

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTATitle: **Monday, April 28, 1980 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 44****The Department of Municipal Affairs
Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 44, The Department of Municipal Affairs Amendment Act, 1980. The purpose of this Bill is to facilitate the ability of the Provincial Treasury to guarantee loans to certain organizations, namely the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association.

[Leave granted; Bill 44 read a first time]

Bill 45**The School Election
Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 45, The School Election Amendment Act, 1980.

The contents of this Bill are entirely in consequence of amendments to The Municipal Government Act. The intention, therefore, is to ensure that school elections are controlled in a manner consistent with school elections, for the greater certainty of the electorate.*

[Leave granted; Bill 45 read a first time]

Bill 43**The Universities Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 43, The Universities Amendment Act, 1980.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill will implement the policy announced last fall whereby private colleges in Alberta will have the opportunity of affiliating with universities in the province in order to permit the granting of degrees pursuant to the legislation in conjunction with the affiliated university. It will also permit a non-voting membership of such private colleges on the Universities Coordinating Council.

[Leave granted; Bill 43 read a first time]

Bill 214**An Act to Amend
The Alberta Energy Company Act**

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 214, An Act to Amend The Alberta Energy Company Act. The Bill makes the government accountable to the Legislature for the handling of the shares in the Alberta Energy Company by setting out that either the government must

bring to the Assembly a resolution giving direction to the people who will vote the government proxy, or in fact the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources will attend.

[Leave granted; Bill 214 read a first time]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. WEISS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 50 grade 10 students from J. A. Williams school in my constituency of Lac La Biche. They are accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Beniuk, and are seated in the members gallery. I would ask them to rise and receive the cordial welcome of this Assembly.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce to you, and to members of the Assembly, some 26 students from St. Gerard school in my constituency of Edmonton Norwood. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Henault. They are in the public gallery. I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to members of this Assembly, 40 grade 9 students from Donnan. When they rise to receive the welcome of the Assembly, I would like you to notice the great number of obvious basketball players who are in their class. They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Korchinsky, Mr. Bubenko, and Mrs. Bianchini. I would ask them to rise now and be recognized by the Assembly, please.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****RCMP Activities — McDonald Commission**

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Attorney General. It flows from the McDonald commission hearings in Ottawa. My question refers especially to what's referred to as Operation Checkmate. Has the Attorney General received an unedited transcript of testimony given before the McDonald commission? I'm referring to the portion that dealt with events that took place in the province of Alberta.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. leader meant to say: have I received an edited version rather than an unedited version?

MR. R. CLARK: Yes, I did.

MR. CRAWFORD: It was indeed an edited version received a number of days ago. It was reviewed by officials in the department and by me, Mr. Speaker. Enough items have been deleted so that no specific charges can be identified as a result of what appears in the transcript. I might add that I think there was considerable discussion over a very long time indeed; the McDonald commission has been sitting on and off for a period of years. The question of what would be done with respect to certain proceedings that were held in camera was frequently an issue there.

I have no comment on what I think is the proper course for a federal commission to follow in such circum-

*See page 639, right column, paragraph 1

stances. What the result of the disclosures — perhaps limited disclosures — will be is something we have yet to determine. But it's against a background that involves the voluntary providing of certain information by the federal Solicitor General's Department. That is how it was done. Again, I make no comment on how other governments should handle such things. That is what was done.

I might conclude that, Mr. Speaker, simply by saying that we presently have under consideration the question of whether or not some of the information which is not available should be sought in some way.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Attorney General. If I said "unedited", it was my intention that the Alberta government should be able to acquire from the federal Solicitor General, Mr. Kaplan, the total transcript that dealt with events which took place in the province of Alberta.

A supplementary question to the Attorney General. Is it then the position of the government of Alberta that a request will in tact go to Ottawa to ask for the transcript in its entirety?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the reference to "transcript" is still fair or accurate, and it's important to make that distinction. I would answer the most specific part of the hon. leader's supplementary question by saying that the actual transcript, as I understand it, was of proceedings taken in camera before the McDonald commission. The McDonald commission did not, as far as I know, make any particular deliberation on what should be provided to provincial attorneys general in that respect. I say again that that sort of decision is clearly within the purview of the commissioner.

The important part, and I think the part that recent reports with respect to the matter all relate to, is the fact that we've received certain information from the Solicitor General's Department in Ottawa which is not complete. The hon. leader's question is whether or not we would ask for a full and unedited transcript. The answer is: not necessarily, but we may well seek the missing information in some way. That is what is under consideration.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney General. Has the government of Alberta been assured by the federal Solicitor General that unedited portions of the transcript which deal with events here in Alberta — and I relate specifically to those portions that fit into the broad, general category of Operation Checkmate — are available if Alberta requests them?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, that particular discussion has not yet taken place; it may well take place. I should say that I received what I believe other attorneys general in Canada received; that is, a short letter of some two paragraphs from Mr. Kaplan or his office indicating that they were providing to us the information I've described. This has not led to any request that some commitment be made to provide further information, although I fully understand the potential importance of doing so.

I suggest that what has to be done is that — the overall issue is the one under review, rather than the specifics of whether it's available in a particular way; that is, by way of a transcript. I think the publication of the transcript by the federal Department of the Solicitor General is still a matter of some importance as between that office and the McDonald commission.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, either to the Attorney General or to the Solicitor General. What representation has Alberta made to the federal government with regard to the possibility of these kinds of events — and I refer again to Operation Checkmate — taking place in Alberta without the senior law officer of the province, namely the Attorney General, being informed before? What assurance does Alberta have from Ottawa that that will not take place again?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, once again I think the timing of the hon. leader's question makes it difficult, in that he is asking about what assurance may have followed events which are really quite recent in the sense of the edited transcripts being made available. The answer is that I've had no discussion with the Solicitor General of Canada since they were received. Given the normal course of events, I don't think it's surprising that that has not yet taken place.

What has taken place over the period when I've had the responsibility, on behalf of the people of Alberta, for law enforcement in this province is that we have worked consistently with the federal office of the Solicitor General and with the principal officers of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to be sure that the working relationship is the way it should be: a very, very co-operative attitude on both sides with regard to their duties and ours, and that is the situation. We're always looking for ways in which, if there seem to be any shortcomings in that relationship, we can work them through and arrive at mutually satisfactory results.

But to suggest that in recent days a particular assurance has been sought — that hasn't been done. I don't mind adding that it's certainly our intention that operations of any members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police who are under contract to the province — which would be the vast majority of RCMP in the province — are indeed fully known to us at all times. I think that is the present situation. We are speaking of incidents that occurred some years ago.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, one further supplementary question to the Attorney General. Having regard for the last comment the Attorney General made that these incidents took place some years ago, and having regard for the fact that the McDonald inquiry has been going on now for close to two years, what representation has the Alberta government made to either the federal Solicitor General or the federal Attorney General with regard to prior consultation between the federal law enforcement officials — namely the Solicitor General — and the Attorney General's Department so that in a province like Alberta, the Attorney General is aware of this kind of activity?

MR. CRAWFORD: That is still a matter of discussion between governments, Mr. Speaker, and I think it will continue that way. Maybe I can simply outline the situation like this: for most purposes the RCMP constitutes a provincial police force for the province of Alberta. But as is well known, in other capacities the RCMP carries on other responsibilities for which it reports to federal authorities. The question is whether any of the activities carried on in that second capacity may be carried on in circumstances which could constitute a crime in the province of Alberta. If so, it's the responsibility of provincial law enforcement agencies to take prosecution in those cases, if they're justified. I think that is the situation; I've

described it the way it is. We're very pleased with the present level of co-operation we have with the federal police force, whether in its capacity as a provincial or as a federal force.

As to the sort of question the hon. leader is asking, the amount of information that's available, to and from, with respect to such activities: it's quite satisfactory on the whole.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney General. The Attorney General indicated the government is quite satisfied with the level of communication at this time. Then can I pose this question: given the present level of communications, if the events as outlined in Operation Checkmate were to take place in Alberta today, would the Attorney General of Alberta be advised ahead of time?

MR. SPEAKER: The question is certainly hypothetical in form, but it relates to a present understanding of an existing fact, in other words, in relation to a certain type of event which I understand is just given by way of example.

MR. CRAWFORD: Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose it's possible to conceive of a type of activity in the interests of the security of the nation, or whatever matters relate to that, that might not come at once to the attention of a provincial authority if the federal authorities were carrying on those particular activities. So I think I would have to indicate to the hon. leader that I don't know what the answer to his question is.

We are pleased with the level of co-operation that exists at the present time and with the flow of information, which is very, very good. I just say again that the fact that there was a previous occasion upon which that didn't happen is not harming the relationship at the present time, because we've had these sorts of discussions and negotiations over the last year or so, and I know my predecessor had similar ones that resulted in what is probably a more satisfactory understanding than might have existed when these other incidents did take place.

As well, I'd point out to the hon. leader that I think there have been a number of instances across the country where this type of complaint has arisen, where it has been suggested that information that should have been in the hands of the provincial law enforcement authorities was in fact not. I can't speculate on whether that could ever happen again.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question, if I may, to the hon. Attorney General. Is the Attorney General in a position to advise the Assembly whether the information released to Alberta and other provinces by the federal Solicitor General was a result of consultation between the McDonald commission and the federal Department of the Solicitor General? I assume the McDonald commission will in fact be assessing the specific information contained.

MR. CRAWFORD: Without specifically asking the question of anyone in connection with the McDonald commission, I've made the same assumption the hon. member has: that the discussions between the federal Department of the Solicitor General and the McDonald commission resulted in this information coming forward. Since the information was given in camera, the McDonald commission would examine it and no doubt

make certain observations in its final report. The question of whether any information which was given in camera would be provided verbatim within the foreseeable future is another matter.

I think the information that has come recently was made available as a direct result of the discussions between the predecessor of the present Solicitor General — who I think took the initiative in the matter — and the McDonald commission. But I don't know who may have recommended the particular course that was followed as a result of those discussions.

Hog Marketing

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my second question to the Minister of Agriculture. Perhaps I might preface my question by saying to the minister that we welcomed very much the minister's announcement Friday, where Regulation 99/80 was removed as an encumbrance on the hog marketing board. My question to the minister is this: at what stage is the government's consideration with regard to a stop-loss or stabilization plan as far as hog producers in the province are concerned?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member recognizes, we had the opportunity to discuss the industry in total and to discuss both the long term and the short term with the hon. minister who represents Agriculture Canada, and an indication from them that they would be interested in a long-term program. Of course, there were no indications of any short-term activity on behalf of the federal people. On behalf of the industry, and indeed the province, we have stated that we would certainly look at the short-term problem that exists in the industry. Mr. Speaker, that is ongoing at the present time.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Mr. Minister, when might we expect some announcement from the government with regard to the short term, because the short term is becoming very long for those people who feel they're losing something like \$20 to \$30 on each hog they market.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, it would be very, very difficult to establish a day and a time. Recognition of the problem that exists within the industry and the promise to the industry itself to continue to review the short term still stand, but to give an exact timing of any activity or movement would be difficult.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Did the decision to remove Regulation 99/80 — did a recommendation to rescind that regulation come from the Foster hog committee?

MR. SCHMIDT: No, Mr. Speaker. We've had the opportunity to discuss with many producers throughout the province and indeed with the marketing board itself — indicating that they felt Alberta Regulation 99/80 in its present form was still a threat to their system of marketing. I had the opportunity to discuss with the marketing council and agreed that at this time, with the price of hogs as it is, any threat — whether it be imaginary or real — should be lifted to take away any element of doubt of getting the best basic price for the producer through marketing.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Mr. Minister, it's been drawn to my attention by a number of producers that the chairman of the committee is really bringing home the bacon, if I might put it that way, being remunerated at something like \$125 an hour, which for eight hours a day would be equivalent to getting about twelve and a half hogs per day. Is that accurate? Is Mr. Foster receiving remuneration at \$125 an hour plus expenses?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the independent review committee, by number and by name and indeed the remuneration that was to be received by each were done by ministerial order. It's a public document. I'm sure the hon. member is aware of the facts he mentions.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Mr. Minister, I can appreciate why the minister wouldn't want to concede that that's the case. But from officials of the minister's own department, it's been made known to a number of people in the agricultural community that in fact the former Attorney General of the province is, if I might use the term, really lining his silk purse from a sow's ear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. R. CLARK: Is he really getting \$1,000 a day for chairing that committee?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, as I stated, the remuneration is there. It's a public document. The remuneration to the members of the committee, including the chairman, is commensurate with the job and the professions to which they belong.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to outline to the Assembly why the government, or the minister in particular in signing the ministerial order, did not follow the general order in council on the committee remuneration orders and the remuneration contained therein, which is somewhat less than up to \$1,000 a day?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the signed order follows the usual remuneration. There are levels of remuneration available. The remuneration followed for the chairman in the ministerial order falls within the range for the legal profession that works for the province. Indeed, it's my understanding that the range is somewhere between \$90 and \$150.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In discussing this matter with Mr. Foster, was the minister in a position first of all to recommend that the remuneration be on the basis of the committee remuneration order? Or at the outset of negotiations with Mr. Foster, did the minister take the position that it would be necessary to pay that particular gentlemen \$125 an hour to study hogs in Alberta?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the remuneration established under the ministerial order is the responsibility and indeed is set by me in the establishment of the department. With regard to the remuneration that would be available to a professional person, the remuneration that was available to the chairman of the board: not being a professional person or knowing the range, we contacted

the Department of the Attorney General for the average negotiated rate which is standard throughout the department.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. What consideration did the minister give in selecting a chairman for this review, bearing in mind the \$90 to \$150 an hour range the minister talked about, and working it out at \$125 an hour in Mr. Foster's case? What consideration did the government give to selecting a chairman of the review committee who perhaps had a little less legal/professional experience but a little more knowledge of the hog industry, and who wouldn't cost us \$125 an hour?

DR. BUCK: Let's see: there's a PC, and a PC, and a PC.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, in setting the members for the independent review committee — and I think it has been stated in this House before — because it is an independent review, the chairman was chosen first of all to cover and be able to comment on those aspects that governed the legal aspect of both the submissions and the producer/packer operation; a person who would be independent; the opportunity to work with, in this case, two knowledgeable members representing the industry as producers, and indeed one representing the packers. So the chairman was chosen as an independent who would give the committee a balance between producer and packer, and the opportunity to separate, recognize, and put into plain words for the operation of the committee any legal aspects presented during the hearings.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In view of the remuneration, has the minister been given the assurance that the committee will in fact meet its deadline, or is it possible that the study may take longer than originally anticipated?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I have no indications that the committee will overextend, because we had placed no time limit on the reports and recommendations they would bring back to us. I would say to you, though, that the hearings that are being held throughout the province are proceeding on a day-to-day basis and, I believe, hopefully by mid-week we will have completed all the open sessions that are held throughout the province.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the government's position now that there's no deadline as far as that committee's concerned? If my recollection is accurate, and I'll check *Hansard*, earlier during this session there was a deadline: either late May or the middle of June. Has this deadline now been withdrawn?

MR. SCHMIDT: No, Mr. Speaker. But if one would look back and check *Hansard*, there was no exact deadline for when the report should be made. But we anticipate that the hearings will be complete and the recommendations in the hands of the Department of Agriculture by that time.

DR. BUCK: Just goes to show that you don't need an incentive in this province.

Road Bans

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Transportation. Has it been brought to the minister's attention that the road bans in effect now on most of the county roads are affecting the movement of seed grains and anhydrous ammonia? Can the minister indicate if the problem has been brought to his attention, either by the agricultural sector or by the counties themselves?

MR. KROEGER: No, Mr. Speaker. I've had no comment.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Can the minister indicate if the system of allowing permits in the springtime, when the bans are on, has been removed, or is it still in place?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in the first answer, I haven't been approached. Consequently, I haven't gone directly into the system. What I do know is that whereas we normally have a 75 per cent ban, we've been working mostly on a 90 per cent ban this spring.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. Can the minister indicate if his department has any information as to the effect on the agricultural community of the road bans' not allowing farmers to move heavy anhydrous equipment and seed grains on county roads?

MR. SCHMIDT: No, Mr. Speaker. The indications we have are that most of the seed was already moved throughout various counties and municipalities earlier in the spring season. I've had no reports as yet of problems that exist in the movement of anhydrous ammonia.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Transportation. Under extraordinary situations where heavy traffic must use the roads during ban times, does the Department of Transportation have a funding program, a cost-sharing program with the municipalities to repair those roads or to assist the local municipalities?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, certainly we do take extreme conditions into consideration, and we do help with this. I wouldn't be able to spell out the specifics of it, but I'll get that information for the member.

MR. L. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Could the minister tell us whether bans on county roads are the responsibility of the rural municipalities or of the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking for enlightenment on a point of law. I'm not sure to what extent it also may be a question of policy; perhaps to that extent the minister might wish to answer.

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, normally the counties and municipalities would set their own road bans, except on secondaries and primaries.

Nurses' Strike Settlement

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and

Medical Care. I'm sure all members are pleased today at the settlement of the nurses' dispute. Now that the nurses' dispute has been settled, is the government of Alberta, through the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care, prepared to fund that settlement in its entirety, and not force hospitals to take any part of that settlement out of other elements of hospital budgets?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, Mr. Speaker. That's been the traditional practice.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either the hon. Minister of Labour or the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Is either hon. gentleman in a position to advise the Assembly what factors forced the government to conclude that a settlement somewhat above the 7.5 to 9 per cent guidelines was required in this instance?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be an error of assumption on the part of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. The collective agreement was arrived at between the parties to the dispute: the Alberta Hospital Association, to which the responsibility for collective bargaining had been delegated by some 82 hospital boards, and the United Nurses of Alberta. So it was their decision.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. As a consequence of the minister's comment today — and correctly so — that last-dollar funding will be made available to the hospitals to finance a settlement which had to be substantially beyond the guidelines, has the government had an opportunity to review those reasons that determined a settlement beyond the guidelines? And is the government in a position to advise the Assembly, through the Minister of Labour, what those reasons were?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I would have to say that I have certainly been privy to some of the reasons; I don't know that I've been aware of all the reasons that each of the disputing parties advanced for their respective positions. I would suggest that the foremost objective was the notion that there should be comparability between the salaries of nurses in Alberta and those in other provinces, and that that comparability had to reflect not just a straight comparability as between provinces — that would be impossible to do, because there is quite a range, in fact. But there have been some historical relationships in terms of the economies of the provinces which are reflected in terms of salaries for different occupational groups in provinces. So it did reflect, I think, that degree of comparability.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to supplement that answer, because I think the hon. member has touched upon an important point. This was laid out rather well in the majority report of the conciliation board. I refer the hon. member to page 18, where the board dealt at some length with the status of the profession, the availability of trained personnel on the market, the competition for them, and what was happening in the education field. I won't read the whole report, but I'd like to read the summary sentence in that section, which says: "The conditions which affect them" — that is, the nurses — "do not appear to be prevalent in the public sector generally nor in the other areas of the hospital industry."

Then the majority report goes on to recommend why they believe the guidelines ought to be exceeded in this particular instance.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either hon. gentleman. Beyond the majority report that the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care alluded to, has there been any move by the government of Alberta to identify other possible special cases where comparability would in fact be a major question, so that after settling the nurses' strike we don't face other strikes in our health system a few months down the road?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, again I would remind the hon. member that collective bargaining in most hospital situations in Alberta is primarily between the Alberta Hospital Association and a range of unions. To that degree, it is not the primary responsibility of government. Now, certainly my department has a research component which does try to examine some of the developments occurring in all areas of the economy from time to time, and to observe the stresses and strains and adjustments which do take place. But again, we do that only in order that our mediating staff and conciliation staff can be well apprized of what's happening.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister, so that we don't have to cross the bridge we've all had to cross over the last 10 days. Is there any specific mechanism now in place, in either the Department of Labour or the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care, in fact to assess and identify other areas where comparability may be a relevant factor, so that we can hopefully avoid other strikes down the road? We know that the decision has to be made between the Alberta Hospital Association and whatever the group may be. But my question is whether this department or this government is acquiring that information and making it available to the Alberta Hospital Association.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, it's a policy of this government that decision-making be decentralized to the parties responsible for it. We are not on the centralist plank of the hon. member opposite, and never have been. Therefore we do our utmost to try to make sure that we have information which, as I've indicated, is available to our staff to show areas where there could be difficulties.

Generally speaking, however, the parties do their own responsible work in terms of informing themselves as to what the situation is when they go into bargaining. There are two parties there, each with its own specific interests, and surely it is primarily their responsibility to know what particular, relevant reference points should be affecting their dispute. It's only as a secondary back-up resource that our mediators and conciliators are assisted by the research department. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the hon. member's question takes us toward government's centralizing all decisions within itself.

