to whether it would reflect an increased emphasis on making this sort of information available on a computer-based information grid, as per the Treasury's coordinating role in that area.

MR. MILLER: As I understand the question, Mr. Chairman, it is whether the information obtained through the studies that are carried out is computerized and made available to the industry. Is that the question? This information is gathered and computerized, and is available.

Agreed to:

2.2 — Resource Evaluation	\$5,962,860
2.3 — Resource Planning	\$621,301
Total Vote 2 — Resource Evaluation and Planning	\$7,054,374

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, before we start Vote 3, there are three areas I'd ask you to comment on to the Assembly. First of all, the success of the enhanced recovery schemes we've become involved in for a number of years, but certainly more recently. If I recall the figures last year, we're looking at in the vicinity of 35 to 37 per cent, on average, across the province. I recognize that varies a great deal from field to field, but what kind of progress are we making there? And, Mr. Minister, I'd be interested in knowing the value of royalties that were written off last year as an incentive for enhanced recovery work.

Secondly, Mr. Minister, what's the latest information available on the new oil discovery down in the southeast corner of the province? Now I'm not suggesting the minister should get into the position of making any new announcement like we had in the heritage fund a couple of years ago, but there have been a number of public comments from several people in the industry — for two days anyway — on discoveries in southeastern Alberta. Also, Mr. Minister, with regard to new gas discoveries in the province, if I'm not mistaken, primarily in the northwest.

The third area I'd appreciate some comments on, Mr. Minister, is an overview of the coal industry in the province. The member from the Crowsnest Pass indicated earlier during the course of the session that there are serious difficulties there; in fact — perhaps not overstating what he said — he said there is the possibility of the mine being closed down. One continues to hear questions about the longevity of the McIntyre mining situation, and then of course there's been the recent opening up of mines in the Eastern Slopes in the Edson-Hinton area. So if we could get some sort of overview of the mining situation, both open and underground, I'd appreciate it.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, dealing with the question of enhanced recovery, I'm not sure I concur with the percentages the hon. Leader of the Opposition used as to the recovery of oil from our conventional reserves. I'm not sure it is as high at the moment on average as the numbers used. I think it may be somewhat lower than that.

As to the success of new enhanced recovery techniques,

I think it is much too early for me to make any comment. We have enhanced recovery of one form or another in place throughout all the conventional reserves, but we're really talking about new enhanced recovery techniques. Actually they are in the research stage, although Imperial Oil in the Judy Creek field is contemplating going to a C0₂ enhanced recovery technique. But that hasn't gotten under way yet. It is a very important area. Members of the committee will recall that we expanded the mandate of the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority last fall to have them move into enhanced recovery projects in a way similar to which they've been operating in the oil sands. We have provided funds from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund capital projects division in that respect. But again, that is just getting under way, and it will be some little time before there are any results from the new thrusts in that area.

As to the amount of foregone royalty during the past fiscal period arising from implementation of that program, I can't give the committee that number at the moment. I will get it and perhaps pass it by memorandum to the hon. Leader of the Opposition at a later time.

With respect to new oil discoveries, Mr. Chairman, as members of the committee will be aware, we would not be making statements about new oil discoveries, except to comment on information already public. I wouldn't comment on statements made by the companies with respect to new discoveries, because I think that is a corporate matter. It would be inappropriate for me to make comments on that if those statements by the companies are based on information we're bound to hold confidential under our usual practice. So I'm not at all sure I can respond to that request, Mr. Chairman.

Finally, on the matter of an overview of coal, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is quite accurate. This matter has been raised by the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest who has a very direct interest in coal future because of the mining operations in his area. I think I can answer it very briefly, Mr. Chairman. I have no doubt that over the medium and longer term, the outlook for coal resources in Alberta is going to be very good. We are now and will continue to be in an energy-short world. Coal is of course a very abundant energy source. As we find shortages developing in the other hydrocarbon areas, particularly oil, coal is going to play a larger and larger role.

But for the short term, the outlook is not nearly as bright, particularly for metallurgical coals as opposed to thermal coals. I think there's a growing demand, and it's apt to grow very rapidly with respect to thermal coals for electrical generation. But I think there will be some short-term difficulties on the metallurgical coals. Part of it flows from the Japanese market, which a substantial portion of our exports from Alberta serve. The market there has been depressed largely because of a depressed steel market. There are other complicating factors, such as a change in their technology and in the mix of coals they use. So we are having some difficulty maintaining markets in that area, but it would be a little premature to forecast exactly what might happen in the coming year, particularly with the Grande Cache mine.

I simply want to add that that's a general overview. Any particular mine may have an entirely different marketing problem. Even if the demand for the particular kind of coal it's producing might be relatively high, because of its peculiar circumstances, production costs, transportation costs, and so on, it may have difficulty even in a relatively buoyant market.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, might I just follow up the minister's comments with two questions. Mr. Minister, if the 35 to 37 per cent figures I've used are high for an average for recovery programs across the province, what figures are we using now? I recall not long ago looking at some average figures in one of the ECRB's most recent annual reports, and I thought they were in that range. If they're not, I'd be pleased to be corrected.

I appreciate the offer to supply some information in a memo as far as foregone royalties. Mr. Minister, the other question is: would it also be possible to put some sort of value on the exploratory drilling incentive program? I don't expect the information today as to the value, but perhaps in the same memo.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the percentage recovery, I'm not sure I can give it from memory. I've looked at it on a number of occasions, but these numbers will vary a little depending on what is included. For example, I think if we include the Lloydminster heavy crudes, it would bring the average down somewhat because there, as members of the committee would be aware, the percentage recovery is very low, something in the 10 per cent range, even with the enhanced recovery programs they are currently using. I wouldn't quarrel extensively with the number used, except it sticks in my mind that it's a bit lower than what he referred to.