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

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of that encouraging response from the minister, is the government now advising the Alberta Hospital Association that free collective bargaining should continue unhindered by any application of the provincial 7.5 to 9 per cent guidelines? Or are

we still saying to the Alberta Hospital Association: you negotiate within those guidelines; we advise you to do so.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member has asked that question on numerous occasions before. The Provincial Treasurer has responded to him. As far as the government's position is concerned, as the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care has already indicated, there was a very clear and unique situation with respect to nurses in this province — as a matter of fact, across Canada. That position was recognized by the conciliation board. It was again recognized by the Alberta Hospital Association.

Mr. Speaker, the collective agreement that was concluded reflects the esteem in which the profession ought to be held. The nature of their round-the-clock work, the shift work, the nature of the training they have to undertake: having regard to all of that and settlements in other provinces, I think we can all be satisfied that it is a unique situation which does not apply to other sectors of the economy.

Meat Packing Plant — Edmonton

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Environment. Has any representation been made by concerned citizens or groups to the minister or the Department of Environment regarding the proposed relocation of Gainers meat packing plant in southeast Edmonton?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, that's correct. I have had some representation from, I think, a Mr. Muzyka who represents a southeast Edmonton citizens' concern group.

MR. HIEBERT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the area is primarily reserved for heavy and light service industries and is relatively adjacent to a prime residential community, Ottewell, what environmental regulations or clean air policy exist concerning the relocation of a packing plant in proximity to an established residential community or heavy industrial area?

MR. SPEAKER: As far as the regulations are concerned, I would respectfully suggest that those should be sought elsewhere. As far as policy is concerned, the minister may wish to answer.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad you made that distinction. In terms of policy, perhaps I could respond to the Member for Edmonton Gold Bar this way: it is our policy to provide reasonable buffer zones before we permit relocation. In this particular case we have generally followed through on the policy we've laid down for relocation of industry.

Bow River Pollution

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Minister of Environment. Earlier in the session the minister indicated that consideration would be made of posting the Bow River by Calgary for swimming and drinking. At this point, in this beautiful sun in Alberta, a lot of people are using the Bow River, and I was wondering if the minister could bring us up to date on that action.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I guess the session's passing so quickly that I thought it was just a few days ago. I haven't had a chance even to discuss this with my colleague to the left, who I guess also has a responsibility in terms of public health. Would you just give me a little time to dialogue, and perhaps we can come up with something?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, will the minister take the matter under urgent consideration and have some action within the next week, so that something can be done by next weekend? It's been a year I've been asking the same question, and no signs.

MR. COOKSON: Again, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the Minister of Social Services and Community Health wishes to add to what I have to say. We like to leave these responsible matters to municipal authorities and the health units in the particular area. As far as Environment is concerned, we'd be happy to take on the responsibility if it is ours.

Perhaps while I'm talking about it, again I would like to reaffirm to the member that it's extremely important that people don't recognize the river systems and surface water areas in some parts of the province as great places to swim, especially if they are in locations downstream from sewage effluent.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health with regard to the quality of water downstream in the Bow River. Is the minister's department monitoring the quality of water that is being used by some of the citizens in the hamlets downstream, such as Rainier, Scandia, Rolling Hills, where recent reports show that water taken out of taps is not suitable for human consumption?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the broader question as notice, but I will add to what my colleague the Minister of Environment has said by indicating that both the public board of health in the city of Calgary and the health unit downstream from the city of Calgary have environmental health officers. Part of their ongoing responsibility is to check water quality, both that which is used for human consumption and the river in general. By tomorrow or the next day I will attempt to get an update for my satisfaction and for the hon. member's satisfaction as to the most recent reports through the local health authorities.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have the consent of the Assembly to respond to a question asked of me on Friday.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Forest Fires

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, in connection with forest fires the Member for Edmonton Kingsway asked the number of acres that were burning this year compared with the comparable time last year. I can advise the Assembly that we now have roughly 200,000 acres in the province that have been burned or are burning. At this time last year there was only a nominal number of acres.

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 Environment

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The minister was making some opening comments. Has he any additional comments?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, I did think I'd say a few more words as part of my state of the union address, commenced on Friday, and I'm glad to see we have a few more spectators. Friday's a bad day to start on estimates. Anyway, I want to speak further to the Assembly and to the public in general about the increasing concerns we have with regard to Environment, and to expand a little bit on the sort of situation that's occurring across the province.

Particularly because of my comments on Friday about the growth of the population in Alberta, because of its buoyant economy, and because of the favorable climate here for economic investment from other parts of Canada and from other parts of the world, for that matter, we do face extreme developments which are certainly going to add to our problems down the road. In my year in charge of the Department of Environment, I've recognized this urgency, and I hope we'll be able to initiate — and we have — some programs which will in fact stay ahead of some of our most urgent problems. We have catch-up to do in some areas as well.

Just as an example — and it is in mind so much with the question from the Member for Little Bow — before me is a brief summary of the situation in terms of water quality in the various rivers across the province. As members of the Assembly know, we have five or six major rivers that originate on our Eastern Slopes. Of course they are of excellent quality where they originate. As they slowly progress through the province of Alberta, then on into Saskatchewan and some to the north, they tend to deteriorate in quality. This is becoming extremely severe in some parts of the province.

To give you a contrast of the different parts of the province, the Peace River water quality is basically unaltered from its origin, except for some problem we're having with color, taste, and odor in the area of Peace River. Other than that, it generally has maintained its quality. But take that in contrast with the area of the South Saskatchewan River: you have a number of smaller rivers leading into the South Saskatchewan; one of them is the Bow River, which has been front and centre for some time, and which we're attempting to improve. The water quality of the Bow River upstream from Calgary is excellent, which one would expect. As you progress downstream, it is affected by treated municipal wastes. The result is high nutrient content which, of course, promotes algae and weed growth.

We're hoping that upgrading of the sewage facility at Calgary and our new program with regard to removal of phosphates will help reduce that problem. That's just an example of the sort of contrast based on population,

industrial development, and the mass of flow of the different streams. For example, the Peace River would be much more able to cope with industrial and population growth than a river such as the Bow River.

The only other area I thought I should just touch on briefly before we get into the estimates, Mr. Chairman, is with regard to our problem in the area of industrial wastes. As I said on Friday, industrial growth is at an exceptionally high level in the province, and Environment has a big responsibility in attempting to cope with this industrial growth. In all these industries there are various kinds of chemical wastes. Some are more hazardous than others. In fact one really has some difficulty interpreting what is meant by "hazardous waste". One could suggest that if you drank too much water, it could become hazardous. So when you use the expression "hazardous wastes", you have to clarify it, because it depends on the volume you consume, the time you consume it, the volume you consume within a given time, and so on. Generally, I think we would be far better to use the term "industrial wastes". These are primarily wastes that are either acid- or alkali-based. A lot of them are used in scouring equipment, and a lot of them are by-products of building materials. They have to be disposed of in some way or another.

In our recent studies, on a trip I made to Ontario, I found that Ontario was having a very difficult time coping with the large number of industrial wastes. They have a number of plants in operation. We visited one in particular, which goes through the process of intensive, high temperature to neutralize. They have a very efficient system of taking in industrial wastes. It's done by means of a special transportation manifest. It's taken into the plant, the materials are identified and, through that process, they determine whether the different industrial wastes may be mixed with others to neutralize or whether they should be burned, and so on. The plant I visited has a pretty efficient operation.

As members know, we are now in the process of public hearings with regard to trying to cope with the problem here before it gets really severe. In terms of the other two prairie provinces, it's estimated that the province of Alberta has about 60 per cent of the total industrial waste. This is accumulating at a rapid rate as our development continues, and we have to find a way to dispose of these materials in a safe manner so that we aren't eventually going to have in Alberta another Love Canal.

So this is an extremely important time. I would take this opportunity of sort of lobbying the public across Alberta that the public hearings, through the Environment Council of Alberta, are now commencing. There will be about 16 meetings across the province. I hope the public will get out and participate in these hearings. We expect a report on the hearings at a later date. Then I hope our government will be able to take some kind of constructive action toward handling that problem, which could become a major problem.

I guess that's really all I wanted to say, Mr. Chairman. No doubt a lot of questions will arise as we proceed through the estimates.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before we continue with the estimates, may the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs have permission to revert to Introduction of Visitors?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

(reversion)

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I am very pleased indeed to advise you that we have in the Speaker's gallery four distinguished visitors from the People's Republic of China. They are in our province and our city for the next week to visit with the private sector, people of our community, and with government and members of caucus.

The Chinese Ambassador to Canada, His Excellency Mr. Wang Tung, is in the Speaker's gallery, Mr. Chairman. With His Excellency is his wife, Mme. Lui Feng. Accompanying the Ambassador from the Ottawa office of the Chinese Republic is Mr. Lui Tse-Pu, as well as Mr. An Wenbin. Ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I'm sure you'll extend a very warm welcome to our distinguished visitors, and I'm sure I can express on behalf of all of you a very warm welcome to Alberta.

head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS (Committee of Supply)

Department of Environment

(continued)

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have two or three questions and several comments. Then I'd like to take just a minute of the committee's time to deal with the proposition put forward by some residents of the Peace River country concerning public hearings by the Environment Council of Alberta on the proposed Dunvegan dam.

Mr. Chairman, I'm glad the minister emphasized the importance of the Environment Council of Alberta hearings on hazardous wastes. I was going to ask him about that. Suffice to say that I share with the government the hope that Albertans will take an opportunity during the public hearings to make representation to the Environment Council. I've had some people contact me about possible sites for a hazardous waste disposal plant. But it seems to be that before any decision can be made on something like that, we'd be much better to have an opportunity to benefit from the hearings of the Environment Council on this important matter.

When the minister summarizes response to the various questions I'm sure we'll have in committee, can he bring us up to date on where things stand on the ECA recommendations on flow regulation along the Oldman River? A number of rumors have been circulating that an announcement is going to be made during this session of the Legislature. I'd be interested to know when we may expect that announcement. If there isn't going to be an announcement, perhaps we might have some indication from the government at this stage on how it generally views the recommendations of the Environment Council of Alberta on the Oldman.

Moving from there, Mr. Chairman, there has been at least some public discussion on moving water in the province of Alberta. I see that the hon. Minister of Transportation is not in his place at the moment, but last fall he managed to capture considerable attention with his proposal on water diversion. Frankly, I hope we are not getting into any kind of resurrection, if I can use that expression, of the PRIME project of some years ago, a project this government abandoned or clearly stated it wasn't in support of when the minister's predecessor Mr. Yurko was Minister of Environment.

It seems to me that any massive water diversion of the

size and scope envisaged in the PRIME project would be so costly that I really question whether any cost benefits would be involved, particularly when one looks at the PRIME project in its entirety, which would see water diverted in almost every major river system in the province. The minimum estimate I've been able to gather on that, and I assume it is definitely a minimum amount, is that if we brought the Saskatchewan/Nelson River basin study up to current cost levels, we'd be looking at something in the neighborhood of \$10 billion to proceed with any massive river diversion. And I assume it would be substantially more than that. I can understand the merits of minor diversion here and there in the province, but the global concept envisaged in the PRIME project is something that I for one would frankly not support.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

I'd like to move from there to deal for a few moments, Mr. Minister, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, with the question of the proposed — I shouldn't say the proposed dam; that isn't entirely accurate. What we have at the moment is a request for proposals from the private sector for the construction of a low-head dam at Dunvegan. I think it's fair to say that the majority of residents in the Peace River country would be positive, but with a number of questions they wish to express and that they want answered. I think it's also fair to say, Mr. Chairman, that fairly comprehensive studies have been conducted on Dunvegan. I've had an opportunity to look through the 14 volumes dealing with everything from the socio-economic impact to the environmental implications. But I would say to people who argue that we've done all the studying we need to do and let's get on with the bulldozers, that a lot of questions are still unanswered in the Dunvegan dam study. And I'm sure the minister would realize this from his assessment of those studies. I just cite a couple, dealing with the environmental implications of a low-head dam. It's certainly not going to be catastrophic, but it is going to lead to a good deal more slumping along the river banks. The economic study concludes that, providing certain steps were taken, the impact of the boom-and-bust effect on the area could be minimized. But it goes on to say, in a very important way, that we need to look at it in further depth.

Several weeks ago, a group of people from the college at Fairview approached me, and a meeting was organized. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that we had excellent attendance, almost 250 people from throughout the settled area of the Peace River valley. A number of people who attended the meeting were from the obvious area that will be affected. There were people from as far up the river as Manning, and people from the Fort St. John-Dawson Creek area as well. During the course of the evening, about 20 people made submissions to this meeting. I'm sorry the Minister of Utilities and Telephones isn't in his place; he wasn't able to be there that night, but he did send Mr. Les Collins from the department, who I think provided a good deal of useful background material for people attending this particular meeting.

But I'd just like to take a moment, Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that whether the government decides to hold Environment Council of Alberta hearings on Dunvegan is essentially a decision of the Minister of Environment, to share with members of the committee some of the views that were expressed, both pro and con — or where it wasn't con, at least where questions were raised

about the dam itself. I think the arguments on the pro side are very straightforward and clear. The construction of a dam that would work out to \$1.15 billion 1975 dollars would increase the revenue to the tax base of the municipalities affected. That's a positive aspect. You can't spend well over \$1 billion in 1975 terms — and it would be hard to say what it would be in 1985 dollars, or whenever the construction proceeds — without having a good deal of positive fall-out for many people in the community. Those points were well made by several of the businessmen who attended the meeting. One of the people who made that point most strongly was the secretary of the town of Fairview.

But in addition to those points, that I think are self-explanatory, a number of other issues were raised that I think are important from a local point of view. First of all, there is still a number of unanswered questions about how a relatively small population base can digest the boom that would be created by — you name it — \$1.25 billion, \$2 billion, whatever the costs would be of a project of that magnitude. I know the economic study suggested the problem could be minimized if you had a separate area, a separate camp if you like, for the workers. But one of the points brought out in the meeting was that a separate camp for the workers has its own problems in terms of those people being able to relate to the community as a whole.

Another question that came up, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, was employment and contract opportunities for people in the area. That goes the gamut from people who work on the damsite itself to the question of who would own the gravel rights. Right now there's a fair amount of speculation in gravel rights. Members are probably aware of the fact that this project is going to take an awful lot of gravel. We've had a number of people approaching farmers, and I've advised the farmers to do their own arithmetic before they sell their land.

Somebody comes along and offers \$200,000 for a quarter section of land; it sounds like an awful lot of money. But do your own checking. Check out how much gravel is there. It seems to me that perhaps there is some advantage to the farmers in the area who have gravel to get together and set up their own company and deal with the prime contractor if and when the project goes ahead, rather than having a middleman coming in and buying the land for a relatively small amount, or at least a small amount compared to the value of the gravel in a project of that size.

Mr. Chairman, we also had several people from British Columbia, who took some time to talk about some of the implications in British Columbia. Of course, Hudson Hope is the classic example of the boom-and-bust town. The town that boomed had 31 school teachers. I believe it's now down to seven school teachers. The town that 10 years ago had an active, thriving business section, now has only two or three operating businesses in place. Concern was expressed there.

One of the things I think the minister would be interested in, being in agriculture himself, is the interest of the market gardeners. In Fort St. John they discovered that the soil [temperature] went down two or three degrees after the Bennett dam was constructed. I certainly am no soils expert, but this was apparently the experience in British Columbia. This has caused some concern among the market gardeners at Dunvegan. There are two very successful market garden operations in Dunvegan, as well as a number of others downstream, who wouldn't necessarily be affected by the construction of the dam,

except if it did reduce the soil temperature. That could indeed affect their operations. So I think it's fair to say, Mr. Chairman, that these people expressed a question about that at the meeting.

Then we have the impact on health services, schools, and roads, all of which are mentioned in a way in the studies that were completed in 1976, although not in any comprehensive manner.

Mr. Chairman, we had representation as well from people in Peace River, who expressed some concern about the water quality in the town of Peace River. I know we have an unusual situation in Peace River because of low flow in the Smoky. My guess is that the dam at Dunvegan wouldn't have a great impact on water quality in Peace River, because it's my understanding that the intake for the town of Peace River gets its water largely from the Smoky River. Nevertheless, that was one of the concerns expressed by residents from Peace River.

In addition, we had several other people argue that if we're going to backstop a project of this nature in the form of the present method of asking for bids from the private utilities, then we should in fact own the project ourselves. This is not something that is relevant here when we discuss Environment; I'm sorry I didn't have an opportunity to be here when we had the discussion of Utilities and Telephones. But it's an ongoing issue that will proceed over the weeks and months ahead. The suggestion was also made, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, that in its planning process, should it proceed, the government should look at the feasibility of a rail link across the top of the dam. I raised this the other day and was pleased to see the Minister of Economic Development applaud that idea. It seems to make a good deal of sense to me. It would link the north and south sides of the Peace River.

Mr. Chairman, after various people had an opportunity to express their points of view, a number of questions were asked and then a motion was put to the meeting. That motion was essentially that we should hold a hearing by the Environment Council of Alberta on the feasibility of a dam at Dunvegan. I suggest, Mr. Minister, that perhaps we should look a little beyond that, at the question of flow regulation on the Peace River and the impacts in the community of a project of this size in the Fairview-Spirit River region. I also want to make clear that it certainly wasn't a unanimous decision at the meeting. I would say a very substantial majority of those voting, voted in favor of it; a number of people from outside the constituency quite properly didn't vote. But that is the suggestion that was made at this meeting. Mr. Minister, I would ask both you and the Minister of Utilities and Telephones to seriously consider it.

No one argued more than I did several years ago, when we changed the make-up of the Environment Conservation Authority and turned it into the Environment Council of Alberta. I have to say that at the time I had real doubts about replacing a permanent, three-person authority with panels that could change from time to time. But the panel approach does allow a certain amount of flexibility. In my judgment, were we to proceed with ECA hearings on flow regulation on the Peace River, that very flexibility would allow the government to choose some people who are particularly qualified. I would suggest that if we were to hold ECA hearings — and this may be rather surprising for a socialist member of the Legislature to make this suggestion — the government couldn't find a better person to head up the hearings than our former MP, Ged Baldwin. He's lived in the area all his life; he

knows the Peace River valley from one end to the other; he's knowledgeable about the total impact along the river valley. In my view, a person of his ability to head up a panel to look into it could give the government not only additional community input, but a tremendous amount of the sort of sober, rational, and reasonable advice Mr. Baldwin has come to epitomize in northern Alberta.

Mr. Chairman, I would just make two other points on the question of whether we should hold ECA hearings. First of all, I would say that we've held hearings on every major dam project in this province. We've held hearings on flow regulation on the Oldman; we've held hearings on the Red Deer and the Paddle. We didn't hold formal ECA hearings on the Bighorn, but the Social Credit members of committee will quickly remember that we held hearings on the Bighorn in this Legislature. I had an opportunity to go back over *Hansard* and listen to some of the things Mr. Horner had to say about why we should have hearings in the Legislature. Frankly I don't think we need hearings in the Legislature on flow regulation on the Peace. But I do think the new, flexible approach to panels in the present ECA would be well worth a serious look by the government.

What are the arguments against it? I guess there are really two: one is that we're going to have to go through that process with the ERCB anyway. Well, Mr. Chairman, with great respect, however much I value the work of the ERCB, essentially you're looking at a much more technically oriented agency. I think ECA hearings could be complementary. I don't think any of us see this as just something to hold it up. As I understand the time formula, it's going to take in the neighborhood of at least three years. I could be wrong, but the figure I've been given is at least three years before we could get construction under way. That being the case, I think the government has the opportunity to move with ECA hearings.

I suppose the other argument against hearings by the ECA is that essentially all this has been done because of the Dunvegan dam study. I think there's a lot of excellent material in the Dunvegan study; no question about it. But having had an opportunity to peruse the study and see the questions posed — perhaps it's just the way consultants are; they try to hedge their bets by saying, we think so and so, but on the other hand ... There are an awful lot of "on the other hands" in the volumes of the Dunvegan dam study.

That being the case, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I would argue that at this juncture it would be well for the government to seriously consider the proposal for ECA hearings. And I want to make very clear that I say that against a backdrop of what in my view, as MLA for the area, is a generally positive approach to the dam — not everybody, but a generally positive approach to the dam. Some legitimate questions have been asked. And in dealing with probably the biggest construction project in the history of the Alberta Peace, it is not unreasonable that we be very careful in making sure the public has a right to be heard.

Mr. Chairman, the only other point I would make is that I understand there were minutes. The superintendent of schools acted as secretary. He took down fairly comprehensive minutes and took copies of the various submissions. As soon as I get that, it will be my intention to have it duplicated and sent to both ministers directly affected, as well as the Premier and any members of the House who would like copies of the minutes of that meeting. I think it would be interesting. It was not set up in any other way than to get some initial feedback from

people. In no way is it meant to be a gauge of public opinion in total. Rather it was a meeting of interested people. As I said, I'd be glad to supply the minutes of that meeting to anyone who wants them.

With those general observations, Mr. Chairman, I want to underscore the importance of the government carefully evaluating whether ECA hearings would be a reasonable step. I don't believe they need delay the project. But I think I can say, on behalf of people in my constituency, that there's very widespread feeling that if the project goes ahead, we want to make sure there is maximum local participation; that the planning is in place so we don't end up with some of the horror stories of other massive projects that, quite frankly, worry people in the Fairview-Spirit River area; and that we can in fact develop a general strategy in proceeding with this project which would be acceptable not only to members of this House, but I think would meet with the approval of people in the area too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Five members have indicated they wish to speak. I'll read off the list, so you know where you stand and how long you'll probably be: the members representing the constituencies of Macleod, Little Bow, Vegreville, Calgary Forest Lawn, and the Leader of the Opposition. I don't see the hon. Member for Macleod with us, so we'll go to the hon. Member for Little Bow.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to make just a few opening remarks on two or three subjects. First, the Oldman River and the ECA report: I'm certainly interested in hearing from the minister the status of the announcement that will be made in this spring Legislature. From my own point of view and in discussions with the irrigation districts, particularly the farmers who rely very heavily on water for their irrigation this summer, I'd like to say there's a lot of support for a dam on the Oldman River at this point in time. I would say there's a bit of neurosis in the system right now, with the dry weather in southern Alberta, with the possibility — it's in the early thinking stage at this time — of having to ration water for irrigating. I know each of the irrigation districts has set up a policy, which they never had before, on how rationing will take place; on what days during the summer we as irrigation farmers may be rationed in our use of water. So, number one, I think I'd like to hear a progress report on that matter; number two, I stress to the minister that it is urgent; and, number three, if there is some information from that area of the province that I can provide to the minister, I'd be pleased to do so.

The second area I'd like to remark on is the provincial water proposal. I would have to say I'm certainly interested in the proposal of having an interconnection between various water flow systems in the province. I don't think we should look at it in a negative way at this point in time. I think we should be open-minded. Water was God's gift on the earth, and there's no reason that one river system can't supply water to another, if it is done in a reasonable, rational, and well thought out way. I certainly urge the minister and the management advisory committee to continue to follow that objective and look at the possibilities of total utilization of our water, whether it's in north, south, or central Alberta, and have it accessible to all parts of Alberta in whatever way it takes to do that.

I'd be interested in some specifics from the minister at this time, though, such as what meetings the water

management advisory committee has had up to this point and what recommendations they have made. Have any policy recommendations been made with regard to transfer of water from the north to the southern part of the province? Specifically, I think there were some recommendations in the Hanna area. What position is the government taking at the present time on interbasin transfer, or is there no specific policy from the minister in that regard at the present time? What time line is the minister or the department looking at with regard to the set of recommendations on interbasin transfer?

The third item I want to comment on is the Bow River itself, not specifically on the pollution question I raised earlier today, but with regard to diversion of water from the Bow River into the Bow River irrigation system. Approximately a year and a half to two years ago, I think, a very well thought out brief and study, done for the Bow River Irrigation District, was presented to the present Minister of Municipal Affairs, who at that time was the Minister of Agriculture, and also, I believe, to the present Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. In that brief there was a recommendation that the diversion between the Bow River and the Bow River Irrigation District distribution system should be widened so that more water could be put into the system and more acreage could come under irrigation.

I wonder if the minister has been able to review that study, and does it look as if a commitment can be made this year or within the next year or two? At present, irrigation acreage is limited. No new water rights are being supplied to the various farmers. But at the same time, there's a high demand from farmers in the area for new water rights for irrigation. I'm asked quite often: when will something be done, and do I think something can be done? So I'd appreciate the minister commenting on that particular item as well.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm sorry I wasn't here to hear the remarks of the hon. Member for Little Bow, but I have a concern on the Oldman River basin study and what stage it's at in coming to a final decision. The assurance of water in the Oldman River basin is a most vital concern. We have the water there if we manage it properly, as I'm sure you're aware. I'd like to know what stage that's at. The communities in the Oldman River basin rely on that water for their domestic supply. I'd ask the minister to respond to that.

Thank you.

MR. BATIUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a couple of comments, only I don't know whether the good news or the bad should come first. Nevertheless, I would like to express my appreciation for the stand the minister took recently in announcing approval for the regional water line from Edmonton to Vegreville.

MR. R. CLARK: That's the good news.

MR. BATIUK: That's right.

When I look over the last few years — the demands for more water, the shortage of it; I always look to the smaller communities first. In 1972, Chipman, in my constituency, had gone down to a population of only 150. The way it looked, in no time there would be no community at all. However, by 1978 the population doubled, but the council of the village of Chipman stopped all building permits because of the water short-

age. For the last couple of years they have hauled water by trucks, and still are. One can understand how expensive and inconvenient it is, and no doubt the quality of water is not the best.

It is the same with other areas. Vegreville, which is growing at a rapid pace, has been depending on the Vermilion River, which is hardly more than a creek. The water runs through it in the spring, and inside of two weeks you can walk across it without getting your feet too dirty. They are dependent on whatever water they get. They have to have large storage facilities to save water from the previous year. So this announcement has been very well accepted.

The next area I would like to stress, which I have expressed my appreciation for not only once, is the support our government has given for irrigation. I have served on a caucus committee on irrigation, I have travelled in southern Alberta, and I really admire the wonders irrigation can do for the farming population. When you compare dryland farming and irrigated farming, there is a world of difference. It's the same whether it's for hay or pasture. As we know, land is a renewable resource. I am glad to see the support irrigation is getting. However, I am a little concerned when we see that our government gives support up to 86 per cent for irrigation.

At the same time, I would say that the northern half of the province has a problem with too much water in many areas. I know that throughout my constituency and many others there are sloughs and creeks, and many of them are not functioning properly, maybe because of nature or because of farming methods over the past years. Some years ago farmers used to thresh with threshing machines. The best place to let the straw pile go was where there is water, that they couldn't use anyway. I think that stopped the natural flow of water in many areas. The same with ploughing lower places and creeks in dry years: now there is a real problem with them.

Very many areas are suffering because of a surplus of water, but because of the high cost of drainage — maybe only a few years ago it amounted to thousands of dollars; now it may cost a quarter or a half million dollars. True enough, a few years ago the federal government assisted up to 50 per cent for water drainage, the provincial government provided 25 per cent, and the municipality and farmers had to raise the other 25 per cent. But since the federal government withdrew from this program, the provincial government has increased its support from 25 to 50 per cent. Now the farmers have to contribute 25 per cent, and 25 per cent is from the county. However, some of these projects are getting far too expensive. I hope the minister would look at areas where maybe drainage does not have to go as far as the study shows. Maybe if it were brought to its natural state of 50 years ago, that would be [satisfactory]. Then I wonder whether the minister would want to advise in his summation whether he too would consider that probably there could be support for draining surplus water, as there is for irrigation.

Thank you.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I too would like to make a few preliminary remarks in response to the minister's opening statement.

Firstly, I would like to compliment the department, and the minister in particular, in respect of his recognition that all is not well with the Bow River. In fact, I'd like to direct all my preliminary remarks to that concern, because I feel it is a very large example of the environmental dangers this province is faced with, and will be

faced with in the years to come as the province continues to grow. I think we've made considerable headway insofar as there is clear recognition and a public statement by the Department of Environment and the minister, that we do have a problem. I recall speaking in this Assembly on this matter approximately a year ago, and at that point it didn't seem we had the specific recognition we now have. I'd also like to compliment him with respect to the announcement that the government intends to move in requiring the city of Calgary to clean up the Bow in terms of the phosphorus presently being dumped into the Bow River by sewage treatment facilities.

However, having handed out those bouquets, I'd like to raise a number of concerns with the minister. In the same way as other members, I'd appreciate his response later in the consideration of the estimates. The first matter I would like to bring to his attention is the status of The Clean Water Act itself. In that regard I would draw the minister's attention to a study completed by his own department back in December 1978, by Mr. Klaus Exner of the water quality control branch, in which he talked about the fact that in the present Clean Water Act we're talking in terms of objectives rather than standards. Through the Chair to the minister, it is this member's understanding that presently we do not have any standards as such promulgated through regulation; we merely have objectives. I suggest there has to be more than a semantic difference in the use of those two terms.

I would appreciate the minister's comments as to whether we should have some standards as such promulgated, which I understand is possible through regulation. I certainly think we're at the time in this province when we need good, tough standards to protect the environment, in terms of both The Clean Water Act and other aspects of environmental concern.

Addressing the matter of standards a little further, it is again this member's understanding that phosphorus has not in fact been regulated as an element of discharge. The city of Calgary licence which grants them the right to discharge effluent into the Bow River, does not impose any limitation in terms of phosphorus output. If that is not the case, I would appreciate the minister's comment; if it is, again I think we have to be concerned with the tightness of the standards we have imposed.

I'd like to make a comment with respect to posting, which has been raised by both this member and the hon. Member for Little Bow. I would simply draw the minister's attention to the fact that the medical officer of health for the city of Calgary, Dr. David J. Hosking, has taken the position that posting or advising the public of any danger from bodily contact or consumption of the water of the Bow is not the responsibility of the board of health. The medical officer of health has taken the position that it is the responsibility of the Department of Environment. I make that point in response to his answer to an earlier question today by the hon. Member for Little Bow.

I would also mention that I have some difficulty accepting the proposition, put forward not only by the Minister of Environment but also the Calgary medical officer of health, that it should be public knowledge, if you will, that the Bow River is not safe for recreational purposes. While I think that comment may be fair in terms of the strong current of the Bow River, particularly in certain areas, I think the public in Alberta has historically been able to view our rivers and streams as prime recreational area subject, again, to problems of current.

It's a great deviation from the norm, if you will, when

we're in a situation where the water is not only undrinkable, but there is a real risk of danger to public health by mere contact. I think those arguments lend further weight to the need to advise the public of the potential danger, and certainly posting is one means of drawing public attention to this very serious health hazard.

The minister has advised the Assembly, and certainly the Speech from the Throne spoke of treatment of phosphorus discharge into our rivers and streams. I would like to suggest to the minister that there is a need to examine not only the phosphorus discharge, but when we're looking at the construction of expensive equipment, I think we have to take a longer range view of the need for full tertiary treatment. I acknowledge that that term is subject to different interpretations, but I think it's fair to say that the popular interpretation would be: treatment of our water which would restore it, as much as humanly possible, to the clear, natural water flowing upstream of the city of Calgary, so that folks who live downstream of the sewage treatment facilities are able to enjoy it in the same manner as those who live upstream of the city of Calgary.

While I recognize the serious technological questions as to how one rids a river not only of phosphorus but of other contaminants, I think this government and the Department of Environment in particular should view the situation in the Bow River as one of most extreme urgency, and that it is incumbent on this government to take whatever steps are necessary to become completely familiar with the most advanced technology available in the world. Again we have an opportunity here in the province of Alberta to be leaders and to ensure that we provide as heritage to our children not only a healthy bank account but a very clean environment.

A final comment with respect to tertiary treatment — and I refer again to the December 1978 study by Mr. Exner — I think we have evidence that the level of bacteria or coliforms in the Bow River just downstream of the sewage treatment facilities in Calgary, is completely unacceptable and, in the words of Mr. Exner, "unsuitable for primary contact recreation". So we already have very strong evidence from the Department of Environment that there is a very real problem there. I acknowledge the problems in trying to deal with it, but I think it deserves, and the people of this province deserve it to have, the utmost priority with this government.

A final comment has to do with the financial burden imposed by trying to clean up not only the Bow but other river systems in this province that are, and have become, contaminated. I look forward to the minister's comments later on in the estimates as to the level of financial assistance this government intends to provide. I humbly suggest to the minister that while there is certainly some obligation on a municipality or any other body responsible for contaminating or polluting our environment, certainly we in this province have an overriding responsibility. Where it is clear that the costs of such facilities would impose an unreasonable and unbearable burden, particularly on a municipality, then I think it becomes incumbent on this government to provide financial assistance to assure the citizens of this province a clean environment.

Thank you.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Minister, there are really three things I want to raise briefly in the course of my remarks this afternoon. I recognize there is always the danger, when the minister has been listening to five or six speakers — if the points aren't dealt with, I can perhaps come

back to them later on.

Mr. Minister, the first and perhaps the most important point I'd like to make is that I think it's incumbent on the department to become more actively involved in what I would refer to as the preventative side of things, from the standpoint of our environment, as opposed to taking the role that I think the department is all too often placed; that is, looking after the casualties. Mr. Minister, that places a very heavy obligation on you and the senior officials of the department.

My comments on this occasion aren't meant to be critical, but simply say that with this province growing as it appears it will — whether it's a dam at Dunvegan, petrochemical plants, irrigation in the south, the terrific growth we see not only in our urban centres of Edmonton and Calgary but also in a lot of rural centres, or whatever — it's incumbent, Mr. Minister, that your department be far more actively involved in giving environmental leadership, if I might put it that way. I'm not one who often advocates that we become involved in central planning, if I could use the term the Minister of Labour used today. I'm not suggesting that, Mr. Minister. But I think it's imperative that the department be seen more as a protector than a 'cleaner-upper' of the environment, if I could use that awful English.

I commend the Member for Calgary Forest Lawn and my colleague for Little Bow on the question of the Bow River. But, Mr. Minister, if officials of the department go back, the kind of things they're now saying about the Bow River are basically the same things they were saying in 1968 and 1969. Precious little has been done during a 10- or 12-year period. I use the Bow as an example of cleaning up a situation as opposed to trying to be involved in the preventative aspect of the thing. That's the first point I want to make.

Mr. Minister, the second point I want to make deals with the question raised in the House today by the member from Edmonton, with regard to the Area 14 co-ordinating council and the proposed Gainers plant in the city of Edmonton. I really have four or five specific questions, Mr. Minister, to which I'd appreciate answers. Has the minister, or ministers, responded to the brief presented to him by the chairman of the Area 14 co-ordinating council? I choose to raise the questions here rather than in question period, because hopefully we can become involved in a discussion back and forth if that's necessary.

Second question: is the minister considering the suggestion of a joint committee of the province and the city of Edmonton, which was put forward by that same group. Third, is the minister in a position to advise other large urban centres with regard to odor-producing industrial plants? What kind of standards are we looking at? Has the minister's department investigated the possibility, or should I say the incident of incompatible industries locating within an urban industrial/residential community?

Fifth, is the minister prepared to release the acceptable criteria for the location of odor-producing industries? If I read the Area 14 co-ordinating group accurately, Mr. Minister, one of the concerns they've made to me is that they want to know what the department sees as acceptable criteria for such a plant. It seems to me that they would then be in a far stronger position to make a judgment as to whether their fears are well founded or whether the concerns may not be as great as some feel they are.

The third and last matter I want to refer to deals with this question of hazardous materials. I appreciate, Mr.

Minister, that some comments were made by you when I unfortunately had to be outside the Chamber. The point I want to make on this question of hazardous materials, and especially on transportation of hazardous materials, is that we often hear in this Assembly that we are going to wait until the federal government takes some initiative on a cross-the-country basis. That's reasonable. The former government in Ottawa had introduced some legislation. The last information I have is that it will be some time, perhaps late this fall or next year, before we'll have some federal legislation.

Given that fact, Mr. Minister, it seems to me that we should be canvassing our situation here in Alberta and saying very seriously: despite the fact that the federal government hasn't got legislation in place with regard to transportation of hazardous materials in Alberta, we in the province of Alberta are going to take the initiative and say what can be done, at least in Alberta, until such time as federal legislation is in place. Naturally, at that time, it would be incumbent on us to try to make our legislation compatible with the federal government's legislation, if the federal legislation is desirable. Mr. Minister, the feeling I get from a large number of people, both people involved in industry in the province and people concerned from a standpoint of the overall environment, is that we've waited long enough for Ottawa; let's take some steps within Alberta itself; and we'll worry about compatibility when the federal government gets their act together, if and when that happens.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, a few remarks on matters related to water management within the province, particularly as they relate to the constituency of Lesser Slave Lake. I want to commend the minister for moving fairly quickly on proceeding with the lake stabilization project, which has been under consideration for the last five years. Although the funds come from the capital projects division of Heritage Savings Trust Fund, I wanted today to urge the minister to proceed as quickly as possible with the calling of tenders for the project, which I believe has now been approved.

Members will recall that there were a number of possibilities of providing considerable assistance to agricultural and service centres in the Lesser Slave Lake constituency. In fact, the proposal would provide for 30,000 acres being reclaimed for agriculture, plus considerable improvement to an additional 30,000 acres, 8,000 acres being located on Indian reserves. So it's very, very important to constituents in the Lesser Slave Lake constituency that this proceed quickly. I understand the environmental impact assessment is now complete and that through the management committee — in co-operation with the Lesser Slave Lake basin advisory committee, which is made up of citizens who for the past three years have worked very hard making recommendations to the government — the department is now at a stage where a decision has been made to proceed with a series of eight cut-offs on the Lesser Slave River, as opposed to the initial proposal of constructing a relief channel.

I'm pleased with the decision the management committee, the department, and the citizens' advisory committee has made. I only request that the minister move as quickly as possible in calling for tenders, so that the work can be done this fall and winter. Of course, this sort of work can best be done during the winter season. At this stage it appears as though this year will be a dry year. That would lend itself to the kind of construction work that is anticipated, bearing in mind that the project is in

excess of \$3 million and the feeling of the constituents of Lesser Slave Lake that the sooner the work is completed the better it will be for that land that has been under water and constantly flooded, particularly since the late '60s. It takes a couple of years for the land to recover so it could be put to good agricultural purposes. It's simply a request on behalf of my constituency that the invitations to tender go forward as quickly as possible, so that we may provide additional agricultural land in that region, and also assist those farmers who have been concerned for a number of years with the increasing problem of high water levels, to alleviate the problem and allow considerable improvement to the agricultural, as well as recreational and tourist potential in the region. It should also assist considerably in maximizing the use of Lesser Slave Lake Provincial Park, Hilliard's Bay Provincial Park, now under construction, as well as various community campsites along the shore of Alberta's most beautiful lake. I would be most appreciative if these tenders were called as early as possible this year.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I had a couple of concerns I wanted to raise with the minister today. He may be able to respond in his remarks.

The first is an ongoing concern with regard to progress being made towards reclamation of the coal slack piles in the Crowsnest Pass area. I wonder if the minister may be able to advise on what progress and action is being considered with regard to the Blairmore coal slack piles. Also, there is a concern locally with regard to plans by Coleman Collieries to reprocess their slack piles, and I wonder if the minister may be able to consider whether there may be an avenue for public concern with regard to that plan to process the Coleman slack piles — whether there will be an opportunity for the public to come forward and express the concerns which they have.

Also, I was wondering if the minister may be able to update the House as to the monitoring by his department of air quality in the Pincher Creek area, particularly with regard to concerns raised by parents in the area about the possible effect of emissions from gas plants there on the health of their children.

Finally, I want to make a couple of remarks with regard to the Oldman River hearings, and the progress of the government to date in making a decision on that. The people in my area who would be affected by a decision to proceed with on-stream storage clearly would like to have a decision made as quickly as possible, in order that they can go on with making plans about their life styles down the road and any plans they may have to make if that sort of decision is made. In discussing the Oldman River, my firm belief has always been that we should proceed with rehabilitation of the existing irrigation systems first, to increase the efficiency of use of water. In terms of the storage alternatives, we should look at off-stream storage first, because it fits in very well with the plans of the irrigation districts in terms of balancing ponds, et cetera. A decision on on-stream storage should only be made if it is deemed and proven necessary to the long-term water supply needs in southern Alberta.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. L. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, just a quick comment. I'm just wondering when we go through the estimates for this department if the minister could . . . You know, there's more pollution than just on the Bow River. I think our Red Deer River is in almost as bad shape. In fact, when I was on the health unit down there, we did a kind

of survey of the river and they said it was polluted above Drumheller and contaminated below. Since then they've put in a new sewer system in Drumheller which, I think, has helped the situation considerably. But I think the water quality in all our rivers in southern Alberta is deteriorating. I was wondering if the minister would give us a kind of run-down: when they build a new sewage plant, say, in Calgary — which is the major cause of pollution in the rivers in Red Deer or Drumheller or Calgary — how much of the cost of this plant is put back to the municipality responsible for the pollution, and what portion of it is paid by the government?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, there are quite a number of questions here. If I look up in the air once in a while, you'll know that I'm signalling someone to give me the answers. I'll try to deal with all as best I can, and try not to take too long. But some of them are rather complex and, to do justice to them, I have to go into a little bit of detail.