With respect to the geophysical incentive program, if the Leader of the Opposition would look under the summary by object of expenditure on the bottom half of this page, we had budgeted \$6.2 million in that area, which would correspond to a forecasted number of \$8.8 million. But again, Mr. Chairman, this number is difficult to forecast accurately. We put in what we think is a reasonable number, in the full expectation that we may have to adjust it by special warrant during the course of the year depending on the level of industry activity. While that is the number we have in the budget and we think it is a reasonable number, it may well have to be adjusted by a special warrant, depending on the extent of industry activity.

Agreed to:

3.1 — Mineral Dispositions	\$8,779,591
3.2 — Mineral Revenue	\$2,994,385
Total Vote 3 — Minerals Management	\$11,773,976

Vote 4 — Forest Resources Management:

4.1 — Program Support	\$18,450,188
4.2 — Forest Land Use	\$3,566,023

4.3 — Reforestation and Reclamation

MR. PAHL: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could comment on the success of the department in staying even with or — I guess you don't get ahead of reforestation. I notice a substantial increase in the budget, but looking at the summary by element, some of that can be accounted for by the Smoky Lake nursery. Could the minister comment on whether we're keeping up with the cut-over land and those lands that need to be reforested, because I understand that in some years past there was a considerable backlog. If we're keeping up year by year, is there an anticipation that we will eventually catch up?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, it's a very important question. I think I can answer it accurately by saying that we

are doing more than simply reforesting the annual harvest. Members will recall that, in addition to departmental expenditures in this area, we have a program under the capital projects division of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Under those two programs, we're actually doing more reforestation than the annual harvest. Some areas we are reforesting weren't reforested years ago when harvesting took place, and others were destroyed by fire. We are reforesting those and doing some work in areas that are not growing merchantable timber but may be able to. The short answer to the question, Mr. Chairman, is that we are more than replacing the annual harvest by seeding and planting.

MR. PAHL: The supplemental to that is that if we are doing more than seeding over the average annual cut, that means we are in fact catching up, which on a sustained basis would just match the average cut, plus losses to wildfire. Is there a projection, or a guess, by the department or the minister as to when we will be in a position simply to worry about the average annual cut?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, I couldn't give such a projection. I think it would depend to a significant extent on the level of fire activity over the years. We are, of course, limited in our capacity. I should have pointed out to the committee that a portion of reforestation is of course done by the operators in our forest management units, quota holders, and things of that nature.

But, no, I think the question of catch-up will be very significantly affected by the level of fire damage each year, and I am not at all sure I can give any useful projections in that area. I think the key point is that we grow more each year than we harvest. So we're increasing the stock in that sense, which I think is a very important policy objective for the province of Alberta.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask some questions of the minister after issuing some compliments. I must say how delighted I am at the increase in the amount spent on reforestation, in particular on forestry research. When all that oil and gas is gone, hopefully we'll still be growing trees in the province.

I have a couple of concerns I'd like to address to the minister. One is the amount being spent on quota reforestation, some \$2.4 million. Indications from the budget presented by the hon. Treasurer are that he's anticipating a total income of about \$8 million from timber rentals and fees which, I understand, is mostly quotas. Under 4.3.3 we are going to be spending some \$2 million on other reforestation. I understand a lot of that will be on areas previously cut over under quota cutting. So in actual fact we're going to be spending over half the income on quotas on reforestation alone. In view of the fact that one of the responsibilities of forest management agreement holders is the total reforestation program in their areas, I am wondering if the quota holders are really paying enough in dues on timber at the moment to adequately cover the costs of the direct services involved in reforestation and other programs required in the areas that they have cut. If not, would the department be reviewing the possibility of increasing those quota dues?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, I think I can only respond in a general way to both very important matters raised in the member's question. I recall doing a review some time ago of the revenue the government receives from the forestry industry and the government's expenditures with

respect to forestry. As I recall, the expenditures exceeded the revenue. But I do want to call to the hon. member's attention that when we're looking at this budget we're looking at the expenditures side, and the revenue side does not show up except in the Provincial Treasurer's revenue statement.

Mr. Chairman, we've had the question of the level of fees for the people who are harvesting our forests pretty well under a continuous review. No doubt a view is held by many that they are not as high as they ought to be. My suggestion to members of the committee would be that that be held in abeyance for a while at least and no immediate action be taken. I'm sure all members are aware that the timber industry is currently experiencing a down-turn in the very cyclical pricing that applies to that particular industry. So the short answer is that it is under review. I appreciate the feelings that it may have been lower than it ought to be. But it seems to me that any adjustments upward ought to be made when the industry is in a somewhat healthier state than it is at the present time.

DR. BUCK: Just a short question to the minister. In the areas where aspen is now being harvested, what are we replacing them with? Are we replacing them with trees similar to the native trees or with evergreens? Is the minister aware or can he indicate?

MR. LEITCH: I can't at the moment, but I may have that information shortly.

Agreed to:

4.3 — Reforestation and Reclamation	\$6,615,151
4.4 — Timber Management	\$3,809,061

4.5 — Forest Protection

MR. BORSTAD: In Vote 4.5, I see there's a considerable reduction, about 44 per cent, from what was allowed last year. Due to the weather conditions, the dry spring and the dry winter, are we going to have enough there to look after the potential forest fire hazard that could arrive this year?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, a good question. I'd simply call to the hon. member's attention that the estimate for '79-'80 is in fact somewhat lower than the estimate for '80-'81. The very high number he's looking at, over \$19 million, was the forecast or the anticipated expenditure during this year. That arises from the very serious fire situation we had in Alberta during the past year and was funded by special warrant. This is another area where we can never predict with any degree of accuracy what we are going to have to spend during the year for fire suppression. The number will go up and down rather dramatically from year to year, so we include in the budget what we think is a reasonable number. If it turns out that we had a year such as we had last year, we will provide by way of a special warrant the additional funding required. It would seem to me to be inappropriate to budget now on the assumption that we're going to have another year as serious as last year.