The first questions were asked by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, and his early comments were with regard to the Environment Council of Alberta report on the Oldman River study. Perhaps I could say again to members of the Assembly that I committed to a statement this spring, and I still plan to follow through on it, although the spring is a little earlier than I had projected. But I will be bringing a recommendation through cabinet that will become a public statement of policy and will deal pretty well with the whole irrigation situation in southern Alberta, the eastern and southeastern parts, and so on. It will be comprehensive in that it will state, in terms of the government, a commitment for funding in the future, and will give direction in terms of expansion of irrigation, if and when. It may even suggest that there may have to be a limit because of the capacity of the river systems. I don't think I can say much more about that. I know there's great interest and anticipation in terms of on-stream storage, by the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest in particular, and I hope I can clarify that as part of the total policy.

I just want to say that one of our greatest problems at the present time is attempting to deal with the problem of acquiring water which originates on the Piegan Indian Reserve next to Pincher Creek. I've had an initial meeting with Chief Small Legs, and I hope to have regular meetings in the months to come, because it's extremely important that we establish clearly the assurance of a water supply at some later date. Even though these court proceedings and determination of the ownership of land, and so on, may be occurring concurrently, my hope is that the chief and I will be able to come forth with some recommendation that would be acceptable to government and to the people of Alberta. And we have a time frame that we're working on. That is part of a dilemma we face in totally tying up the report, and in the type of progress we're going to make in terms of expenditure, because we have to have this clarification.

With regard to the concept of transfer of water between basins, I think I've said before in the Assembly — if I haven't, I'm going to; and certainly I've said publicly — that at the present time, the province is not looking at the feasibility of interbasin transfer of water. I've also said that until our basins across Alberta are used to their capacity, there wouldn't even be a thought given to that. Dr. Harry Gunning is chairing an advisory committee of respectable people across the province, who are looking at the general capacity of the irrigation areas. One of

their terms of reference is basically the need for further study in terms of basin transfer. I'm going to wait to see what comes in with regard to that. That's basically the response to the question.

With regard to the Dunvegan proposal, I thought the Member for Spirit River-Fairview presented a good case, then proceeded to give the pros and cons, and almost solved the problem for me. I just want to add several areas that I don't think he covered. One is the fact that any major hydro development in the province requires an Act of the Legislature. My understanding is that this would be the case if it's a major hydro development. Then there would be an opportunity for public debate within the Legislature. In that respect, it would be important for members personally involved to see that they made representations here.

The other point I would like to make is that I don't think there's any disagreement about the importance of public input. I think we agree it's extremely important that the public participate as much as possible in the hearing process. In this respect, in the case of ERCB hearings, we have provision for environmental impact assessments. At the present time, we're looking at the general relationship between EIAs and the procedures of the ERCB, in hopes we can work these two responsibilities more closely together.

In the environmental impact assessment, of course, the public has full opportunity to make presentations on an informal basis. Public hearings have to be held, so it doesn't necessarily fall in the category of quasi-judicial, or some argument that might be made because the ERCB is more formally designed. So there is, has been, and always will be lots of opportunity for public input. I think it's important, though, that we don't confuse the public by having too many concurrent hearings or procedures that thoroughly confuse the issue.

Generally speaking, the Environment Council of Alberta deals with general policy issues; the classic would be the hearings on the forestry report. The Environment Council works best — and I've had discussions with the chief of the Environment Council — not necessarily on site specifics but on general hearings. For example, we're presently working on general hearings on hazardous chemical or industrial wastes in the province, and they are of a very general nature. The input is much easier and in a more informal manner, but not necessarily with regard to site specifics. Site specifics deal on a much more technical level.

I just wanted to touch on the Peace River problem and its source of water. It now gets its water from the Smoky, and we're looking at the possibility of transferring so it gets its water from the Peace River. So if there's any impact by construction at Dunvegan, then maybe we have a problem there.

The Member for Little Bow again asked a question about procedure with regard to the Oldman report. I still hope I'll have that here and be able to make it part of a public announcement during the session, although there are a couple of problems in that respect. I'm not sure I can do that.

I note the Member for Little Bow is interested in transfer of water, and I seem to detect that kind of pressure from some parts of the province. As I've said to the Member for Spirit River-Fairview: at the present time, the province is not contemplating any type of interbasin study, although this particular committee is looking at a general overview, to see if there is a need for further study in this area.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

A comment on the diversion project: that is really part of the total irrigation thing, that I hope to get before the public before very long. Hopefully there will be an expression of funding in that particular area, too. There are some funds in the estimates with regard to the Little Bow, widening of canal work. So there are some commitments. But I guess this deals with the area of the Carseland weir and on down, which again would be part of the total Heritage Savings Trust Fund allocation in this area.

The Member for Vegreville raises an excellent point. I think that members of the Assembly should address themselves to this, because there is a difference across the province in terms of shared costs. In the north we have drainage projects which are 50-50 — that is, 50 government, 50 local or municipal. In central Alberta, we talk about drainage projects that sometimes are 75-25. I'm sorry, it's the other way around: in the north it's 75-25, with the province picking up 75; in the central part, it tends to be 50-50 on drainage. Then of course you have irrigation, where we pick up huge capital costs in providing a supply of water. When we get into the areas and responsibilities of Agriculture, in terms of the individual operation you're talking 86-14. I appreciate the presentation by the Member for Vegreville. I don't know whether you can compare them totally, but I think it's worth looking at, because the argument can be made that one area needs water and the other area has to get rid of it, so why is the shared cost on a different formula? It certainly is worthy of consideration.

In his usual capable manner, the Member for Calgary Forest Lawn raises a number of points. One was that The Clean Water Act operates under objectives rather than standards. The only thing I can add is that it's very difficult, as he knows, to try to enforce an objective. So we do have standards. Whether we're successful in enforcing the standards is another question. But our standards are generally on the basis of the biological oxygen demand, or BOD content, of the sewage which finds its way into the system. In setting up our standards, we use that as a measure, and generally the flow or capacity of the stream to handle that amount. We are setting up a standard for phosphorus emission. That will be about one part per million.

I recognize your comment with regard to helping — even though we followed a general policy of polluter-pay — in cases where it's virtually impossible for individuals to carry the total cost. In our proposal to handle the phosphate problem, we are looking at a shared cost. And once it gets its way through the system, that will be public information. As I say, we do have the phosphorus point: it must be down to one part per million.

I've got to clarify the responsibility of the board of health versus Environment. The Minister of Social Services and Community Health and I are working this out now. I don't know whose responsibility is what. My understanding was that when it came to bacterial coliform problems, and so on, it would be the board of health, and that Environment would deal with other things, such as nutrients. But I'll try to get that clarified. I think it's in respect to a question that was asked today in the House, too.

Again, I have trouble with the term "tertiary treatment". I appreciate the comments of the member from Calgary with regard to looking at some of the other trace elements. We're looking at them. So far, we aren't satisfied we have a problem; for example, with materials such

as zinc, cadmium, and so on. But as our industry develops, there's going to be a problem. In this respect we have to look very carefully at the use of sewage effluent for irrigation purposes, because there is a possibility of these trace elements being picked up and causing some problems. I think it's been noted that in Ontario they're having problems with tobacco. I'm happy about that, and I hope they have a lot more problems with tobacco. Maybe it'll solve a lot of problems.

The Member for Olds-Didsbury raised a number of questions with regard to the group that corresponded with me in terms of their concern regarding, in this case, the transfer of Gainers into an area which is not in the Edmonton industrial area but is in an area that's zoned by the city for industry. By controlling the content of the emissions at the stack level, generally speaking we can control the odor, because the odor is caused by a specific combination of elements.

I guess I can't respond very fully to the member's questions, unless I happen to get a note down here, because I couldn't get them down quickly enough. With regard to the question on criteria used in the case of odor-producing industries, though, maybe I'll look up in the sky again to see if I can get some more information on that. I guess that is in relation to the question of incompatible industries in a defined area. In general you would like to know more about the standards for odor-producing industries. I'll try to get that.

MR. R. CLARK: I'll send a copy over.

MR. COOKSON: We've had comments in the House with regard to transportation of hazardous materials in the province. My most up-to-date information is that this legislation will be in the House of Commons within three weeks. I'm in the process of advising my federal counterparts that it's extremely important that they follow through on this. In that legislation, the federal government will be standardizing packaging and labelling and concentrations, for example. We would then like to take that legislation and expand from that point, if we have to. It may be sufficient, and we won't have to do this. But if we have to, we would like to go from there and, if necessary, make it a little tougher. It may involve routes and this sort of thing.

The Member for Lesser Slave Lake spoke about the Slave Lake project, and I appreciated the comments that were made. A large part of that funding comes from the Heritage Savings Trust, although I think we have a fair amount allocated in the estimates for Slave Lake drainage area work. We're progressing as quickly as we can. It's correct that we changed our original concept. We are sure we can accomplish the same thing by straightening out the channelling. I might suggest to the member that I've had some expression — not of concern, but of interest — by Ducks Unlimited in participating in what we're doing, because of interest in wildlife, and we're prepared to meet with them. They don't see it as any major problem in the deltas at the northwestern end, but they would like to have more chance to dialogue with us, and we can do that.

Pincher Creek expressed a number of concerns: first of all, the gas plants in the Pincher Creek area. At the present time, we have our own portable monitoring device in the area, and we'll probably have it there for the next two months. It monitors, I think, about eight out of 10 different combinations of chemicals. As yet we have not been able to identify any relationship between the

emissions of the two plants in the area, Shell and Gulf. But we're going to continue to monitor, and see if we can't zero in on what might be a problem there.

Those old slag piles keep coming up. If you got the wind we've had for the last two days in my area, they're probably a lot smaller today than they were. But that's not a hope. I could perhaps check further on Coleman. I believe we have been involved with the Blairmore one before. Under the Department of Transportation we've agreed that at the time of construction, if we don't get private industry shifting those piles, we'll be involved personally with money from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, and we'll make this area a lot more pleasant in terms of environment. On the Coleman one, let me get an update for the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

I think problems of on-stream storage have been alluded to. We recognize the problems. I agree with the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest that the quicker we put our position before the public, the easier it's going to be for everyone concerned.

The Member for Drumheller raised a question with regard to pollution. It's not in this water quality report, other than the oxygen level which, by the way, dropped this year for some strange reason in a lot of our bodies of water. To comment on the Red Deer River: the most recent report indicates that the Red Deer River is generally in good condition throughout most of the year, except for the midwinter period, when dissolved oxygen levels drop below five milligrams per litre. Regulated flows in the river will help overcome this problem, and I can't stress the importance of that. If we can stabilize those rivers close to their sources and regulate them, we're going to solve a lot of our problems.

The other question raised by the Member for Drumheller was the cost of new sewage or water supply plants: the portion that is picked up and the responsibility of the local authority. Since the spring of '79, when we went into the new shared-cost program for water and/or sewage, we started with a base of zero debt load per capita, and suggested to municipalities that the province would cover the cost over \$200 per capita debt load, up to 90 per cent of the additional cost, going up to a maximum of \$2,000, if it were one project; or up to \$1,000, with \$200 per capita debt, if it were two separate projects.

In general the municipalities have certainly been very happy with the funding by the province. It's really generous funding. There is a limit to what governments can do. Local authorities have to carry some of the burden. If we go too far, I don't think it would be too long before all the farm people asked for capital costs to construct their own systems. We use that \$200 debt load as a sort of cutoff. And because of efficiency of numbers, and so on, some of the major municipalities, such as Calgary and Edmonton, do not qualify at all. So it really is a great boon for smaller municipalities throughout the province, that couldn't possibly have handled the strict environmental requirements without this kind of funding. It escalates. It will go up according to an inflation factor. In addition, we're looking at another special program for phosphate removal.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether that answers all the questions, but it answers some anyway.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Minister, I never got a response on the question of the role of the department. I made some comments with regard to the department's dealing with problems once they've arrived, as opposed to having a much higher profile from the department, from the

standpoint of being involved in the preventive aspects of things happening to our environment. I used the Bow River as an example. I take from the nod, Mr. Minister, that you plan to comment on that.

Mr. Minister, I sent over to you those questions with regard to the situation in Edmonton. If some detail is required, perhaps you could simply forward the information to my office by memo as soon as possible. That would be very helpful.

MR. COOKSON: I'm sorry I missed that comment, and I appreciate that, coming from the Leader of the Opposition. I hope the leader will support our government on what I consider some bold steps, because phosphate is a classical — we're trailing in the Bow River, but not in some other areas of the province.

In the future, I would like to see a further look at our total water systems in terms of protection of the watershed area within the confines of those systems, particularly the larger ones. As you probably know, we have restricted development areas in both Calgary and Edmonton, that tend to protect the watershed areas within the two cities. However, we've never looked beyond that to any large degree. I think we have to start looking a little more closely at the watershed areas, certainly within a specified area. We also have to look at concentrations of livestock, and that involves all of us in the business of agriculture and the political problems associated with it. If we don't do this, I think our streams are really going to end up cesspools. That's the sort of thing I presume the member has in mind: that we have to project ahead, rather than react to a problem after it's happened.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Minister, as an example of the kind of thing I'm talking about, let's take the Eastern Slopes for a moment. The government now has a fairly reasonable policy position as far as the Eastern Slopes are concerned. The real challenge is going to be to see that we live up to that, and not let that policy be watered down, if I could use that term. Because, as the minister knows very well, much of our water in this province starts in the Eastern Slopes.

Secondly, Mr. Minister, it seems to me that before very long the Department of Environment is going to have to give some leadership on this question of land use, and the Department of Environment along with the Department of Agriculture is going to have to be concerned about the amount of prime agricultural land in this province that's going down the tube from the standpoint of urban growth, in Edmonton and Calgary to a very great degree, but not only in Edmonton and Calgary. I suppose one place that's going to become critical is in the decision the government makes with regard to the annexation proposals from the city of Edmonton itself. I think we'll have a good opportunity there to see what kind of response the government, and the Department of Environment in particular, has on this question of land use, especially as it relates to prime agricultural land.

Agreed to.

1.0.1 — Minister's Office	\$131,229
1.0.2 — Deputy Minister's Office	\$369,107
1.0.3 — Finance and Administration	\$190,286
1.0.4 — Accounting	\$395,733
1.0.5 — Personnel	\$247,088
1.0.6 — Office Support	\$501,662
1.0.7 — Systems and [Computing]	\$1,179,431
1.0.8 — Communications	\$203,927

1.09 — Management Training and Development	\$71,099
1.0.10 — Library	\$228,453
1.0.11 — Solicitor's Office	\$26,631
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$3,544,646

Vote 2 — Pollution Prevention and Control	
2.1 — Program Support	\$543,197

22 — Air Quality Management

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Minister, I see here a reduction of some 54 per cent from what was actually spent last year, virtually the same amount as was included in the estimates last year. What is the reason for that?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, last year on the forecast we picked up two projects by special warrant. One had to do with the Crossfield area, where we relocated a pipeline on a joint agreement with AMOCO.

The other had to do with finally settling the problem . . . We look very carefully at cases where we impose some undue hardship because of environmental requirements, and an industry has to relocate. If they're not financially able to do this, and if they can make a reasonable case, we operate under a policy under which we will provide some funding. That happens to be the Edmonton Rendering plant, which was relocated at Clover Bar.

Those two projects were picked up late in '79-80, therefore our budget in '80-81 is that amount less.

Agreed to:	
2.2 — Air Quality Management	\$1,611,235
2.3 — Water Quality Management	\$1,353,552

24 — Municipal Water and Sewerage Management

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. During the presentation of the persons representing the 10,000 petitioners on the Bow River, one of the pieces of information they left with us as members of the Legislature were reports on the water quality at the hamlet of Rainier. This was water taken from the general store in Rainier in the summer of 1979. The senior public health inspector's report at that time was that the water from the tap was not suitable for human consumption and required chlorination. At the hamlet of Scandia they indicated — this is water taken from the Scandia store — the same report: not suitable for human consumption; requires chlorination. But it was going through the tap, out of the river. From Green's store in the hamlet of Rolling Hills, the report was unsatisfactory, should not be used for human consumption. There's also a certificate of analysis of water for the town of Bassano, indicating that the water was of poor quality. I could go on and give other statistics.

I was wondering whether the minister's had an opportunity to look at it at this point in time, and whether he has an up-to-date report on these matters. Is there some kind of emergency program that can be put into effect with regard to their water and sewage treatment, if necessary?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate receiving the input from the group who came in with regard to the pollution in the Bow. I think it was clear at the time I spoke to them, though, that it would be almost foolhardy to use for drinking purposes water from such a source, when it's pretty well known publicly that it has a high coliform bacterial content. I haven't been able as yet to pursue the petition interests with regard to what we can possibly do to improve the water quality.

I have no program within my budget to make provision for treatment. Again, we presume that people who use this water will obtain their own treatment facility. I guess there are small units that can be acquired and used. As yet we have no program for this particular use. It may be that Social Services and Community Health has something through the health units, but as far as I know, Environment has no funding for it.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, has the minister any plan of contacting or directing personnel, or directing the Minister of Social Services and Community Health to put this problem in perspective? Or do we just let it delay and drag along? As far as I know, these people are still using exactly the same water. I don't know of any chlorination treatment or systems that have been put on the water. The hamlets are the responsibility of the county of Newell. I don't know of any expenditure they have put forward to treat the water systems in these areas.

Isn't the problem urgent enough — it's the drinking water, the water they use with their food — to have someone in the Department of Environment or one of the other departments get on top of this so the minister at least has an answer back in this Legislature? It's been a year now, and I've said this two or three times. I remember saying it last year. Let's clarify the issue, find out who's supposed to do the job, and put the finger on him. The minister's got control of grants; the minister's got control of senior civil servants sitting up here in the gallery; the minister's got control of 1,000 or 2,000 of them out in the field. The public health units could get on this thing, if they were given a directive.

One, there's a problem out there; two, there's this communication. Last week we talked about access to information and understanding in the Legislature. It just doesn't seem to be coming back in here for some kind of decision, nor does it seem to be going down to the department to get at the job and get it over with. Do the people just go on?

Certainly, we can't solve the problem in Calgary right away. As the minister has explained very clearly — and I can understand it — putting that mechanical process into effect in Calgary is going to take at least into three years from now. I accept that. But there must be some interim measures we can take, so that all safeguards are taken and the people are looked after. I just don't get from the minister the feeling of the urgency of the matter, and the concern that I've got for it. Ten thousand petitioners have been here just within the last two or three weeks saying: look, the issue is urgent; let's do something. Water quality samplings show that there should be grave concern.

What should we be doing about the thing, members of the Legislature? My colleague from Brooks has raised the matter; I've raised the matter; 10,000 petitioners have raised the matter. I don't know what else we can say to the minister. But it seems like Calgary is saying it's the responsibility of Environment; the minister is saying it's Calgary; the people downstream are saying, help us. Nobody's really going out there and saying: what are five

things or three things we can do immediately. There must be some things we can do immediately. If the people in these towns, these little hamlets that I've mentioned, need chlorinators, maybe the store is running on a such a small margin that they need some help. Well then, let's finance them in some way and do something. But we just aren't doing that, and I get a little impatient about the whole thing. I know it may take a little time, but let's get at it now and come out with some clear steps at this point in time. It just isn't there.

DR. BUCK: We're waiting for an epidemic.

MR. R. SPEAKER: My hon. colleague says we're waiting for an epidemic. Maybe that's right. Then we'll all react. We shouldn't be that way. We have the facilities. We're not short of people in this province to serve us from the government end; no question about that.

MR. COOKSON: Well, as I've suggested to the Member for Little Bow, we have no policy. I'm not closing the door on a policy of some type. But him being a right-wing, free-enterpriser, I presume he assumes that individuals have some responsibility. That applies to both individuals and incorporated municipalities. I don't know what response the hamlets, which are not organized municipalities, have had, for example, from the county of Newell in this case. My understanding is that the municipalities themselves have some responsibility for supply of water.

When I sat on a municipal council, one of my major tasks each year was to find out whether the well was working properly — usually it wasn't — and to make sure it was thawed out at the time it was needed during the winter. So I suppose one has to assume some responsibility as an individual. If I have a problem with my water supply at the farm, I have the health unit, which does the water testing, tell me whether there's a problem. They don't offer any funding or anything, they just tell me if it's a high bacteria [count] or not. I presume the responsibility is mine to find out whether it's getting in from the barnyard or where the source of the pollution is, and to deal with it accordingly.