DR. BUCK: One very short point to the minister. In the battle against — what beetle is it? The pine bark beetle. What mechanisms are used to combat the infestation? Are they insecticides, or are they just removing the dis-

eased ones? What is the combination of the protective mechanisms?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, I'm glad the question was raised because there was one important point I haven't made during the series of questions asked on the pine bark beetle during the question period, and that is it's food source. It does not attack young trees; it attacks primarily the mature trees. The control methods we are using at the moment are primarily cutting, simply cutting the infected trees. One of the difficulties is to determine when the trees are infected. It's not readily apparent that they have become infected, and of course we can't make individual inspections of trees. But we do have a monitoring system that was in place last year and will be in place this year, which is called a false infra-red photography, which is an aerial photography survey. By that we hope to identify the infected areas and move in primarily with cutting of the mature trees. In some cases it may be appropriate to spray insecticides, but their use is very limited. We are not talking about an aerial spray; we're talking about a ground spray. The other measure we are trying to take is, of course, limiting the movement during mid-summer when they're flying.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this particular pest is susceptible to extremes in temperature. Normally a very severe winter, temperatures in the minus 35 degrees Celsius range for a little while, would tend to kill it. One of the problems we have is that in the past few years the winters have been mild in the area of infestation.

DR. BUCK: A short question to the minister. Can the minister indicate or find out if the spruce budworm is a potential factor in this province, as it has been down in the maritimes? I know a few of them are around. Is it becoming a concern in our forests?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, I reviewed that with personnel in the department a while ago, but I really wouldn't want to rely on my memory for the information, except to say that it's a concern but I don't feel it is an immediate concern at the moment. The expansion of that particular pest in Canada is a concern.

DR. BUCK: Could you get that information and make it available to us, please?

Agreed to:

4.5 — Forest Protection	\$10,854,393
-------------------------	--------------

4.6 — Forest Research

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, one short question to the minister again. Can the minister indicate what progress is being made in the breeding and selection of so-called super trees? Does the minister have any of that information available?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, I covered that to some extent during the review of the estimates last year. I'm not at all sure I can add any information this year. I've not had an up-to-date report on it, but at least nothing happens very quickly in this area anyway. It takes quite some time for results to be developed. But, as the members of the committee would know, we are carrying out research in this area at the Pine Ridge nursery, and experimenting not only with developing a better tree in

our native trees, such as the lodgepole pine, the white and black spruce, and so on.

One of the things we're doing there is collecting the cones from particularly good trees. One can spot that by an examination of the forest stands. You occasionally see a tree of the same age that is much larger than the trees surrounding it. We've been taking the cones from those outstanding trees and trying to ascertain whether it's a genetic factor that's led them to that extensive growth, or just an accident of soil or something of that nature. The belief is that they are in fact a superior tree. We're collecting the cones or seeds from those trees and will be planting them. But, again, it's going to be some time before there are any proven results from that program.

We're also experimenting with species that are not native to Alberta in the hope that we'll develop a tree that will produce more lumber than our existing native trees. But, again, that will be a slow process. It will be some years before we have any firm results.

DR. BUCK: In that same line, Mr. Chairman, is any work being done on co-ordinating the department and the private sector? I know some work is being done in the Whitecourt area. Is there any co-ordination of information there?

MR. LEITCH: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We endeavor to co-ordinate our research efforts with the private sector, with other provinces, with the federal government. Not only that, research is going on internationally. I don't want to leave the impression that I'm satisfied that all that can be done in that area of co-ordination is being done in Canada. It's one of the things we discussed with the federal minister of the former administration, and expressed the view that the federal government had a role to play in forestry, particularly in that, as well as other areas such as research on disease and so on.

Agreed to:

4.6 — Forest Research	\$745,516
Total Vote 4 — Forest Resources Management	\$44,040,332

Vote 5 — Public Lands Management:

5.1 — Program Support	\$3,139,596
5.2 — Land Disposition	\$1,547,962

53 — Land Management

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could indicate to me whether the Crown leases come in under this vote.

MR. MILLER: Yes, this is where we do the inspection of Crown land leases to make sure they're being operated in a good-husbandry manner, as well as co-ordinating the use with the wildlife activities and other uses being made of Crown land.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To the minister: I've always had some difficulty in understanding how the leases work. I wonder if the minister would take a minute, in responding to my questions along the line of ... A person makes application for lease land. In his application, I would assume he states the use for which he wants that land. I suppose we come around a bit to the definition of a farmer or whatever, because I understand

that at the moment that's not a criterion for acquiring lease land. In other words, the occupation of the person is not clearly a criterion. I'd like the minister to respond to that.

Then if leased land is, for example, for a 10, 15, or 20-year term, I understand that many people are selling their holdings and, along with it, are selling that lease. I've always had great difficulty understanding how the value of a lease can be greater than the actual value of land, when people don't own it. Yet I understand this is happening all the time. It just seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that if it's primarily agricultural land, young Alberta farmers who are sincere about farming the land as a way of life should somehow get priority. I understand that's not necessarily happening.

So, Mr. Chairman, if the minister wouldn't mind responding to those questions, to see if I'm on base or not.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. MILLER: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, there are two different things here. First of all, we have unoccupied Crown land which is put up and posted for disposition. This is land that isn't presently being leased. In these cases, when we post land and ask for applications, the applications are received by the department on specific parcels of land. The applicants are interviewed by members of the department, by field staff who determine who in their opinion should receive this disposition. In other words, they look at the land and at the people who made application. Generally speaking, the person who is most deserving is the one who is giving a temporary — and it's a temporary consideration in that piece of land. This is subject to an appeal before the agricultural development committee by the unsuccessful applicants. So then we have the position where an award has been made on a temporary basis to one individual. The other individuals have the right to go to the ADC committee and say, no, I have more use; I should be given consideration. The ADC committee reviews the ones who appeal, and the appeal is either upheld or is left with the person the department felt was most entitled to it.

On the other hand, we have lands which presently are being leased by an individual. As you say, when a person has his farm unit, part of which is deeded land and part is leased land, what happens is that he is entitled to sell his own private land, plus he can assign the leased land. The one requirement here is that the person he assigns it to has to be a Canadian citizen. You're right in some instances when you say that the consideration given for the leased land is quite a substantial amount of money on occasion. We do charge an assignment fee, which is based on the relative value of the selling price of the land in the area, plus the formula tied to the price of cattle. This fee is collected by the government but, as you mentioned, there are cases where the individual selling does obtain some benefits when he assigns his Crown lease.

I guess you could say this is something that has been under consideration for a number of years. Generally speaking, the idea behind the assignment aspect is that the lease has to be with the deeded land in order to make a viable economic unit. That is the argument put forward by those who suggest it be left as is.

MR. GOGO: One final question to the minister, Mr. Chairman, on these assignments. Must all assignments be signed by the minister before they're allowed to go through?

MR. MILLER: Yes, we have the final say as to the approval of the assignments. I might also mention that allowance is made for improvements, such as dugouts, fences, et cetera, that have been made on the leases.

MR. L. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the minister clarify that point. At one time in public lands and leased land, say in the Special Areas where you have a lease for a cattle ranch — if it was sold, I was of the opinion that the people in the area had the first chance to buy it before anybody else could come in. I'm wondering if that is still in effect or whether it goes to the highest bidder. In the Special Areas we've had many large tracts of land go to companies that are in reality development companies out of Calgary looking for a place to invest their money. I think they have a year to invest it in some other land. This has caused a great escalation in the price of that lease being sold out there. It has almost priced the ordinary rancher out of the market. I'm wondering if the government is looking at something in that area.

MR. MILLER: We have a land use caucus committee that has looked at and will be looking at the different aspects of Crown lands and the disposition thereof. We do have a limitation on the size of a lease. The maximum is 600 units. As far as who should be eligible to purchase it, the one requirement is that they be a Canadian citizen. We don't differentiate between the city dweller and the local rancher or farmer. It does tend to escalate the price on occasion. We monitor it, but we don't have any restrictions.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Chairman, under program support, I notice they have nuisance animal removal. We're running into considerable complaint from the sportsmen of Alberta who buy a licence each year and go out to try their luck in bagging a big game animal. Perhaps due to lack of snow and noise in the woods, wolves are being unfairly blamed. The wolf population has drastically increased in the province in about the last 15 years since they were controlled during a rabies outbreak. We now have wolves that have moved out of the northern area and have extended their habitat into southern Alberta, even as far south as Waterton Lake. In discussions with people of your department, they have never justified or explained to me whether a wolf is a vegetarian. I'm of the opinion they do considerable damage, especially to the young of moose and deer. I was wondering if the minister is prepared to implement some predator or wolf control. We've got the choice of having either the wolf or our hunters manage our game herds.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are you on Vote 5.3?

MR. STROMBERG: I didn't know which it came under. I thought it probably came under program support.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I believe he's on Vote 6.

Agreed to:

5.3 — Land Management	\$6,269,469
Total Vote 5 — Public Lands Management	\$10,957,027

Vote 6 — Fish and Wildlife Conservation:
6.1. — Program Support

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Go ahead and ask your question.

MR. STROMBERG: About the four-legged wolf, not the two-legged ... [laughter]

MR. MILLER: Would you repeat the question please?

MR. STROMBERG: To the minister, Mr. Chairman. Basically I suppose the decision should be made whether we allow the wolf population in Alberta to reach its maximum and then stabilize itself and let them control the game herds, or do we lower the wolf population and control the size of the game herds through hunters?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, this is a management responsibility. We look on harvesting game as one of the major ways of controlling the population. Generally speaking, the population of our wildlife throughout Alberta is at one of its maximum peaks right now. One of our major concerns is not so much the wolf or the hunting impact on the population of game but a severe winter. The weather factor seems to have the greatest impact on our wildlife population. To the best of my knowledge, at this point in time the wolf population is not increasing so dramatically as to cause that much concern regarding our game.

MR. STROMBERG: One other question, Mr. Chairman. I see that lure crops and bait stations fall under this vote. Since the Alberta crop and hail board, which you were a member of last year, Mr. Minister, has been asked to do the appraisal, has consideration been given by your department as to the damage done, by elk especially — not in haystacks, but where the majority of ranchers have now turned to large round bales, leaving them in the hayfields until the need arises to turn cattle in on them and let them feed directly from the round bales, if the elk haven't beaten them to it.