I don't know whether this helps the member. As I say, at all times we're looking at policies for situations where people are not totally responsible, so I'm not closing the door on that kind of thing. I don't know whether I can respond any more fully to that.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, the minister has not. The minister is generalizing about the problem out there. As far as I'm concerned, we have provided legislative authority for the minister with regard to air quality, water quality, and land quality. We've given him legislative authority to investigate problems such as this. In the last few moments, we have passed moneys for his office and his staff. There's the capability to get the job done.

Mr. Chairman, the problem's urgent. All it would take is five minutes of the minister's time to say; one, the problem's important; two, to direct the chief deputy, who's sitting up here in the gallery, that I want the answers to these questions by the time these estimates come back into this committee: is the water quality in those hamlets right, is someone going to look after that water quality, are we going to have a plan in place during this summer? Three questions and a directive to somebody to get the job done: that's all that's necessary. I've been asking for the very same thing for over a year. The

people down there — good Conservatives, a pack of Conservatives in these 10,000 names, very good supporters of the Conservative party — are fed up because they can't get answers. They feel the government's not listening. I'll tell you, I'm getting the feeling nobody's listening from here either.

The minister casually looks at the problem — casually. It's not a casual problem. It needs a plan of action. One, we've got people in the civil service; two, we've got legislation; three, we've got money; and four, we've got people down in those areas who'll do anything to help clear up the problem. Sportsmen, people who use the water day in and day out, irrigators: everybody will co-operate. But nobody's initiating the thrust that's needed. That's what this government was elected on back in 1971 — great thrusts. Maybe we should get one going here. I don't know how to say it any more clearly. I don't know why the minister can't take it seriously. It's just beyond my understanding.

It's fine to do something in Calgary. I agree with that. It should be done with all haste. But in the interim, something can also be done downstream to help the people. A simple thing: for over a year, the hon. member from Calgary and I, and others, have been saying, let's post some signs on the Bow River indicating the pollution. If I was concerned about the Bow River, I wouldn't be arguing about whether it's my responsibility or the responsibility of the health unit in Calgary; I'd see that it's done. One good phone call to somebody to tell them to get it done and it would be done. If the senior staff isn't responding to that directive, then something should be done with them. I think that it's time to take some action. I don't know how to say it any more clearly to the minister. I've allowed it to go on. I've allowed this delay, this generalization, but the minister really hasn't inspected the whole problem.

It took a long time before we got him out in the Bow River by Calgary. As yet, he hasn't been downstream to talk to the people down there. We can't say that's a government that's reacting or wanting to really understand what the people are saying. There's a focal point of concern. Why don't we follow it up?

As far as I'm concerned, we're going to talk about these estimates until the minister comes back in here with some plan of action that says, this is how I'm handling the problem; it's clear to me that I've given some directives to people to get the solutions and answers, and I'm going to tell you what I'm going to do. I'm going to wait for that answer and argue for that thing as long as we have to stay here. If the minister can't do that, well, they're going to pay the consequences eventually. It's a demonstration of just not being aware of, one, what the problem is and, two, focusing on a plan of action. It isn't that we on this side of the House haven't given the minister time. It's been over a year and a half since I raised this issue. Others have raised it, asking for a plan of action. And it hasn't come.

MR. COOKSON: I don't know whether it's worth repeating myself to the Member for Little Bow. Based on the petition that came in, I think I assured those people that we would need at least a month or a month and a half to assess the whole bacterial problem downstream. Really, that's where we're at. My people are looking again at the bacterial content. But I have to reaffirm that at present we have no policy. It doesn't mean to say we're not interested and concerned. It also reflects on the responsibility of the county of Newell, in which those hamlets are

located. In terms of individuals, I'm not sure if the Member for Little Bow is suggesting that we should poke into everybody's water well in Alberta and provide some funding if the water is polluted, or perhaps solve the iron problem or maybe reduce the calcium. I have to ask whether that's really what you want us to do.

DR. BUCK: You're playing games with people's lives.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I'm saying something very clearly: set out a plan of action in this Legislature and meet the commitments. Let me deal with each of them. The municipality: if they're not meeting their standards at the present time, tell them that. You have people in your department who can assess whether the standards are being met or not. Tell them that. Number two, the hamlets: if the standards are not met in the hamlets, then tell the municipality they should look after that. Private individuals: if they can't meet their human water needs — as they can't be met out of the river at the present time — then look at a plan of action. Maybe we need to drill them wells, maybe help them get access to a good common spring in the area.

These things are done. I've helped other areas build good common spring areas. Each farmer hauls his own water, happy as can be. Maybe that is what's necessary. But it's a plan of action. To the present time, we have had no plan of action. I don't think that's asking too much from government at this point in time. That's all that's necessary in this Legislature.

People out there don't feel the government's even thinking about a plan of action. From the answers I listened to today, the minister has not indicated to me that after the meeting we had with the representative group of the 10,000 petitioners — the minister sat down for a few minutes and jotted down three or four things that were asked for, that he wanted done on their behalf. Directives have not gone to the staff to get them done. If they were, the minister could say, I have given these directives and expect an answer by a certain date. If it's three months from now, that's what it is; but if it's 15 days from now, I understand that. But that hasn't been done, Mr. Chairman, and I just can't accept that. That's what I want at this point in time. I don't need all the answers, but I want a plan of attack. That isn't asking too much.

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions, reports progress thereon, and requests leave to sit again.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, when the members reassemble at 8 o'clock, it's proposed the House be in Committee of Supply. I move we call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[The House recessed at 5:28 p.m. and the Committee of Supply met at 8 p.m.]

head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

(Committee of Supply)

Department of Environment

(continued)

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee of Supply will come to order. We have Vote 2 under consideration. Order please. Vote 2.4: are you agreed?

24 — Municipal Water and Sewerage Management

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, no way. It's not quite that easy. I think the minister has had an opportunity over the dinner break to consider the request I made to him, and certainly has been able to have a discussion with some of his officials as to a plan or strategy by which they can deal with some of the concerns on the Bow River. I certainly would like to hear from the minister.

MR. NOTLEY: A comprehensive report, Jack.

MR. COOKSON: Yes, another study. Mr. Chairman, I thought I should refresh my memory a little about the meeting with the group when the Member for Little Bow was present, also Fred Mandeville. Basically with the petition they brought in, they had a number of observations and concerns. I wanted to make sure the Member for Little Bow understood that action was taken.

The notes I made were followed up. The meeting was held on April 14, and on the 15th an internal memo to Mr. Kupchanko, who is the assistant deputy of environmental protection. In earlier discussions I think I suggested it would quite likely be on or about the end of May before we could answer some of the specific questions. The memo essentially suggested that we provide this information as to the practicality and the cost of handling and dealing with the coliform bacteria problem, which was one of the issues raised, and the zinc cadmium situation. I've suggested to my department that we should have a clear position on those trace elements by the end of May. I also asked him to look at any other work being done in any other part of the country that would give us some direction in terms of dealing with the coliform bacteria problem. That kind of information does take a little time; that's why I asked for that amount of time.

The only other thing I could perhaps add to the Member for Little Bow that might be of some value to him is that we can certainly put our people out there as soon as tomorrow, as far as that's concerned, and let them check and advise generally on what they should or shouldn't do. I'm still of the opinion, unless these particu-

lar hamlets — if they have water systems which are approved by the Department of Environment and dealt with through the county of Newell, and if they weren't properly constructed or if there were problems with contamination, then under our licensing procedure we could simply shut them down.

That's something they can probably check too, because I'm not sure of the size of these hamlets or whether in fact they do have water systems which were developed under the Department of Environment. If they are unorganized municipalities operating on their own, in other words they have devised their own system, then they have recourse to the county of Newell, because under the municipal Act they have a responsibility. We'll do whatever we can to assist them, but it would also involve the Department of Social Services and Community Health under the health units.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the information the minister has given. If that would have been available earlier in the House, I think some of my concern would have lessened, but not completely. Just to summarize what the minister has committed to us here with the memo — and I'd like to ask the minister whether he could table that here in the committee; it's his memo. If it's an outline of a strategy and it says, these are the things the department is looking at, and the information will be available to the minister in either complete or interim form by the end of May, I don't see anything secretive about that. That would certainly endorse the fact that the minister took quick action on that aspect of the delegation. So I'd like to ask the minister: one, to table the memo; two — and I think he has confirmed that at the end of May we'll have an interim or a final report of the best information available at that point.

The third thing was to ask officials from the department to check these items out with regard to water quality in the hamlets and what it looks like for the summer. I think it would be a good idea to have the people in the department do that, because as I read the definition under municipal water and sewerage management, the whole responsibility of the department is — and I won't read it all: certification programs, studies, enforcement activities, and complaint investigation. I guess at this point in time I'm laying a complaint, if you want to put it under that category. So that's number three. I'd like to have the commitment from the minister that someone will act and be able to report back, through some medium, prior to the end of this session as to what is really happening out there and what water quality is. I think that would mean taking some tests of the water.

The fourth thing I'd like to ask of the minister — the minister said he would do this, but just to put it on the list of requests — is the responsibility with regard to signing on the Bow River about swimming or drinking of the Bow River, Calgary and downstream.

If the minister could take on those four commitments, Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to move ahead.

MR. COOKSON: Well, I guess I missed one of them. I thought it was kind of buried in one of the others. First of all, we don't normally table memos, and I think that's a consistent policy. I think one has to be satisfied with the commitment that this information will be available to both Speaker and Mandeville by the end of May. I've already listed the areas we will review. I've also suggested that we'll check, starting tomorrow, with regard to the coliform bacterial problem, so we will be able to deter-

mine the water quality. If I recollect, the member is concerned about the specific hamlets Bow River, Rainier, Scandia, and Rolling Hills.

Just a word about posting. The question was raised this morning in question period, and I think it was answered this way. We will try to clarify just whose responsibility it is. Someone in the board of health suggests it is the responsibility of Environment. I'm not sure of that responsibility. I don't think we've ever — or very seldom, certainly not in my time — had to post because of health problems due to bacteria. But I don't see that as a problem. We'll try to clarify that for the member.

I guess the big question — and maybe someone can help me with this — is what to put on the sign. Do we say, "Danger, Deep Water", "Don't Swim", or "We have a coliform problem — please swim at some other spot". I hope the member can appreciate the problem. It may be just the word "Warning", and leave it open to someone else's imagination. There are so many variables and such complexity in this area. Where a sign is posted there may be a problem in that area today; it may not be a problem tomorrow. I wonder if we wouldn't be — and I just throw this out for consideration — giving someone a false sense of security by simply posting a sign. As I say, I haven't any answer to it, except to pose the problem of what we might be facing by posting. Here in the Assembly, in the media, and through the health units, we can suggest through the media that, for example, anyone using water for drinking purposes downstream of Calgary would be well considered to have the water analysed and, if necessary, treated. We might use other forms of advice and warning. I haven't any answer to whether posting signs would really do what we want to do, but I'll certainly explore as to who has the responsibility, Environment or the board of health.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to address a couple more concerns and questions to the minister which flow from the preceding discussion. I must apologize that it was necessary for me to be absent from the House a little earlier this afternoon, and this area may have been covered. Could the minister advise the committee whether he is now satisfied that high coliform counts in the Bow River do in fact constitute a health hazard?

I must confess that to this point in time this member hasn't clearly understood whether the minister has now come to the conclusion that high coliform levels do, in fact, constitute a potential health hazard. If the minister is not yet of that view, has not been satisfied in his own mind that there is a health hazard from substantial coliform counts, could the minister then advise how quickly he will have at hand the necessary studies, information, and research data to come to a conclusion on that question?

Contemporaneously with obtaining that additional data, if in the minister's mind such additional data is required, could he also advise the Assembly what steps are being taken at the present time to become completely conversant with the existing technology in the area of tertiary treatment? If it is the view of the department and the minister that more than simply a treatment of phosphorus is required, we would then know what methodology is available to provide full tertiary treatment and provide the cleanest water possible to citizens who are dependent upon the Bow River for a multitude of uses. It would be most appreciated if the minister could elaborate on those matters.

Excuse me, if I might just slip in one more. This would

relate to the analysis of alternative forms of tertiary treatment, and the kind of time frame that we might be looking at. I realize that may be a difficult question to answer at this point, if in fact the minister hasn't yet had an opportunity to canvas the various tertiary treatment methods. I would appreciate that advice.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, I don't even pretend to be an expert in this area, and I'll be frank with you. A lot of work has been done with regard to removal of bacteria and the particular coliform problem. The process of ozonation, which is being experimented with, is one way research is being done in terms of controlling that problem. Perhaps by the end of May we'll have a better picture of the practicability of attempting to reduce the bacteria and coliform problems, particularly downstream from Calgary.

Coliform types of bacteria are only part of what probably could be a more serious problem, such as typhoid. I think I'm right on that; typhoid is one of the more serious types of diseases that could occur from polluted water. I just don't have sufficient information. In a sense that overlaps the department of health responsibilities. I guess very few parts of the world can actually say they're taking water in its natural state, running it through 500,000 people, and then putting it back in the shape it was before it got to the 500,000 people. I know of very few, if any, places in the world that can say without equivocation that that's possible.

As to whether the situation downstream from Calgary in terms of bacteria and coliform is a serious problem, or words to that effect, again I would have to say that certainly where the discharge from the present plants, Bonnybrook and Fish Creek, takes place, it certainly would be a serious problem. As you get further down, and as the effluent becomes more diluted with the natural water system, naturally the concentration is reduced. I don't know how far down. Perhaps that's one of the things we can answer for the Member for Little Bow. But certainly when you get to a certain point, you probably have a greater risk of coliform bacterial problems in your refrigerator than you do in the water system.

Perhaps some of those questions could be addressed and answered by my officials as we try to bring something together by the end of next month.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, just for the record. Maybe I didn't make this quite clear in my earlier remarks, but to relate to what the minister has just said, on August 1, 1979, the Medicine Hat health unit did sampling along the Bow River at the various communities I mentioned. I'd like to read them into the record so the minister can have his officials look at those health reports of mid-1979 and compare the present water sampling to the earlier reports.

For example, the hamlet of Rainier: the date sampled was July 23, 1979; the source of water was the Bow River; the point of sampling was the kitchen tap of Kuefler's general store. After the sample was analysed — I won't give the coliform content — Mr. Huddleston, the senior public health inspector, said: not suitable for human consumption, and it certainly needs chlorination treatment. This is after it comes out of the tap, so most people don't chlorinate it at that point. Scandia, Alberta; July 23, 1979; source is the river; Scandia store, kitchen tap. Again the remarks are: not suitable for human consumption, requires chlorination. Again, it's signed by Mr. Huddleston. The hamlet of Rolling Hills; July 17, 1979;

source is the river; point of sampling, the tap at Green's store; remarks: unsatisfactory — double underlined — should not be used for human consumption; signed by the senior public health inspector for Medicine Hat, Mr. Huddleston — which indicates again that the problem is there and most likely still exists. I think there has to be concern, not only by us here in the Legislature, but by the citizens using the water. I also have an analysis of the town of Bassano, which indicates a concern as well.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister would be good enough to give some additional comments with regard to two situations in southeast Calgary. One is with regard to the disposal of chemical wastes at the CIL plant, which was raised in question period last week. The other is the matter of the Western Co-op fertilizer plant. Earlier in the year there was concern about stack emissions. I wonder if we could have some comments on that, please.

MR. COOKSON: First of all, with regard to the Western Co-op fertilizer plant in Calgary, we have had long-standing discussions with Western Co-op. Only just recently we have been able to put together something that would certainly be acceptable to Environment. There is a policy laid out by Environment that deals with fertilizer plants in general. Most fertilizer plants that were in operation prior to this policy had already come under the ambit of those policy positions. Western Co-op had some problems — high overhead, high cost of conversion — in order to meet our requirements. We had them operating under a certificate of variance for some considerable time.

As I say, just recently — within the last six months, I guess — we've had Western Co-op in and discussed very carefully with them the procedure they must follow in order to meet acceptable standards laid down under our policy. They have agreed to this. We have a letter on file with Western Co-op. They have a time frame in which they have laid out the various processes they must comply with before, I think, 1983. So Western Co-op is certainly co-operating — if I can use a cliché — and they will be following through on our requirements.

The CIL plant recently closed out in Calgary. The particular problem is a substance known as methyl mercury. They have been operating in the area for some considerable time, in fact, prior to any environmental regulations, which we brought in around 1971, some of the major ones. The result is that they had a stockpile of methyl mercury, which had been accumulating. It was a by-product of their industry. Upon closing out, of course, they were asked to clean up the site and subsequently approached our department because of the problem of the methyl mercury.

My information at the present time is that the methyl mercury was all well contained within containers of 25 gallon size, then cemented in 45 gallon drums. At the present time, our people are on the site. We are testing the soil very carefully to determine if there has been any breakage or spillage.

There are two potential disposal sites; one in eastern Canada — I think I'm correct on that — and one in the United States, I think in the state of Oregon. CIL is arranging first of all to remove the material and, second, to find a resting place for it. Mercury is a substance that cannot easily be broken down. You can't destroy it by heating, and therefore it's a difficult substance that can cause some fairly serious health problems. At the present time then, they are removing the material, and it's in

temporary storage. If CIL isn't fortunate enough to find a resting home for it outside the province because of complications, then it'll be our responsibility, along with them, to try to work out some arrangement for some permanent storage facility in the province.

Agreed to:

2.4 - Municipal Water and Sewerage Management	\$46,075,882
2.5 — Earth Contamination Prevention	\$1,504,157

2.6 — Waste Management

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. A concern has been brought to my attention, and I was wondering if the minister could comment on it. There's an indication that potentially there could be a danger of African swine fever and other diseases exotic to our environment being imported with the trash on board international flights. I refer to the International Airport here in Edmonton. What happens is that the trash from overseas flights from the Edmonton International Airport is now being buried at the Leduc landfill site, where it could be exposed to dogs, birds, and other animals who can carry it to neighboring farms. I was wondering if the minister has reviewed this concern or has had it brought to his attention, and whether federal authorities that enforce federal regulations require that such garbage be burned in both Edmonton and Calgary where, my understanding is, there's a possibility of a violation.

MR. COOKSON: The member raises a point that I haven't had — perhaps I can look up at the top there and see if there's anything I can get down on that to the member. I know that swine fever has broken out in some of the southern areas, and there is a concern with regard to it. Perhaps I had better hold that one, and we can maybe respond a little later on.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I have to apologize; I was out for a moment or two. The minister may have touched upon when the hazardous waste committee will be reporting. If so, then the minister can give it to the other members. Can the minister indicate when that committee will be reporting, and when a decision will be made on the establishment and construction of a hazardous waste disposal plant in the province?

MR. COOKSON: At the present time, we have planned 16 hearings across the province. They'll go on through May and part of June. We have no way of predicting the response out there. If there is some concentrated request because of putting the crop in or some other problem, we might have to extend that to a later date; we would be obligated to do that. Following the Environment Council of Alberta hearings, I'm going to ask them perhaps to prepare me a quick preliminary report while the final document is being put together. I have set the time frame of no later than the fall of '80 for the formal report if possible. Problems are always associated with that. I'd like to have an interim report almost as quickly as they're able to complete the hearings. Following those hearings, depending on the kind of report they give us, I would like to set my own people in action.

Let's presume that the committee, based on its hearings, realizes the urgency, and projects, for example, a waste management facility which would use high heat for

disposal of some of our industrial wastes. Presuming that, they will also be reporting not on specific locations but certainly general areas where it would meet environmental standards. The next stage would be to zero in on one or more locations, if necessary, which would be environmentally safe. It has to go through the hearing process, rezoning, and whatever else is necessary at the municipal level. Then, if the province has to be involved, I hope I can pilot through some funding to construct or participate in such a plant.

At this time I can't project whether the request will be to have partial, total, or no government involvement. But we want to move as quickly as we can, because of the very situation that has just been suggested; that is, landfill requirements for things like methyl mercury, and so on.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, just one short question to the minister. I'm sure the minister has been made aware of the representation and opposition as far as Fort Saskatchewan goes. I would like to say that our community certainly does not and would not welcome the building of a plant in that community. I would like to know if the minister can indicate if there are communities that have requested that a facility be built in that community. If the government is really dedicated to diversification and decentralization, maybe there are communities within trucking distance of the major centres where the hazardous chemicals are being produced that would want the facilities. Are there any such communities?

MR. COOKSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. There have been at least two, possibly three letters of encouragement as far as we're concerned, that they would like at least to explore the possibility of such a plant in their general area, providing it meets all our environmental standards. I think, though, at this time I'd prefer not to — in fact, I'd have to have their approval to make those requests public. I think it would be wise at this point not even to divulge those, because you get into the general hassle of rejection before acceptance, and that defeats the purpose.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one question. The minister indicated that at some point the government would be looking at building, assisting to build, or not, as the case may be. Has there been any preliminary discussion between Kinetic Contaminants, for example, and the government of Alberta concerning a partial joint venture or sharing of construction costs of such a site?