MR. MILLER: That's very true. We have certain areas of the province where elk are causing some damage, particularly in alfalfa fields and, as the Member for Camrose says, the large bales which are left out in the field. We do have a program at present where if the bales are moved into the feedlot and stacked up, we provide fencing material so they can be fenced to keep the elk out. We've had quite a bit of success in developing a type of fence for the stacks. Where the bales are left out, that's a problem, particularly if we have a lot of snow and the elk move down into the fields and into the rancher's haystacks. This is a particular problem in southern Alberta where we have large concentrations of elk coming down and grazing. Then if the snow gets too deep, they move further east into where the hay has been baled.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Chairman, still on the problem. That's all right where the bales are in a stack, but say a rancher has kept a section or quarter of land for two years to build up his winter grazing and hasn't hayed it, hasn't pastured it during the summer seasons, has left it for winter grazing, and 100 elk move in on him. There's no compensation for that. Has your department given consideration to what various states in the U.S. have done with the elk problem? They went ahead and fed the elk back in their native range before they moved into the high-density farming areas.

MR. MILLER: Yes, we are aware of programs that are being carried out in the States, where they do carry feed out and feed the elk where their native wintering grazing area is located. One thing we are attempting is to control the hunting of elk so that, by authorizations, we're able to go in and harvest a certain number of elk and drive them back to their natural range. We have a program where we're looking toward range improvement, where we'll be able to accommodate some of the concerns of the ranchers. We'll go in and attempt to upgrade the grazing and carrying capacity of a specific portion of land so it will be able to accommodate part of the elk feeding that is taking place and be able to maintain his present carrying capacity as far as his cattle are concerned.

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Chairman, some of the wildlife offices seem to be understaffed. I'm speaking particularly of the Grande Prairie office. With the amount of resource work going on in the area and the amount of inspections they have to carry out, I would strongly urge the minister to look at that section of his department, if he could, please.

MR. MILLER: If I might respond just briefly to that, Mr. Chairman. I think regionalization will help tremendously in this area. We are presently looking at putting in six regional directors which will be an addition to the staff. By having regional offices with a regional officer co-ordinating officers in the region, we think we'll have more effective control over the area than we had previously, and that we'll be able to do it on a localized basis rather than operating out of Edmonton.

MR. BORSTAD: A supplementary. Will those regional boundaries follow the regional transportation or . . . I think this is one thing we should look at seriously. We seem to have so many regional districts in the province, but they all overlap, and every department is different. Is your department going to look at regionalizing the same as Transportation, or some other department?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, we're attempting to co-ordinate with the land use forestry offices, because they work together. It'll be on that basis.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Chairman, another question to the minister. The federal government has indicated it's going to withdraw from its cost sharing of different programs in relation to wildlife damage, lure crops, and blackbird damage, a very serious problem developing in Alberta which the federal government shows no indication of helping. If the feds withdraw completely from that cost sharing, will your department be in a position to pick up the other 50 per cent?

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that we are presently looking at some way to negotiate both the lure crop and the Wildlife Damage Fund with the federal government. The last contract we had with the federal department ended on March 31 this year. There've been no developments to this point in time. We are attempting to work with the other western provinces in getting our programs co-ordinated so that we can approach the federal government and just see what its input is going to be in wildlife and wildlife damage.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, back to the subject the Member for Grande Prairie brought up. I share his

concerns in this area. To the minister: I feel we need to get more men out in the field. I don't know if this regional office concept — all that means is we're going to get more men in the office. We really need them out in the field instead of in the offices. I really have problems thinking that is going to solve the problem the Member for Grande Prairie alluded to.

MR. MILLER: Well, if I might respond briefly, that's not exactly the way we look on it. There is so much paperwork and other activities which have to be carried on, we would rather that be carried on out in the region where they're dealing with the people, rather than channelling everything to Edmonton. We do look at the aspect that the regional officer will be able to co-ordinate wildlife officers, biologists, and other people in the wildlife division, and better utilize the personnel to do a better job on a regional basis.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, speaking on the same issue, I notice that our director of enforcement went to Saskatchewan, I believe. I'd just like to indicate to the minister that I have the same concerns as the previous two speakers. I would like to know if the minister can indicate very briefly to us what the training program is for wildlife enforcement officers. Is it a fairly extensive program? Is it available here in Alberta?

Also, has the minister considered a quasi-apprentice type of program where in the fall, when we need assistant wardens, we'd look at using young people, maybe on a volunteer basis or paying just a small amount? If we make people more aware of the fact that, you know, we should conserve our habitat — not the law doing it, but we as individuals being more concerned. So I think the minister could look at some type of apprentice program such as that and get young people involved; plus, upgrade the salaries and the training.

MR. MILLER: Yes, I would like to point out to the hon. member that we have established a habitat branch within the department. With regard to regionalization, we feel the biologists will work closer with the enforcement and habitat people so there'll be co-ordination within the region, rather than three separate entities. It's our opinion that we'll be able to make better use of all the personnel in wildlife, rather than have specialists that are just looking at one aspect of it. We're quite hopeful that the overall benefit on a regional basis will be substantial.

DR. BUCK: Another short question to the minister. Can the minister indicate how the 4-H program worked out, where the 4-H children were given pheasant eggs, then reared the birds and turned them loose? Is that program continuing? Is it being expanded? How about just ordinary concerned farmers or acreage owners who want to raise pheasants and turn them loose? Is that program available to them?

MR. MILLER: This program is going to be expanded, as I mentioned in my opening remarks. This year we're hoping to be able to produce of 80,000 to 100,000 chicks at the Brooks hatchery and expand to 200,000 down the road.

I'm not sure on the egg aspect, Mr. Chairman. I do know we send the chicks out to 4-H clubs and to interested individuals to raise and release into the wild. It's part of a program that I'm extremely happy with, particu-

larly the 4-H aspect, where it's a learning experience as well as raising the birds.

Agreed to:

6.1 — Program Support

\$3,643,186

6.2 — Wildlife Services

MR. STROMBERG: Just to give the minister a brief background, in the Camrose constituency in the area of Miquelon Lake a moose population has built up that is, by aerial survey, estimated at between 35 and 40. The community is very proud that they have this moose population, but they're running into a problem. They try to protect these moose during the hunting season, by not trespassing and so forth, but under federal legislation, I suspect the native people of Alberta have the right to hunt year around. They're running into the problem where the native people are coming into the Miquelon Lake area during the winter and shooting these moose. Have we the authority within Alberta to control native hunting as to the seasons?

MR. MILLER: Under the treaties that were signed by the native peoples and the federal government, they are entitled to harvest game for food. Our legislation states that they can. We abide by the rule that they can hunt for food purposes. However we do feel that they should abide by the regulations as laid down by the Act. So they have to follow the law, as it were. But they are allowed to hunt for food.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Chairman, a supplementary to that question to the minister. You indicated that you felt they should abide by our regulations. Apparently they are not. Have there been discussions with your department and the Indian Association of Alberta? Have you had success with those discussions and are they starting to abide?

MR. MILLER: We had the occasion where some natives were apprehended for unlawful harvesting of game, and they were successfully prosecuted. We do attempt to see that they follow the laws laid down by our statutes. At times it's difficult actually to say whether they're harvesting for food or whether it's in excess of food. It's something that causes us concern, particularly when they overharvest in a specific area.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Chairman, the natives the minister referred to were prosecuted for shooting within Jasper park. Does Alberta have the right to bring in legislation limiting the hunting to our native people?

MR. MILLER: They have to abide by the laws laid down for the rest of the people of Alberta. But they are still allowed to hunt for food purposes.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I think the increased progeny of moose in the Miquelon Lake area is probably because that constituency was represented by a buck at one time. [laughter]

Agreed to:

6.2 — Wildlife Services

\$3,947,660

6.3 — Fisheries Services

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister might be able to give us an update on the Allison Creek brood stock station, exactly what's going to take place this year in terms of capacity, et cetera?

MR. MILLER: Over the years the availability of eggs for the Livingston hatchery in Calgary has been a concern. With the development of the Allison Creek brood stock station, we will have an assured supply of eggs for the hatchery in Calgary. This has been one of the shortfalls before: even though we had the hatchery, we didn't have the eggs to put in it. This, along with what we're getting out of the Caroline brood stock station, we feel will put us in a position where we can fully utilize the Livingston hatchery in Calgary. We are in a position where we hope to go to tender on the Allison Creek station in the near future. Certainly it's something I'm looking forward to as being very, very important, particularly for the sport fishing industry in Alberta.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I've appreciated very much the enthusiasm that you've displayed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would the member use the common parliamentary rules. We've had a number of members addressing the ministers directly. Would you please put it through the Chair.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the enthusiasm the minister has displayed since he assumed this portfolio. In the area of fisheries, I guess this is the one time when members representing urban constituencies wish to have a better relationship with their counterparts in the rural areas because, as most of us know, the fishing is not too good in the metropolitan areas. The concern I have is the line of co-operation between the minister responsible for fish and wildlife and the minister responsible for recreation and parks.

I've had a fair degree of mail from people, particularly senior citizens, who for many years have gone fishing to surrounding areas; for example, in the area of the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest and the Member for Taber-Warner. It's not that the fishing has really fallen off in terms of the catch; that's not what I'm getting at. It appears that recreation is taking a higher profile and the traditional fishing areas are rapidly developing into areas for water skiing and so on. That's fine, I'm not really quarrelling with that.

There are just two specific areas. One is in the Beauvais Lake area, where I see great plans are under way in the Pincher Creek-Crowsnest area to expand, eliminate cottages, and at the same time eliminate fishing grounds. Then the Chin Lake area east of Lethbridge, where for years many people have gone fishing. Now I understand there's a move afoot to eliminate that, to so-called modernize or clean up, with the net result that there's going to be lots of water skiing.

I guess, Mr. Chairman, the question I have for the minister and I'd like him to respond to is that we have the St. Mary Irrigation District with St. Mary Lake. I think a fish was caught there in 1912. Since then I don't think there's been one. To me that appears to be a logical area for expanding things like water skiing and water sports, and not sacrificing the traditional fishing areas in southern Alberta by so-called modernizing them, destroying

the wildlife, and making them into the so-called water sport areas.

So, Mr. Chairman, I'd like the minister to indicate, if he could, how closely he works with the ministry of Recreation and Parks, so there's not a conflict here, so that both these groups could be accommodated; that is, the fishermen — fisherpeople, or fisherpersons, if I don't want to contravene certain Acts around here — and the lovers of water sports.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Chairman, could the hon. Associate Minister for Public Lands and Wildlife tell the committee how much money was expended on the pilot project for land habitat protection in the county of Red Deer, and if additional funds will be allocated this year for that?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, may I advise the hon. Member for Lethbridge West that the fishery resource in Beauvais Lake Provincial Park is a very important resource and that no water skiing is allowed on that particular lake. There are plans to improve that fishery resource. There are no plans to decrease the enjoyment of the fishery experience by southern Alberta's fishermen.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Chairman, nothing is dearer to my heart than some good fishing, and I'm probably recognized as having the most success in fishing of any member of this caucus here. [interjections] That's no fish story. I can prove it; the proof is in my deep-freeze at home.

However, the minister's department has designated five lakes in Alberta as trophy lakes. Two of these trophy lakes are only reached by plane, and you buy a trophy licence to fish these lakes. One of the lakes I will be going to very shortly is Winefred. Here is a trophy lake: we rent an airplane at considerable expense, to go in by plane, not speaking of the equipment and refreshments, et cetera, we take in, and then find out that the lake has been commercially netted for the last three years. Now I understand ...

AN HON. MEMBER: Complain to the MLA.