I realize it would be inappropriate to release the names of individual communities, although some have already indicated that publicly, and I think it would be inappropriate for this government to do anything further about a site until such time as we get the Environment Council of Alberta report. There's not much point having ECA hearings throughout the province if we're already prejudging what site is in mind. But it would seem to me that perhaps the ultimate location would be based not only on what communities in Alberta are receptive to the idea, but one thing we might look at — and again that is all contingent on the ECA findings — would be some agreement with the federal government for necessary surface rights in the Suffield Block. Again that is assuming, and only assuming, that the ECA makes a recommendation that that would be a reasonable place to locate it.

MR. COOKSON: If the ECA comes in with that we'll certainly explore it, because there has been a facility in

the Suffield Block for some time. DDT was handled in that area. So that's a possibility. We have had discussions. There are probably two private operations that have shown an interest. Of course Kinetic Contaminants Canada Limited initiated the first overtures toward this type of management, and we have had discussions with them. Certainly those discussions have talked about joint or partial and so on. I think they would be conducive to any kind of reasonable proposal we might make. I think the most important thing is what the public would like us to do. I think that is the significant thing, not so much what Contaminants would accept or reject. What the public wants us to do is the important part of it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, just one further question. Presuming that the government of Alberta decides to go into some kind of joint venture — and I guess that's highly speculative at this stage — would there be any possibility of other provinces co-operating with us in the partial funding of this?

MR. COOKSON: That hasn't been explored in terms of a plant. We have said to the other provinces, and I've stated to them personally, that we don't want to be the catch-all for environmental problems in other provinces. But there may be another way of handling the problem. Because Alberta presumably has 60 per cent of the industrial wastes, and this is going to escalate at a rapid pace, naturally Alberta should be initiating work on the problem.

What we have talked to other provinces about is the possibility of sharing storage facilities, and the door is not closed on that. For example, there may be some material here, such as methyl mercury, that can't be handled with high heat and so on. Saskatchewan might be willing to find a location for permanent storage of that material in exchange for some substance we can handle for them through possibly high temperatures. So that reciprocal arrangement is open, and we're certainly open to any suggestions on that issue on the part of the other provinces.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Has the minister explored with industry or in this study that's going on the possibility of industries being able to deal with their own wastes on their own grounds so that they don't ship them off somewhere else? The plant is totally independent, on its own. The private company would monitor what happens to the wastes, store them in the necessary facilities. I believe that somewhere in the world this is done. Is that being explored by the minister, and has it some possibilities?

MR. COOKSON: Yes, I think it is fair to say we are exploring that more all the time. In any new industry that's developing, as far as Environment is concerned, we'll want to know in terms of the permit and licence. We want to follow through and know as part of that process what is to happen with any industrial waste they may have. So that's being upgraded all the time. CIL was an example of a long-standing plant that there was no way of regulating.

The other point I'd like to make is that if the Environment Council of Alberta recommends a high-heat unit for disposal of some of the industrial wastes we have, and the province is involved and proceeds in terms of funding and whatever, I would like to see us make it clear to the industries that concurrently with the construction of such

a plant, we would establish regulations which would zero in on all industries and require them to account to us for any industrial wastes they might have and how they propose to dispose of them. I think that would help us, and it would help them. At the present time they stay pretty low key because of the risk of shut-down and all the other problems associated with their industry. But if we can show them our sincerity in encouraging construction of a plant using high temperatures and other methods to dispose of their problem product, I'm sure they'll co-operate with us in terms of regulations which will make them accountable for any industrial waste they might have.

Agreed to:

2.6 — Waste Management

\$2,915,054

2.7 Chemical and Pesticide Management

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to ask the minister one or two questions on the 2,4-D spill. In light of the fact that a large greenhouse operation in my constituency has received quite a lot of 2,4-D, at this time we're having a little difficulty trying to establish if it was from the spill, from the mop-up, or from the plant in the area. Is the minister aware of the situation, and can he report to the committee?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, if I could find the right sheet of paper; it's got to be here somewhere. Yes, we are aware of the problem. We haven't been able to pinpoint what caused it. At the present time our people are still exploring it. It was a major loss for the greenhouse concerned. It might have got into the greenhouse through water supply; we haven't even been able to clarify that. Greenhouse plants, as you know, in particular tomatoes — all they have to do is have a smell from a mile away, and that's it for tomato plants. Unless I find something further here, I guess that's about all I can respond.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I believe most of the material was collected and taken back to the Dow plant, but was the ground around the spill deposited in the Clover Bar sanitary landfill site? Has this been investigated to see if it was possibly the source of the contamination?

MR. COOKSON: Yes, you're thinking in particular of the recent truck upset. We found no relationship between that and the amount that was placed in the Clover Bar sanitary landfill. We don't think there was sufficient there to cause a problem. As far as we know very little, if any, found its way into the sewer system of the city, so we think we've effectively corralled it in that respect. There is just no answer for some of these things.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Can the minister indicate who will be responsible for the damage that's been inflicted to the greenhouse operator? Has anybody resolved that slight problem?

MR. COOKSON: No, I don't think it's been resolved. I'm not responsible.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, it always unnerves me to think that we always start looking for somebody else who caused the problem. It's very difficult for a private firm,

quite often a small firm, to suffer a loss, and it could be a very substantial loss in this case. I would just like to indicate to the minister that I think it would be very nice if somebody said, let's go to bat for this fellow. It usually ends up that the big people keep throwing the ball back and forth, and the little guy gets caught in a squeeze play.

So I would just like to say to the Minister of Environment and the minister responsible for Disaster Services, let's be on the side of the person who was affected. If there has to be a claim against someone, let's be on the side of the guy making the claim. That's my pitch to the minister.

Agreed to:

2.7 — Chemical and Pesticide Management \$1,214,073
Total Vote 2 — Pollution Prevention and

Control \$55,217,150

Vote 3 — Land Conservation:

3.1 — Program Support \$91,884
3.2 — Land Conservation and Reclamation \$1,900,078

33 — Land Assembly

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, just before we go on with Vote 3.3, I wonder if the minister could outline . . . There's a substantial reduction over last year's forecast. If I'm not mistaken, would this particular section deal with some of the land obtained for Fish Creek park? Would it also include land being purchased for the Red Deer River dam? Perhaps the minister could give us a little clearer breakdown. I see we still don't have the breakdown in the elements, so if we could have that please.

MR. MAGEE: Mr. Chairman, also in this vote I would like to explore with the minister the restricted development management area. I would like specifically to bring to his attention that within the city limits of Red Deer there's an area known as the Gaetz Lakes sanctuary. This is an environmentally sensitive area of about 230 acres. It has two finger lakes located on it. It's located close to an escarpment which is heavily treed and is backed up by the Michener Centre property, which is fenced. It provides a great location for flora and fauna. Studies of this area have been made through the years, and there have been counts of as many as 100 different species of birds and about 130 different types of plants. This land is adjacent to our large composite high school and vocational school in Red Deer, and for years has been used by the biology teachers as an instruction or interpretive area for the students in teaching botany.

However, of late there seems to be quite an encroachment on the area by many people going onto it with snowmobiles, running through the fauna, and creating problems in that area. While this property was owned for years by the old Public Works Department, as of last April it was transferred to the Department of Energy and Natural Resources. It is my understanding that when it becomes the property of that department it comes under the jurisdiction of the Department of Environment.

So my question of the minister is: has any thought been given to protecting some of these environmentally sensitive and interpretive areas by some sort of person control, fencing, chain link fence, or things of this nature? It seems to me that some of these areas are dying out around our province. Certainly it would be an area that should be protected, in my opinion, within the city of

Red Deer, not only for this generation but for future generations. It's been well established for at least 50 or 60 years, if not longer, when it was at one time given to the provincial government, I believe, and then changed back into the provincial government's hands.

I would like the minister to comment, if he would, not only on this particular piece of property but maybe others of a like nature.

MR. COOKSON: To answer the Member for Spirit River-Fairview first, the extreme increase in the forecast for '79-80 from the estimate — it goes from \$13 million to \$44 million — is primarily land that has been purchased in the restricted development areas of both Calgary and Edmonton. But the other major, I guess 75 per cent of that total, is the Dickson dam west of Red Deer. It also includes the purchase of some grazing reserve land, some forestry and woodlot purchases, and some recreational lands in some of the other areas.

Perhaps it overlaps a little bit on the comments made by the Member for Red Deer to do with the responsibility of Environment in terms of land purchase. The Department of Environment does practically all the land buying for all the departments with the exception of Transportation, which buys its own land for right of way. If I get a request from Public Lands or Recreation and Parks to purchase for some particular purpose, we proceed to purchase through our organization within the Department of Environment. Those are two of the major areas, plus what Environment itself has to purchase for its own use.

We attempt to budget for this as well as we can, but some unforeseen factors come into it; for example, the Dickson dam is a classic, where we've proceeded to purchase as rapidly as we could. We had to approve that by special warrant because we couldn't project just how quickly we could move. Also in the area of utility corridors, which we're working on, we're finding that we have to spend large amounts to attempt to handle them.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

I think if we've had instructions to purchase in the Red Deer area — and perhaps the Member for Red Deer could clarify this; I just missed the point — there would be no reason for Environment necessarily to own any land in the area, unless it was necessary for some environmental reason. We can control that through our environmental Act, where we pass what are called restricted development areas. We don't actually have to own the land; we can simply place that caveat on it. Then in a sense we supervise any changes. We don't necessarily reject, but we supervise.

In the case of Red Deer, I may have had a request through one of the ministers concerned to purchase land for some reason or another, maybe by Public Lands. Perhaps they could respond better to this. It would then come under Energy and Natural Resources and the associate minister. Unless there's some special reason for Environment's owning it, I would presume it's under their name and has been requested by them. You might want to clarify that.

MR. MAGEE: It is my understanding that it is owned by the Department of Energy and Natural Resources. But my question is regarding the potential loss of an area which is very highly sensitive to people traffic, and preservation of the flora and fauna unique to that particular

area, in fact probably unique to many parts of the province. It is a resource that I think should be protected to a greater degree than it currently is. My question was whether there would be any means of funding for fencing and so on, in order to continue to protect this particular area.

MR. COOKSON: It will be under the name of Energy and Natural Resources, and it's their responsibility. So I agree. I know the particular area. I think the member would probably be best to address that department as to protecting the flora and fauna.

I just want to correct the Member for Spirit River-Fairview. I had presumed the extra costs here were largely due to the Dickson. Let me correct that: 75 per cent of the land for the Dickson dam has been purchased. Of the nearly \$45 million, about 75 to 85 per cent of the expenditure was for restricted development areas, excluding Fish Creek, which would come under the heritage savings trust. The three major purchasers in government: Transportation, Alberta Housing, and Environment.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could just be a little more specific. I realize now that Fish Creek would come under the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Has there been a settlement on that with respect to the Mannix property? While that presumably could be dealt with next fall, it's a matter of some public interest, and we might be interested in finding out what that is now.

I like to know, Mr. Minister, what portion is associated with the Dickson dam. The minister indicated 75 per cent of the increase was with respect to the restricted development areas, excluding Fish Creek park. How much of that increase was related directly to the Dickson dam? Has the land now been acquired for the dam?

MR. COOKSON: Well, I might be able to take a minute or two to find the breakdown. I can say this, though. I guess in the area of 80 per cent of the Dickson dam property has been purchased — somewhere in there — and some of it pending. So we're very close. I don't think we have as yet had to proceed to any expropriation provision. What was the ...

MR. NOTLEY: Do we have a settlement on the Mannix property in Fish Creek?

MR. COOKSON: There's no settlement; they're still going through the inquiry stage. I could probably answer better on that, hopefully, by fall when we get into Heritage Savings Trust Fund estimates.

Agreed to.

3.3 — Land Assembly	\$6,286,950
3.4 — Environmental Assessment	\$1,299,174
Total Vote 3 — Land Conservation	\$9,578,086

Vote 4 — Water Resources Management:

4.1 — Program Support	\$71,437
4.2 — Surface Water Development and Control	\$22,401,337

4.3 — Regulatory and Regional Advisory Services

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure exactly which section one asks this question on, but I do want to know, and I'm sure the Member for Stettler would like to know

also, when we will get a feasibility study of the proposed Heatburg coal field generating plant, and what impact that will have on Buffalo Lake. At the same time, the minister can possibly tell us what the future is for Buffalo Lake in the Stettler area. In light of the fact that the water's been going down in that lake, maybe he can just give us a run-down on what the rationale was for the drawing of water from the lake during the winter to be used in drilling rigs. That's the start.

MR. COOKSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, dealing first of all with Buffalo Lake, we have done a fair number of engineering studies on the feasibility of possibly pumping water from the Red Deer River to the lake, for example, in an attempt to stabilize the level of the lake. There's a lot of concern. Apparently there's a lot more concern now than there was some time ago. We had proceeded to a certain stage, and then looking at the total cost and the fact that we have a policy around these lakes which says, in effect, that the province must own a minimum percentage, 25 per cent or whatever, of the lake shore ... That's one of the provisions under our policy. The other is that the operation maintenance of whatever capital cost the province incurs must be worked out and prorated in some way between the municipalities concerned.

When we looked at that total thing, we recognized that there are some obstacles in the way of setting up a practical way of pumping water at that great height in attempting to stabilize the lake. So I decided, arbitrarily I guess, that we wouldn't do any further engineering — that is, the next stage of engineering, which involved \$150,000 to \$200,000 — unless we were absolutely sure that the people in the area would be committed too, to whatever we were facing in terms of operation maintenance. Since that time, there have been a number of letters and submissions. The hon. Member for Stettler has certainly done his part; he has made a number of submissions to me. However, in Environment we haven't budgeted or shifted from our original position yet.

Two or three other areas we are exploring may have some bearing on what could be developed. One of them is the Heatburg coal development, or the Ardley coal development. I understand at the present time that the company, Fording Coal, has just made in the last while, or is making, an application to the ERCB to have it give some consideration to a development on the north side of the river, which would be the Ardley coal development. If through the hearing process, et cetera, they were successful in obtaining permission to do this — and they are mostly interested in the export of power — then there is some possibility that the blow-down water, in other words the use of water by the power plant, which is a high consumer for thermal power — there's nothing wrong with it, except it's a high temperature — could be held and concurrently transferred into Buffalo Lake. Two things could be accomplished at once. You would assist in stabilizing the lake and, in addition, that would cost to the company, to government, or both, of raising the water initially. Secondly, there was a possibility we might be able to channel part of the water through Alex Lake, a small lake in the general area that needs stabilizing. Also, we have some problems with water supply for a community there called Mirror, and we might be able to help them at the same time.

So those are two projects out there. They're not dead, but they're not too lively either. That's the stage there, Mr. Chairman.

Finally, with regard to seismic and other use of water

out of the lakes, through our water resources legislation we require a permit to remove water. We monitor the amount. I guess, generally speaking, we found that the amount being used is so insignificant in terms of the total body of water that we've allowed this to happen — not only in the case of Buffalo Lake, but Gull Lake is another classic in my area that I've been hammered about in terms of use of water from the lakes. But it is an insignificantly small amount, and we permit it only if no other logical, practical source is available. So we try to keep that kind of thing under control.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Can the minister indicate how extensively the phase one report on the stabilization program was circulated and made available to the people in the area?

MR. COOKSON: I'll have to have that come from above.

DR. BUCK: The last question I'd like to know is: in light of the fact that the minister felt that an insignificant amount of water was being taken out of Buffalo Lake, did the minister indicate the condition of the lake at this time?

MR. COOKSON: Well, it's up and it's down. It's down more than it's up. The last time it was up . . . It's a little like us old guys, you know. [laughter] The last time it was up was in 1974. [laughter] Now where was I? Well I get lots of help, Mr. Chairman, from the background here.

DR. BUCK: Can you give us some long range plans? [laughter]

MR. COOKSON: There was a major flood in that particular year, and the lake did rise considerably. One of the problems is that it's a large shallow lake. If it increases in depth by one foot, it spreads over the surrounding area by one mile — not quite that severely, but it is a problem in that respect. We in Environment certainly haven't written off the project. It's down, but I don't know whether you can say it's lower than it has been in other years. I know the Member for Stettler must monitor it pretty closely or else be advised by a large number of people as to its fluctuations. As I say, we haven't written off the project. We just have to pick our priorities in terms of participation, also at the local level on the basis of our policy. Hopefully we'll come up with some way of handling the problem.

Agreed to:

4.3 — Regulatory and Regional Advisory Services	\$1,423,496
--	-------------

4.4 — Operation and Maintenance of Water Resources Systems

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. In your earlier remarks you mentioned that money was going to be available to do some work on the headworks of the Little Bow River. Did I hear that correctly, Mr. Minister? Or were you referring to headworks at the Carseland dam area for diversion into the Bow River Irrigation District? These are two different ones. The Little Bow headworks are at High River.

MR. COOKSON: [Inaudible] channel improvement on the Little Bow, I think. I might be able to find it here.

On the stabilization question, the report on Buffalo Lake stabilization was made available to local people, and it's available in the Environment library. We have no recent levels on the lake.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Was that channel work on the Little Bow River?

MR. COOKSON: Yes.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Has the minister got an indication how many dollars that would be, and location? Or is that too much detail at this point in time?

MR. COOKSON: I just can't spot it, but I think I saw somewhere here an expenditure of \$10,000 on channel improvement on the Little Bow. Maybe I can be corrected from above there. The other point I wanted to make was that some of the other major costs will have to await the final approval of the package for the total project out of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund shared costs.

Agreed to:

4.4 — Operation and Maintenance of Water Resources Systems	\$4,706,302
4.5 — Data Collection and Inventory	\$4,327,117

4.6 — Water Resources Planning and Co-ordination

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, before we finish with this particular vote, I want to make some comments with respect to 4.6 and 4.2, because I believe they are related. One is water resources planning and co-ordination, and the other is surface water development and control. Mr. Minister, I see on page 64 of the element book a fairly substantial increase in northern river basins, from \$817,000 last year to \$2,153,000. Now I take it that we're dealing here with overall river basin management studies, or what is the reason for that increase?

MR. COOKSON: Which vote is it? 4.2?

MR. NOTLEY: We're talking about 4.6 at this time, and if you'll look in the element book on page 64.

MR. COOKSON: I could just respond to that quickly. The large expenditure in 4.6 has to do with the Slave River planning project. We estimate at this time that it will involve approximately \$10 million total, with all the consultant work that has to be done in the Slave River study in the northern part of Alberta. A large part of that allocation will be towards that. Two costs are coming out of 4.2. One is the Vermilion dam, and the other is expenditures towards the Dickson dam.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make some comments with respect to 4.2. I was busy looking up the element book when we came to it, but I think it is in a sense related to 4.6. I could wait until we get to the total vote if you wish, whichever is most convenient. I can do it right now.

Mr. Chairman, the major reason we have an increase in 4.2 is basically the Dickson dam. Mr. Minister, on page 63 of the elements, the increase for construction of water resource projects is very modest, from \$9,382,000 to

\$9,639,000, an increase of about \$240,000 or about 2.5 per cent. I was interested in the remarks the Member for Vegreville made today with respect to water resources projects, and I think they were appropriate. He raised the point that if it can be 86:14 for irrigation in southern Alberta, why not 86:14 in northern Alberta? That point has been made in this House before, and I'd just second it.

But today, because of such a small increase in the construction budget, in actual fact we're going to find that many projects which are ready to go but are just awaiting funding, aren't going to be able to get off the ground, Mr. Minister, because of this very, very modest increase. First of all, I would just argue that I think at the very least we should be keeping pace with inflation. I'm sure all northern Alberta MLAs have had numerous requests for water resource projects in their respective constituencies. But we aren't even moving toward an 86:14 formula. We're in a situation now where, quite frankly, Mr. Minister, we aren't holding past performance. We're going to be pushed back because of increased costs, so that less work will be done with that \$9,600,000 budget this year than with a \$9,400,000 budget last year.

So I would say to the minister: why such a modest increase? I'm sure the minister is well aware of the projects on the drawing board that, frankly, are awaiting funding to proceed. It seems to me that we've been extremely cautious here. There's a very substantial overall increase, but the bulk of that increase is associated with the one project in Red Deer, which we won't get into now. But in the area of overall water resource construction throughout northern Alberta, we won't be keeping pace with what we did last year.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether I can put together all the projects being proposed. I recognize the discrepancy in funding and the fact that a large portion will go towards the construction of the Dickson dam. We attempt to spread the funding as fairly as possible throughout the province. Other projects are going on; for example, the Paddle River project is not even in these estimates because it's from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. That total project, which deals with massive control over flooding, et cetera, is part of the work being done in the north. In addition, we have a number of smaller projects which deal with drainage. They're not costly ones, and they're joint-shared. Again the major Slave Lake project is from the heritage savings trust.