MR. STROMBERG: I'll talk to him, too. I understand that they're commercial-netting whitefish, and when they've reached a limit of the pickerel and the pike, they'll stop the whitefish.

Mr. Chairman, when I go up there and find out it has been commercially fished, and I come home with one pickerel and get all kinds of static from my wife — you spent all that money to get one fish. My question to the minister is: will you either refund my \$5 or, if you're going to commercial fish these trophy lakes, remove the designation of trophy lake that's on them now?

MR. MILLER: Responding to the question by the hon. Member for Camrose first, I think you would have to look at our lakes and the fish in them as a resource that has to be harvested. It is right that we are going to net Winefred Lake. However, we don't net it completely. There are specific areas where we allow the nets to be set and endeavor to harvest the whitefish without harvesting the pickerel. This is open to a degree of error in that we're never just sure at what level the nets should be set, where they should be set, and at what time of the year they should be set. I understand the different species of fish are in different areas of the lake and are at different

depths of the lake. It's more less trying to do it by trial and error. We are getting a little more expertise than we used to have, whereby we can now go into a specific lake and harvest the whitefish by netting, yet not have too big an impact on the pickerel fishing for the sportsman.

I hope the hon. Member for Camrose has good luck on his fishing trip. I'd be interested to know the cost per pound of the fish he brings out. I would also like to know his wife's reaction.

MR. STROMBERG: The minister didn't reply to my question. If commercial netting is going to be allowed on trophy lakes, will he remove that trophy lake designation? I think it has fooled a considerable number of people. Now I do know, Mr. Chairman, that thousands of pounds of pickerel have been caught with the whitefish, to the extent that the quota has been dropped from 10 pickerel last year to five this year.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I would hope the hon. member wouldn't think that netting was the reason the quota was dropped. That is not the case. I think one aspect that is overlooked is the fact that we have to harvest the fish; otherwise they deteriorate in quality. In some of these lakes where we have a very viable whitefish population, it's imperative that they be harvested, not only to provide income for some of the people who live in that area and make their living from commercial fishing, but also because it's a resource that would deteriorate if not harvested in its prime.

MR. WEISS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would like to challenge the prowess of the hon. Member for Camrose in his fishing ability. I would like him to meet and match a 17 pound northern pike, which I have in my deep-freeze.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think if the hon. members are going to carry on with this dialogue, they should do it privately, not in the Committee of Supply.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I didn't respond to the question by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West. Perhaps he was happy with the answer he received from the minister from Crowsnest. If he is, fine; if not, I will elaborate on it a bit.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I'd like the minister to respond, if he wouldn't mind, about the degree of co-operation between his department and the Department of Recreation and Parks, when it comes to the matter of determining, in these recreational and fishing areas, that indeed representation from both sides is considered before there's a change of use in these water areas.

MR. MILLER: Yes, this is carried out to a limited degree. I think it has to be carried out even further. We're in a process right now of looking at stocking various lakes for sports fishing throughout all Alberta. It certainly has to be co-ordinated with other recreational uses on our lakes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Innisfail also had a question, Mr. Minister.

MR. MILLER: His question was with regard to the amount of money that was spent in Red Deer for, I believe, habitat projects. This is a program where the

provincial government, through the Bucks for Wildlife program, has worked with the individual ratepayers in the county of Red Deer to maintain habitat. In other words, an agreement has been reached with the individual landowners, where land would be left in its natural condition for wildlife benefits, such as low-lying areas for migratory birds, and corners of fields left uncultivated so there would be escape routes for the deer as well as pheasant habitat. I'm sorry I haven't got the exact figure. I will get that figure and present it to the member.

Agreed to:

6.3 — Fisheries Services	\$2,815,606
6.4 — Public Services and Enforcement of Resource Regulations	\$4,420,862
6.5 — Conservation Education	\$637,117
Total Vote 6 — Fish and Wildlife Conservation	\$15,464,431

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, perhaps after all this discussion about fishing, it would be appropriate for me to return to the subject of worms. I have now had the opportunity to refresh my memory with respect to the question the Member for Clover Bar asked regarding the spruce budworm. It is present in Alberta. We do not regard it as a serious pest threat for a number of reasons, primarily because the climate and ecology of the province's forests do not lend themselves to an extensive growth of that pest. In addition, it predominantly attacks the balsam fir, as opposed to the lodgepole pine and white and black spruce which form the larger portion of our forests. We have a relatively small percentage of our forest that is balsam fir. In addition, when that is harvested we tend to regenerate with species other than the balsam fir.

The second question I left unanswered, also from the Member for Clover Bar, dealt with reforestation with respect to aspen. Actually, Mr. Chairman, there's very little commercial cutting of aspen in the province at the moment, so there's not a large regeneration program. Essentially, it's being done by natural regeneration — sprouting. If we get into substantial harvesting of aspen, I think there are other programs we may adopt, such as regenerating with a superior aspen tree or, alternatively, with other species.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 7 — Oil Sands Equity Management	\$447,757
Total Vote 8 — Foreign Ownership of Land Administration	\$220,324
Total Vote 9 — Oil Sands Research Fund Management	\$1,814,140
Total Vote 10 — Petroleum Marketing and Market Research	\$2,556,552

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, one or two points to the minister before we get the total. Can the minister indicate to the committee the state of the prebuild pipeline, the so-called pipeline we think will go someday. At the same time, can the minister indicate what the department is looking as alternative forms of energy that we can use in the province, and the conservation of energy as we as consumers look at it? I would appreciate it if the minister

could give us a little outline on that before we can get the final vote.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, with respect to prebuild, members of the committee would appreciate that the government of Alberta is not directly involved in that. There was a hearing before the National Energy Board some time ago. An authorization was issued for the export of additional volumes of natural gas to the United States. It contained certain conditions with respect to prebuild. The sponsors of the prebuild felt there had to be some change in the conditions, as well as additional volumes, in order to meet the time lines set out in the order of the National Energy Board, which were that the western leg of the prebuild be available for shipment of natural gas by November 1 this year and the eastern leg by November 1 next year.