I don't know whether I can say much more, other than that we do the best we can to get as much as we can for the dollar. I'm not sure whether I can give you any further breakdown here.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm not asking for a breakdown, because there would be a myriad of projects in almost every constituency. I can think of all the projects in improvement districts 19, 20, and 21, for example, that would be subject to cost-sharing.

I guess the point I'm making, Mr. Minister, is that we're really dealing here with drainage projects in northern Alberta. There's a very strong feeling throughout the north among most local government officials that we should have the same general guidelines, if you like, for water resource projects — 86:14 — as we have for irrigation projects in the south. I think the Member for Vegreville raised that this afternoon. I appreciated your re-

sponse, although I would say the matter has been subject to review now for several years by the government. I would like to see us move beyond the review and recognize that land that is reclaimed because water is drained from it is just as valuable as land that is brought into production because water is delivered to it. If 86:14 can apply in one case, 86:14 can apply in another. That's a philosophical argument. I would hope we'd have the government take some position on it soon.

But my major concern in the estimates we're voting is that quite apart from worth-while projects like the Slave Lake project, the fact is that a lot of the smaller drainage proposals that have to be cost-shared with municipalities or IDs still cannot go ahead because the funding isn't there. I would just make the pitch to members of the Assembly and to members of the Treasury Board that, in fact, more money should be made available for this kind of program. It is a very worth-while program, one that's widely supported, and one which, frankly, when we really look at the facts, will probably slip back marginally because a 2.5 to 3 per cent increase won't keep pace with construction costs, especially in northern Alberta this year. So it means that we're going to be doing a little less this year than we did the year before. That's unfortunate. I would hope we can substantially improve the budget over the long run.

Agreed to:

4.6 — Water Resources Planning and Co-ordination	\$4,716,770
4.7 — Groundwater Development	\$1,119,258
4.8 — Water Rights Administration	\$873,781
Total Vote 4 — Water Resources Management	\$39,639,498

5.1 — Environmental Research Co-ordination	\$1,105,611
5.2 — Alberta Oil Sands Environmental Research	\$2,000,000
Total Vote 5 — Environmental Research	\$3,105,611

Total Vote 6 — Overview and Co-ordination of Environment Conservation	\$1,167,000
---	-------------

7.1 — Program Support	\$1,786,155
7.2 — Plant Sciences	\$1,029,871
7.3 — Chemistry	\$2,864,847
7.4 — Animal Sciences	\$1,493,747
7.5 — Environmental Technology	\$1,664,038
Total Vote 7 — Interdisciplinary Environmental Research and Services	\$8,838,658

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I asked the question with regard to potential diseases and so on from air-planes, and put into landfills in both Calgary and Edmonton. I wonder if the minister has any detail on that yet.

MR. COOKSON: Yes. We have had discussions with the federal government on African swine fever and trash disposal. Again, hopefully they will provide incineration of intercontinental wastes. As yet we have received no reply to requests to provide incineration, and that's the stage that's at.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, if I could move on to a different topic. Is it possible under provincial legislation to order that kind of thing to be done, so that there's

just no question, so we as Albertans have no concern that any kind of disease or epidemic could get into Alberta? If you look back to 1952, historically, I think we found that uninspected meat in Saskatchewan caused all our hoof and mouth epidemic. I guess someone just didn't check their work out or look after the health measures as they should have, and it cost us a billion dollars then. This could be equally as bad. Again, I'm urging the minister. Maybe the minister hasn't got this information. But if it's under provincial legislation, I'd certainly recommend that we give some deadlines and say, look, that has to be looked after, and that's it.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, it's a good point. I think we're overlapping the responsibilities of the Minister of Agriculture, but I'll certainly take that as notice and pursue it. It may even be into the area of public health. But the only way I can respond is just with the information I have right now. I'll certainly follow through on it. If the member would like a response at a later date, I can get that for him.

Several other questions were asked. I guess the Leader of the Opposition raised — was it with regard to Area 14 co-ordinating council? Al Muzyka, chairman. This has to do with Gainers being relocated. We've responded, and I think I said that initially. The hon. Leader of the Opposition asked if the minister was considering the suggestion of a joint committee of the province and the city of Edmonton. Just in the last few days we've had a letter from the city of Edmonton. We're looking at this kind of committee, not dealing just with Gainers but with the total problem of odor industries.

"Is the minister in a position to advise other large urban centres with regard to odor-producing ..." Normally we do have input to municipalities regarding odor-producing industrial plants. They have to comply with The Clean Air [Act]. However, it has to be said here that the location of an industry is the responsibility of the municipality concerned. We simply apply our environmental standards. In other words, if they locate an industry, it has to be subject to approval by Environment. That's where we take over.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

"Has the minister's department investigated the possibility, or the should I say the incident of incompatible industries located within an urban/industrial/residential community?" We've done this. One we dealt with was the Edmonton Rendering plant, which was finally relocated in an area outside Edmonton.

Finally, "Is the minister prepared to release the ... criteria for the location of odor-producing industries?" We can provide that information.

Agreed to:
Department Total \$121,090,649

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the \$121,090,649 be recorded.

[Motion carried]

Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. minister wish to make any comments?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, as I sit here and listen to the dimension of dollars which are flashing before our eyes — my colleague the Minister of Environment with his \$120 million — I am pleased that in this, the sixth budget which I've had a chance to bring before the Assembly, it's a distinct pleasure to have the smallest spending department. That is not to say, however, that in fact we are not ... [interjections] That does not diminish the importance of the department, sir.

I might point out that we continue to be a non-program department, a policy consultation department. Although the past year was not particularly characterized by a lot of activity in intergovernmental affairs, primarily because of the spate of elections across our country — two federal elections and several provincial elections — I must say that our department continued to maintain its position to, I think, lead among other federal and intergovernmental affairs departments in Canada. I note as well that as a result of at least two of those elections, other provinces have emulated our province and have established intergovernmental affairs departments. I think we now have a very important network across Canada to allow us to carry on these important consultations. I know that in the next year, with a federal government which has a mandate for slightly longer than the last, we can see much more in the area of intergovernmental affairs through the next four years. Once again, I hope that Alberta's position will be in the forefront.

I ask, Mr. Chairman, for something in the order of \$3,129,615.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I appreciate what the minister has said, but one of the things I've often said to the minister, and I get this from the Provincial Treasurer — I remember prior to 1971 he always said to us: on to Ottawa and get the job done; go down there and tell them what to do. Now the minister has sort of said he appreciates that he has low budget and is doing some things, and others see the light of their ways in establishing the same kind of department. I wonder if the minister could just tell us what kinds of things he does, so we really know. I haven't heard any specifics at all.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I'd be glad to provide a broad outline for the Member for Little Bow. Typically the role of Intergovernmental Affairs historically has focussed to a great extent, I believe, on the questions of revenue sharing and established program financing, the areas of equalization: essentially the fiscal arrangements which affect all of Canada. As you well know, these important negotiations were essentially carried out at conferences among ministers and among first ministers. To a great extent these fiscal arrangements are the fundamental sharing forms which are now in place, and which now provide the provinces and the federal government to deal on the fiscal side. It's my belief that in the next four years the fiscal matters will perhaps not be quite as important as at least five other areas which I have outlined in my own mind.

Mr. Chairman, I would just note four or five items for the member's benefit. If I were in his position, I would ask the same questions, because it's always interesting to know what this department is doing. First of all, I think there'll be a substantial focus on economic matters relating to the structure and the development of our economy. As you've seen over the past three years, the provinces have taken a very high role and established an important

profile in the negotiations of trade relations on behalf of Canada from a provincial point of view. I think these kinds of structural questions, particularly the question of trade and tariffs, will bring much more to the intergovernmental conferences as we pursue our own economic priorities and ensure that these are reflected within the national framework. At the same time I think we'll be much more concerned with the mobility of people and capital, particularly into Alberta where the rate of real capital formation and investment is beyond that of other provinces.

Secondly, there is no question that the energy issues will be at the forefront of intergovernmental negotiations. We are all well aware that the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources will be commencing those negotiations very soon. Clearly, this is an important area of intergovernmental negotiations.

Thirdly, I think we can look at the other macroeconomic areas, in particular the question of monetary policy. The members of the opposition have, over the past few months, questioned us on how we're dealing with the monetary issues. I think more and more the premiers have expressed the point of view that they need to be consulted and have input into national monetary policies and formulations, because these do affect the economic objectives and, to some extent, interfere with the objectives of the provinces. So I think there'll be much more negotiation in the case of monetary policy. As well, the questions of inflation and unemployment must be those other macroeconomic problems which will be dealt with by Intergovernmental Affairs ministers.

I mentioned the revenue-sharing question, the tax equalization established program financing — these are some of the fiscal arrangements which will continue.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the whole question of national unity will be at the forefront of our discussions. So, in the broad sense, those are the broad programs we will deal with.

Specifically, I can mention some of the institutions of Intergovernmental Affairs now in place which I have attended over the past year, in particular the Continuing committee of Ministers on the Constitution, which commenced operation under the Conservative government and attempted to establish a set of priorities which at least were in agreement, so we could find constitution commonality among the provinces to initiate discussion. At the same time, we have continued to place very high emphasis on the western premiers' conference, and we'll continue to work towards that objective. We believe there is now a strong, unified voice on behalf of western Canada, and those meetings will continue to have high priority. As you well know, we had hoped for a national economic conference that would have been held in December 1979. However, the election was called the night before, and of course that was deferred.

So those are some of the items. We continue to work on a day to day basis with intergovernmental items such as agreements for wharves on some of our lakes, which are really in the area of national jurisdiction, and some of the social cost-sharing programs we're dealing with. These are what might be described as routine or program decisions which we deal with on a day to day basis, and continue to make sure there's a consistent policy on behalf of the province of Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY: I wonder if we can perhaps discuss the second-last point, which I think is by far the most important; that is, the question of national unity. Mr.

Chairman, I would like the minister to be as specific as he can be. This matter has been raised in question period, but I think the estimates of the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs give the government an opportunity to be a little more precise before the Assembly than they can be in the question period, where we have the problems of very strict procedural rules in both asking and answering questions.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I'd like the minister to outline very clearly to the committee what role he sees the government of Alberta playing in this crucial referendum debate. The Premier of Saskatchewan has gone to Quebec and has taken at least several speaking engagements in that province. There's been a good deal of speculation about Premier Lougheed travelling to Quebec. But as I recall his response in question period, he indicated that only if it would deal with an energy question or if he were invited. I would presume that the invitation is a standing invitation. If what I read in the press is correct about Mr. Ryan's position, the leader of the "no" forces would very much like to have the Premier of this province participate in the referendum in some way.

Mr. Chairman, I know we began this discussion in a humorous vein, but I don't think any of us can be terribly light-hearted about the next three weeks in the province of Quebec. The very future of the country is going to be determined in that referendum. I realize it's a difficult judgment call to make. I know that the argument can be raised that if people from Alberta — the Premier or the minister, but particularly the Premier — were to take part in the debate in Quebec, that could be seen as intervention which, in fact, would create a backlash that would help the *oui* forces.

On the other hand I think it is very important that the people of Quebec are clear when they vote on the 20th that we in Alberta very, very much want the people of Quebec to stay in Confederation. While it's worth while that we've had the People to People petition — and I certainly applaud the work of people like Mrs. Forest who have gone to a lot of trouble to organize this excellent petition — and while it was useful to have several members of the Alberta Legislature go to Quebec City a week ago, there really isn't anyone who can convey the overwhelming sentiment of Albertans on this question of saying to our fellow Canadians in the province of Quebec in a spirit of generosity that we want you to stay with us. I just have a feeling that there is a danger of people in the rest of Canada playing it so cool that in fact we lose what is perhaps the most important referendum ever in the history of Canada.

So I would like to have the minister perhaps begin discussion tonight on just what role this government perceives itself playing over the next three weeks. As I've said before, while there probably were a few smiles when we began the estimates, we really can't smile about the next three weeks. It's a very, very difficult time in Canadian history. We are not facing a group of amateurs in Quebec. Mr. Levesque is a very able person, a person with tremendous credibility. And rightly so. He's championed the cause of the Quebecois all his life and is a man of enormous integrity. I think he just happens to be very seriously wrong on this issue.

I think that sense of passion we have in other parts of Canada must somehow be conveyed to the people of Quebec. It's not just an academic question. It's not just an economic question. There is a passionate desire on the part of Albertans, Saskatchewanites, British Columbians,

Ontarians, and Nova Scotians that the people of Quebec vote no on the 20th.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I certainly would not be one who would suggest for a second that the referendum and the very difficult times in which our country has been placed primarily as a result of the election of the PQ government in Quebec are something that any of us can take in a light vein or with a casual attitude. I can assure the Assembly that that has not been our position. In fact we have spent a substantial amount of time dealing with this issue. I know it would be repetitive to outline what we have done, but in responding to the member's question perhaps that is the best way in which we can do it. I will essentially collapse my comments to deal with the last year, or year and a bit, probably moving from the Malbaie conference, Point au Pic — the premiers' conference held in Quebec — into what is today's current time frame.

Before I begin, however, I want it to be very clear that while the newspaper has carried the comment that Mr. Ryan would extend an invitation to the Premier, to the best of my knowledge that has not happened. That was one of those communiques which might be an aside, that was picked up and perhaps played out of proportion. At this point, as far as I know, the Premier has not received that formal invitation to come to Quebec and to speak on behalf of the pro-federalist cause. So we should have that on the record.

Let me just recall what I consider to be the framework or the difficult conceptual problems which I think all politicians faced in Canada. Quite clearly I agree with the hon. member that it was a very difficult time. On one hand you thought you were making a very strong defence of Confederation, expressing this very emotional feeling which you thought was important to convince the people of Quebec, to communicate in an effective way that you wanted them to stay within Confederation: to suggest that there were more pros than cons, that their way was not the solution but in fact the solution to our Confederation was within the constitutional framework, certainly not the status quo but working toward a change within the constitutional system. I think the province of Alberta had indicated very clearly a very definite and strong commitment to pursue that end: Harmony in Diversity, attendance at various conferences, et cetera.

But in the case of Malbaie — and of course you can recognize the context of the Premier of Quebec hosting it — I think the province of Alberta took a strong position. I'm sure I'm not speaking out of class when I suggest that our Premier actually said to the Prime Minister of Quebec: Mr. Levesque, what are you going to do with this question: how do you plan to handle it? In fact challenged him on his own ground. I think it's fair to say that there was some reluctance on behalf of the other politicians there to take that position, to say that within a year we might find that the referendum question couldn't find in favor of the 'pequistes', and what would be left? So from that moment on, I think the way was clear that in fact our Premier and the province of Alberta were in a position to challenge the postulates, the views, the concepts implicit in the understanding presented by Mr. Levesque.

At the same time, I think the work of the western premiers is significant. To my mind, this is a very important group of premiers who express a very strong sentiment on behalf of all Canadians from a western point of view. Since 1977 those comments have been very specific,

very clear, and understood, I think: that in fact the western provinces will not entertain sovereignty and association. To be very clear to the people of Quebec, it has been communicated on several occasions that if you're voting, you're voting for a sovereign state, and it should not suggest to anybody's imagination a renegotiation of the arrangements and an economic association to follow. That has been communicated on several occasions, and I think it has been effectively communicated. In fact, it was restated this past week in Lethbridge; once again this unanimous position was expressed by the western premiers clearly, specifically, to the point, and from my understanding very well understood in Quebec. Over 100 people from the press were there, and certainly a heavy emphasis on the focus on the national unity question.

You mentioned, Mr. Chairman, that the People to People petition was carried out. I think the response was substantial. We had some very distinguished people in our province carrying the petition — that is, carrying the momentum. It was private sector, essentially non-government; we provided a support element. But that did engender a response from at least 100,000 Albertans, and that was communicated to the people of Quebec.

At the same time we've had significant comments on each of the papers that was presented. On November 6, 1979, when Mr. [Levesque's] paper was presented, we made a very strong comment that it was in fact misleading, that the assumptions were wrong, that it ignored the statements by the western premiers on sovereignty association; and we continued to make these comments. At the same time, when Mr. Ryan's beige paper, if you like, was produced we continued to come in generally in support of it, particularly in terms of the mechanism suggested by Mr. Ryan. We agreed that this was the way in which Confederation could be saved. From Alberta's point of view we certainly agreed with the change or movement away from the status quo: change the constitution and focus on the division of powers. I believe Mr. Ryan recognized the dualism of Quebec, and made some suggestions which I think will require a lot of debate. But at the same time he focused on the area which Alberta did; that is, the division of powers between the federal government and the provincial government.

So I think these are almost an itemized shopping list of things the province of Alberta has done.

Getting down to the specific point of the Premier's going into Quebec, it should be noted that both Mr. Lougheed and Mr. Blakeney were in Quebec before the referendum was called. I think good planning was involved there. I think there was an opportunity for our Premier to communicate directly with the press to spell out what was in his mind, to be shown to be interested in Mr. Ryan's position, to be on his side. Whether the Premier will move in during the current debate is at this point uncertain. As I indicated earlier, we have not received that request. However, we think it is appropriate for Alberta, particularly the Premier, to comment from Alberta on the referendum, and to make whatever comments are necessary, because I believe the Premier is well respected in Quebec and his words are listened to when he speaks.

However, we have not yet received the request to come directly to Quebec and to speak on behalf of the "pro" forces. So at this point there is some speculation as to what our continued strategy would be, if it involves the Premier's direction. But I can say, and I would think the Assembly would agree, that when the occasion was presented, the province of Alberta either took the lead in

expressing the view that sovereignty association was not appropriate, or certainly took whatever other initiative was necessary to communicate to the people of Quebec. Through these next 20-some days we'll continue to do that.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, just to follow along. I take it from the minister's answer that should the Premier of Alberta receive an invitation from Mr. Ryan, that invitation would be looked upon positively?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I think we've already answered that. In fact, quite clearly it would receive a positive response from our point of view. But, as I said, we have not received that.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a couple of brief comments and ask the minister a couple of questions. First of all, I wonder if the minister could offer the House some advice on the value of the referendum. By that I mean, should English Canada and Alberta overreact to the referendum? Should we consider a yes vote tantamount to a desire on the part of Quebec to secede from Confederation? Mr. Minister, I refer to the CBC poll conducted very recently which suggests that voters who are going to be voting for the "no" umbrella group still believe that that is not an acceptance of the status quo, that over half of them would like to see a renewed Confederation. Also, those voters who are voting yes probably believe in a renewed Confederation and see some shock value to English Canada in a yes vote.

I'm trying to make the point that we shouldn't get hysterical, something like the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, in suggesting it's the end of the world. The apocalypse is not about to descend, if English Canada reacts in good faith.

Regardless of the vote, a yes vote or a no vote, the results are substantially the same. It's a clear message to English Canada that we have to renegotiate Confederation. I wonder if the minister could advise the Assembly what the government of Alberta is prepared to do to signal to the rest of English Canada its willingness to negotiate for renewed Confederation at the same time with Quebec. For example, would the minister consider recommending to the Executive Council the calling of a Confederation of tomorrow conference, hosting it in Alberta, or assisting a government in Canada to host a similar conference, without the federal government, to get the provincial governments' response prepared in a period of time following the referendum campaign — and it's very short — basically to prepare English Canada psychologically for the period of hard bargaining that must follow?

Mr. Minister, I'd also like to make just one brief comment. The minister from Calgary Currie — the Member for Calgary Currie; he's not a minister yet — and the Member for Drayton Valley, the Speaker of the Assembly, and I were in Quebec just a little while ago. We had the very clear impression that not only would Mr. Levesque win the referendum — and we are more than convinced now that he will — but that he might well succeed in winning the following election. A scenario that develops is that if English Canada does not bargain in good faith when the ball returns to our court after the referendum, whatever the results, Mr. Levesque will hold his election, saying that the third option isn't viable, that English Canada has not bargained in good faith, and then demand the final referendum, which is implicit in the

referendum question put before the National Assembly. That scenario is that there will be a yes vote on May 20; there will be a Confederation conference where English Canada will rebuff Quebec — this is in the Levesque scenario; hopefully this would not come to pass — followed by a victorious PQ re-election campaign, followed by a final referendum campaign which would take Quebec out of Confederation. So quite clearly, if Mr. Levesque is banking on that scenario, it's in our great interest to prepare ourselves, as Albertans and English Canadians, to bargain in good faith to renew Confederation. That makes that short period right after the referendum all the more critical.