Further applications were made to the National Energy Board, and some additional applications will be made with respect to financing. An important decision has come out recently, altering the conditions of the original provisions with respect to financing. I'm sure that alteration will make it much easier to meet the financing conditions which were a requirement before prebuild will proceed.

In a sentence, Mr. Chairman, a number of things need to occur in Canada before it would proceed. One will be a favorable decision on the upcoming hearing with respect to financing. In addition, things will need to be done on the United States side with respect to various regulatory approvals. So I don't know that I can give a more detailed report than to say that to my knowledge everyone, particularly those involved in Alberta, is working very vigorously towards having gas flowing through prebuild by this fall. But certainly much has to be done and a number of decisions have to be made in both Canada and the United States by midsummer in order for the line to be constructed during a critical construction time window that's available.

With respect to alternative forms of energy, some research is being done that I referred to on one of the earlier votes, such as solar, wind, and items of that nature, uses of waste wood, solar demonstration houses, low-cost solar collectors, and research of that nature. We're not into the fusion area or some of the ...

DR. BUCK: Coal gasification?

MR. LEITCH: A good deal of work on coal gasification and coal liquefaction is in progress through the auspices of the Research Council. I didn't regard that as an alternative energy source, Mr. Chairman, but certainly it is in that coal liquefaction would be an alternate to oil, and Canada's energy problem is essentially one of being vulnerable to interruption of world oil supplies. A good deal of work is going on in that area, and I anticipate more from both a government point of view and from private-sector involvement.

Finally, on the matter of conservation, I think an item often overlooked is conservation in the sense of avoiding waste in the field. Clearly, Alberta was a leader in that respect. The former administration, through the Energy Resources Conservation Board, implemented conservation practices in the field. I think Alberta certainly has a superb record in that respect.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, in the department we have — and we've already passed the vote — a section which concentrates on the matter of energy conservation. Essen-

tially the role within the department has been one of disseminating information. We've done that through booths at things like the Calgary Exhibition & Stampede and the Edmonton Exhibition. There are a number of other programs in various departments. For example, in the Department of Education, as I recall, we have a program whereby schools are encouraged to remodel, if you like, or insulate: things of that nature to use less energy. Certainly we have a major program through the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower where the same thing is happening in the universities and colleges. In Government Services, of course, we are expending significant sums in order to use less energy in government buildings. Also, in the Department of Economic Development, I believe, there is an energy bus, a joint program between the federal government and the provincial government. It's objective is to provide information, particularly to smaller commercial and industrial users who do not have within their organizations the expertise to direct their minds to the question of using less energy.

So there are a number of areas in which we as a province are working to inform people as to how they can use less energy.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. This relates in a way to my question on aspen trees in the province. Has any research been done on using some of these forests for the production of methanol and using that in combination with gasoline in so-called gasohol?

MR. LEITCH: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I referred a moment ago to a research project with respect to uses of waste wood. Certainly a number of things are happening in the nation with respect to using our forest resources in a number of ways to provide energy output. The methanol option which the member refers to is one. I'm not aware of any projects in that area that we are working on at the moment, although I want to qualify that answer by saying I wouldn't be confident I had called to mind all the areas in which, say, the Research Council or other bodies might be working.

DR. CARTER: One brief question about that pipeline issue. Through you, Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I gather from press reports in the last week that Mr. Lalonde has made comments about gas supply and keeping most of the gas, if not all of it, within Canada. I take it from the remarks earlier today by the minister that the Alberta government will certainly give its support to the matter of the prebuild of the Alaska Highway gas pipeline and give it very strong support with regard to negotiations with the federal government.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, in our discussions with the federal government, we've concentrated primarily on the question of exporting additional volumes of natural gas. When I say additional volumes, I'm referring to those volumes of natural gas over and above the volumes required to assure Canadian supply. Our discussions have concentrated more on the concept of export of those

additional volumes as opposed to the particular way in which they are exported, because to a major extent that has been dealt with as a result of the agreement signed between the federal government and the United States government.

Agreed to:

Department Total \$105,189,016

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, I move that the vote be reported.

[Motion carried]

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions, reports as follows, and requests leave to sit again:

Department of Energy and Natural Resources: \$10,860,103 for departmental support services; \$7,054,374 for resource evaluation and planning; \$11,773,976 for minerals management; \$44,040,332 for forest resources management; \$10,957,027 for public lands management; \$15,464,431 for fish and wildlife conservation; \$447,757 for oil sands equity management; \$220,324 for foreign ownership of land administration; \$1,814,140 for oil sands research fund management; \$2,556,552 for petroleum marketing and market research.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Having heard the report by the Deputy Chairman of Committees, are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to hon. members that in the business next Monday some small change in the order of departments previously indicated will be made for the consideration of estimates in Committee of Supply. However, I'll note that on Monday afternoon it's proposed to deal with second reading of Bills 13, 9, and 37, if there's time for all three. If there's additional time, we would do committee study of Bills on the Order Paper to round out the afternoon.

In any event, the House is to sit on Monday evening. At that time we should start with the estimates of the Department of the Attorney General; after that, Advanced Education and Manpower, Utilities and Telephones, Culture, and Consumer and Corporate Affairs, in that order.

Mr. Speaker, I move we call it 1 o'clock.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 12:53 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Monday at 2:30 p.m.]