So I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you would consider recommending to Executive Council the holding of a Confederation of tomorrow conference, much like the Robarts conference in the late '60s, to consider ways that English Canada might prepare its case for the people of Quebec before we get into the serious bargaining, which we cannot afford to muffle.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just by way of preliminary remarks, I'd like to say that in my year-plus in this Legislature I've been most impressed with the department which we're discussing at this time and, in a general sense, feel that the allocations we're being asked to provide for that department are definitely worth while, perhaps some of the more worth-while dollars we will vote in this Assembly.

I would like to address some remarks, however, to the question of national unity which both the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview and my hon. colleague the Member for Edmonton Glengarry raised previously. As was mentioned, I was one of the people who had an opportunity to visit the province of Quebec last week. Though I very much appreciated the remarks that my colleague from Edmonton Glengarry made with respect to our impressions of Quebec and his personal knowledge of that province, I must say that I am not completely convinced that (a) the referendum will be lost, and (b) Mr. Levesque will win the subsequent provincial election. I do think there is a possibility of both happening, a better possibility than I would have assumed perhaps a year ago, but it might be a bit strong to write off both at this point in time.

My remarks, however, deal with what we will be doing over the next few weeks with respect to the referendum campaign and, more generally, Confederation itself. I personally believe that this government's approach to the referendum question — that primarily being a need for a restructured Confederation in which all provinces will have a chance to play a role which will make them take advantage of the resources, the culture, and the heritage of their area, and still share with the rest of the nation those things which they logically should share — is the correct, the positive, and the responsible direction which should be taken over the long run with respect to the referendum question and the question of separation.

My question, though, is with respect to any specific monitoring devices we currently have in operation regarding the current referendum and, following that, the opinions of the people of the province of Quebec and how we may best assist them in understanding our point of view and our desire to work with them.

Secondly, following on the heels of the question raised by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, is it the government's position that we stand ready to supply any kind of resources needed within reason to the federalist

forces in that province within the next three weeks, with the idea of assisting them to win that referendum question?

While I'm making preliminary remarks, Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could just ask one other question totally unrelated to this matter; that is, with respect to the area of responsibility held by the hon. Minister of State for Economic Development — International Trade. I've not got clear in my own mind how the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs interfaces with that department, what initiatives the department we're discussing currently takes with respect to international trade, and how that interfaces with the area co-ordinated by the hon. member I mentioned earlier in terms of economic development and trade.

Those are the questions I have. Again, I'd like to say I think the allocations are well designed. My personal primary concern in the area of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs at this juncture over the next month is, of course, with respect to the referendum question, and I look forward to the minister's further comments on that topic.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, certainly I appreciate not only the input but the contribution to the discussion with respect to Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs by my two colleagues. There is no doubt that implicit in the questions is a certain amount of speculation. I think we can probably share some of the speculations, or scenarios as the Member for Glengarry describes them, but I would not want to be held to any preciseness when it comes to predictions. I'm sure that's understood.

The post-referendum period in fact will be a very difficult period. I guess we have the two options: the yes vote and the no vote. And if you're Social Credit, it will be a maybe vote. Through our debate in this Assembly on the resolution introduced by the member Mr. Anderson, we suggested that to us the no vote would signal to the rest of Canada the time for constitutional change. It would be the most flexible of the alternatives before the people of Quebec. I think this position has also been argued by Mr. Trudeau. It is one of the few times I have agreed with the position he has taken, but we're very close. In fact, I think we spoke on the same day on the same topic. So that has been our position, and that's the message we're trying to communicate.

If you deal with the yes question, it becomes more complex. I'm not altogether sure what the yes vote really means. That is probably the feeling of uncertainty which is facing the people of Quebec today. For example, the western premiers have said that the yes vote means nothing, that they will not negotiate the sovereignty association question, full stop. They will not attend a conference. There is nothing to talk about, because in their view there is no such thing as the sovereignty association question.

In relating his impressions to us, I think the Member for Edmonton Glengarry stated something very clear: with the new federal government in Ottawa, with Mr. Trudeau, a strong Quebecois, representing not just all of Canada but Quebec, there's a certain reassurance. In this case, if the referendum was a significant yes vote, they feel somewhat more secure with Mr. Trudeau there. He won't let anything untoward happen to them, that in fact they have some safety among his cabinet members and his prime ministership. At the same time they have the opportunity — I guess one of the first times — to stand shoulder to shoulder and give a clear expression of their continuing and historic frustration with the current sys-

tem. That's probably the kind of feeling implicit in those who are supporting the yes question. I think to some extent the strong view being expressed or argument being made is that we do have a chance in Quebec to stand shoulder to shoulder and to make a strong suggestion for change. Of course the Premier goes on to state: well, don't be too alarmed by this simple yes vote; really all we're doing is asking for the right to negotiate.

Two other important events could intervene before sovereignty took place; in particular, an election, as properly pointed out, and possibly a second referendum in which the clear question would be put. But I think all of that is a bit misleading, in fact substantially misleading, on behalf of the government of Quebec. We're attempting to say to the people of Quebec that really you're voting for sovereignty; it's a separate state, and you have to take the economic risks that go with that.

In terms of conferences in the post-referendum period, the province of Alberta suggested — and it's in the communique of the western premiers' conference this past week — that we would suggest to the federal government that they should convene a constitutional conference as soon after the referendum as possible, so we can show that we're willing to initiate changes and come up with some real changes which recognize the dualism in Quebec. That's going to require some give and take from all provinces, and I think we in Alberta are prepared to make that commitment at this point.

In terms of Confederation, a conference of tomorrow, my own view at this point is that we'll probably not move in that direction, simply because you need the federal government to be a part of the conference. I would think that a national constitutional conference, first ministers' level, would certainly be appropriate, and we could clearly see what the indications of our colleagues across Canada would be. I might just note that the Prime Minister as well has indicated in his throne speech his willingness to deal with constitutional issues. Recently, when he was questioned during his press conference, suggested as well that he would like to reconvene the constitutional conference shortly after the referendum. I might note in passing that the western premiers as well suggested the constitutional conference, directed the Continuing Committee of Ministers on the Constitution to continue its work. Of course we will pursue that direction.

I might note that one other element that has to be considered is the role of the federal government over this period. They have been rather quiet on most issues. There hasn't been any overt movement, with one or two possible exceptions, which would essentially create problems for them as they move into the referendum period. They have been very quiet. They could do such things as deal with the lottery question. They've deferred the energy debate. They have moved on the Public Utilities Income Tax Transfer Act, and to some extent they've moved on the force majeure clause regarding Syncrude. However, those have been essentially focused towards Alberta. Maybe they're not altogether concerned what Alberta does. Those are the two areas where they have initiated new policies, but they have been very careful not to generate any conflict between the provinces while the referendum question is on.

So as far as I recall the question of the Member for Edmonton Glengarry, I appreciate his input. He has some wide experience in Quebec which we can draw on. I do appreciate his comments with respect to the very difficult post-referendum period.

Mr. Anderson did indicate to us a couple of questions which I can react to. I thank him for allowing me to round out my response to the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, Mr. Notley. We are in the process of monitoring, through our bilingual people who are actually living in Quebec at the present time, the kinds of press reactions which are taking place in Quebec. In particular, we're focusing on the communications which, for example, the individual western premiers are making, to see that that message is in fact getting across. If it isn't, if there are some difficulties or some confusions, or some of the key issues are not being mentioned, then we will be recommunicating those in some fashion.

You might note that the Premier did make a speech on energy in Toronto, which talked to a great extent about the forthcoming energy problem — how it was difficult for Alberta, but how we would like to try to settle our differences within a Confederation spirit. There was some intention in there on several reasons, but in fact, that was a communication technique to the people of Quebec. So we are monitoring. We'll do it not only in Quebec by resident people, but in fact we're doing it here through copious review of the French language papers.

In terms of the commitment of our energy and resources, which I think was the term the member used, let me just note in talking about energy, which is important to Quebec, that on a province to province basis we have worked out very closely an incentive arrangement for natural gas pricing to Quebec. I think we have said on several occasions that that would continue as long as they were within Confederation. Now I recognize that the Member for Calgary Currie did not mean energy in that sense; he was talking about the energy of the people. I think I have generally answered that. We would like to contribute our Premier's time in particular. In terms of the allocation of time or responsibility to the House, I think it would essentially be the Premier's time that would be allocated to the pro-Confederation forces within Quebec.

The other question dealt with the separation of responsibilities between Economic Development and Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Generally speaking, I could suggest that any time the relationship is government to government, Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs must be involved. In the case of our two departments, I might note that we have the highest level of co-operation. I think the spirit of joint objective prevails. Whenever my travelling colleague is on the road, one of our people is with him, mostly to learn and to pick up some of his energy and spirit that are clearly expressed around the world, but for us as well to have an insight into the notions of those particular governments so we have a fuller understanding of what that government is doing on a government to government basis. It's very difficult to separate it clearly along those lines, as you can appreciate, because when you meet with an ambassador he may well want to talk about trade as well as other issues. We do work very closely.

I would only note that since Economic Development was formed, subsequent to March 14, 1979, the responsibility we had in FIGA for the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade has been transferred specifically to the responsibility of Economic Development. That was a line responsibility. It was an *ad hoc*, short-term function. The follow-up responsibility for that has essentially been transferred to Economic Development as the lead department, but of course, we continue to play a major role as a subsidiary and complementary department.

So I think it's fair to say that in some of these areas it's difficult to separate them clearly along lines. But in terms of rough criteria, FIGA deals with the government to government negotiations, is closely aligned on the trade side with Economic Development, and generally we work very closely on most of these negotiations. Essentially, trade becomes a government to government negotiation or, conversely, government to government negotiations become trade. So it's not a very clear distinction, but I think we have worked quite effectively to disentangle some of the responsibilities over the past year.

I think that's the schedule of questions to date, Mr. Chairman. I would pause to take others.

MR. NOTLEY: If I can just pursue a couple of comments. I must say I was a little concerned at the pessimistic tone of the assessment by the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry of the prospects for the "no" forces in Quebec. It's not a question, hon. member, of being hysterical; it's a question of being rather concerned. I think that expression of concern is appropriate for this Assembly. But I would not be as pessimistic. The recent polls show that we're looking at approximately 41-41, with 18 per cent undecided. So we should not assume that the cause is in fact lost.

I raise that to the minister, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, because that really does underscore what productive role Canadians who are concerned about the result in Quebec can play. I'd be the first to acknowledge, as I said when I raised the subject, that there is always the danger of the backlash. In any assessment of the role we play, that has to be kept in mind.

But I think it's important to note, Mr. Minister, that while we as Albertans respect the right of the people of Quebec to choose, we must not leave them with the impression that in the right to self-determination we're neutral. We're not neutral. They have the right to choose, but we very much want them to choose to remain in Canada. I think that's the point that has to be made as clearly as possible. I'm not saying it hasn't been made; I think it has. But in this next three-week period, it's important that we keep restating what I might call a generous view of Canada: that it's very important to us that the people of Quebec vote to stay in this country of ours, and that while it's their decision, we're not neutral about how they vote and that we very much want them to stay with us.

The second question is really with respect to — and I think the suggestion by the member from Glengarry was made in a very constructive manner. But a Confederation of tomorrow conference just of the provinces — after a referendum in Quebec, whatever the outcome, yes or no, with the current Parliament in Ottawa and a very able Prime Minister, who himself is a Quebecois — would not be a very wise move. I think the western premiers were right in saying that we want to see an early constitutional conference. I think it's very important that after the referendum, whether it's yes or no, we see some movement. If it is yes, we have to deal with the position that we would not want to negotiate sovereignty and association.

But that doesn't mean we can't negotiate a new constitution. I don't claim to be any expert on the sentiments of the people of Quebec, but from what I've been able to gather, a large percentage of the people who are voting yes are people who basically want to stay in Canada, but want to see their government — if you like, it's almost a strike vote for a stronger negotiating position. That being the case, whatever the result — perhaps it's 51 or 52 per

cent "yes" — I think we should be willing to show movement to hold a conference right away, not simply to say: you voted for sovereignty association; we aren't going to talk at all. I think that would be a very serious mistake.

That doesn't mean that we say, we're going to talk about sovereignty association. I think we'd take Mr. Levesque up on the arguments and rhetoric of his own campaign. Over and over again he's saying to the people of Quebec, give us the mandate to negotiate. Fine. If he gets a yes vote, I think we should be prepared to negotiate a new constitution, but not a constitution based on sovereignty and association. If the "no" win, I think it's equally important that the government of Canada and the provinces move very quickly. Because if we just sort of let things slide by, saying the "no" forces have won and therefore everything can just remain as it was, that would be a serious misreading of the sentiments and the feeling of the people of Quebec.

The other point I would make, Mr. Chairman, is that we must look not only at constitutional change which would examine the distribution of powers — it's a very important aspect; no question about that — but we have to take an open approach to constitutional reform in the broadest sense. The Pepin-Robarts report, for example, raised other questions that would normally not be accepted by members of this Legislature or by Parliament; for example, a form of proportional representation. One of the concerns we all have is that none of our national parties at the moment is really able to speak for all of Canada. You've got the Conservative Party that has no representation in Quebec, with the exception of one member. You've got the NDP without representation in Quebec. You've got the Liberals governing the country with no representation in three provinces. Without saying we will jump on the proportional representation bandwagon, I would argue that we have to go to a constitutional conference with an open mind. We have to honestly search out avenues, in terms of both distribution of power, Mr. Minister, and structural changes in the federal government itself, so that we can make it possible to reconcile the differences within the country, in terms of both the division of powers and the federal political process itself.

But what is key is that on May 21, the levels of government say the verdict is in, but the verdict is not that we will leave things as they are. We can never go back to that comfortable position. It is a question of how quickly we can move to where we want to go rather than leaving things where they were.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had some questions related to the Alberta offices, but as a result of the discussion on the referendum and the constitution, I want to make a few comments. When one looks at the budget of the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, which is just slightly above the postage bill of medicare, one tends not to attach too much importance to it. I suggest that it's a critically important department of government. How swiftly we see things change. Historically in Canada, when political parties have had very weak candidates the tendency has always been to wrap them in the Canadian flag and talk about the constitution. That's how you got them elected. But here tonight we see just the opposite. We're facing perhaps a constitutional crisis in the nation.

I'm a little intrigued by some of the comments of the members who seem to think that the minister has a

crystal ball, and he simply has to look at it and come up with the answers. I don't think members are being very fair in anticipating what the position of the government must be depending on how the referendum vote goes in the province of Quebec. I think a couple of facts perhaps haven't been considered. For example, for the first time in Canada's history we have more Canadians living west of Winnipeg than in the province of Quebec. I think that is very significant. I think too that a question that probably should be addressed is that there are more English-speaking Canadians in Quebec, certainly in Montreal, than the total population in four of our provinces — perhaps five if you look at Manitoba. I, along with other members of the Assembly, wonder who's speaking for them.

The other thing that's tended to bother me is that I've never known governments to hold referendums unless they knew the answer before they held them. So I'm somewhat intrigued by the opinions by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

However, I am very encouraged by the minister's comments about the People to People petition carried forward by Chancellor Forest, Mayor Alger, Mayor Anderson of Lethbridge, and others. I think that gives a clear indication to the people of Quebec in probably the most suitable way, where rank-and-file Albertans stand on the issue — not its government, but the rank and file of the province.

As well, Mr. Chairman, when you consider that the slightly more than 8.5 per cent of Canada's people represented by this Assembly could have made such an impact on the nation with regard to its leadership position on Quebec, that shouldn't go without notice. I think the minister has touched on that several times. Although I don't speak French, there is also a tendency in this Assembly to recognize the uniqueness of Quebec. As I understand it, they call their House a National Assembly, which is very important to the French-speaking people of Canada. They don't have a Premier, they have a Prime Minister. I think it's sometimes difficult for members who refute the position of outsiders coming to Alberta to tell us how to run our affairs, suddenly believing that we should be jumping on bandwagons, going into that province, and telling them how to handle their affairs. I tend to agree with the minister that it's a very, very sensitive area and one that we should approach with caution, particularly at the political level.

Mr. Chairman, the other thing is that I think the minister's office is critically important to the future of Alberta, because not only is the good will of the nation important to Alberta in terms of the fact that we export most of what we produce, either to the rest of Canada or to other countries of the world, but it ties in extremely closely with economics, and really that's our future. I have noted with a great degree of satisfaction the very close relationship between the economic affairs of this province, through both the international minister and the Minister of Economic Development, and the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to reiterate how critically important I as a member of the Assembly view the role of the minister's department. I had the good fortune and privilege of attending the western premiers' conference a week ago at Lethbridge and was very impressed, when I looked at the four premiers and their delegations, at the tremendous degree of preparation of our minister's department — I wouldn't say in structuring the agenda; that was obviously a consensus of the premiers —

but in preparing the facts and figures that were necessary for a successful conclusion to the agenda. I couldn't help but notice the strong leadership displayed by both the minister and the Premier of this province. Let no one make a mistake in western Canada: from my point of view, looking at the four Premiers and the conclusions they came to, indeed the affairs of western Canadians are perhaps in the hands of the four finest leaders in the country.

Thanks very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've had considerable latitude in the debate on this particular vote and the relevance. We get into a discussion of the referendum and a great many other factors that are not relevant to the vote itself. For the rest of the discussion I wonder if we could be more specific.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I was weighing how far I could go after your ruling, sir. Let me just very briefly, weighing carefully the time, comment that I have mixed impressions about the polls. The Member for Spirit River-Fairview spoke on the statistics of the polls, the way in which they're changing, the variation in them, and the amount of undecided vote. I think it would be interesting to see how the polls change as a result of the western premiers' statement. That might be significant. But as you will note, I am not making any speculations about the outcome of those polls, even though I am fascinated by the decision-making through polls. But that's another item.

I think the Member for Spirit River-Fairview expressed a view which is very closely held by me until he came to the question of constitutional changes and some of the institutions which need to be reformed. Outside of a couple of disagreements, I'm sure he is well aware that our province did not make a statement on the Senate reform, which is one of the major institutions proposed for a careful consideration for reformation, change, et cetera. I would, of course, go on record as disagreeing to a great extent on the proportional representation question, but go on to say that if other kinds of electoral reforms could be found, we'd be willing to consider them. I think he has expressed my view entirely that notwithstanding the outcome of the vote, it's important for us to communicate, that we're willing to meet. I think we have done that.

I appreciate as well the comments to my department from my colleague, the gentleman who represents the other part of the city of Lethbridge for which we share responsibilities. Mr. Chairman, I might just go on record as suggesting that I'm very proud of my department. Of course I want to express my appreciation for their effort over the past year, and extend my thanks to that department as well.

Thank you very much.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to change the subject. The minister earlier indicated a comment with regard to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. When Jack Horner was Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, there was an indication in this Assembly at that time that Alberta would be given the federal government's position in the GATT negotiations. It was never concluded in our discussions in this Assembly as to whether Alberta received that information, whether we've had any intensive involvement since that period of time. I believe that's just about two years ago in the negotiations.

Maybe the minister could elaborate more specifically on what Alberta is doing there. What has happened? What are some of the outcomes that have been to our benefit?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I will attempt within the broad areas to outline the process for you. As the member well knows, the negotiations started some time ago with Mr. Strauss on behalf of the United States and several very distinguished economists and diplomats on behalf of Canada. I think the leadership of my colleague who had the responsibility before me was significant in that Canada allowed the provinces, if that's the proper term, to have input in the decision-making process to reflect their own objectives within the GATT negotiations, and moving towards a consensus on behalf of all the provinces as put forward by Canada. However, while they did allow us to make those presentations and to have that view expressed, I would only say that the provinces were not at the table when the negotiations took place. They felt that was their own responsibility. As the member well knows, we now of course have a schedule of tariffs proposed to be implemented over the next few years.

I'd only specifically comment that while we appreciated the co-operation, we did not necessarily recognize all of our priorities. In fact, in the area of petrochemicals, I think it's fair to say that we did not receive the priority we'd wished. However, on the agricultural side, I think it is also safe to say that we did receive some substantial benefits for our exporters of agricultural products to the United States markets. With the leadership of the Economic Development portfolio and my colleague the Minister of State for Economic Development — International Trade, we will continue to pursue bilateral arrangements with the United States on a follow-up basis. That is where our efforts are being directed at the present time.

Agreed to:

1.01 — Minister's Office	\$117,070
1.02 — Administrative Support	\$345,059
1.03 — Intergovernmental Affairs	\$1,230,586
1.04 — Alberta Offices	\$1,229,000
1.05 — Conferences and Missions	\$207,900
Total Vote 1 — Intergovernmental	
Co-ordination and Research	\$3,129,615
Department Total	\$3,129,615

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the votes for Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs for the year ending March 31, 1981, be reported.

[Motion carried]

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981, sums not exceeding the following for the departments and purposes indicated:

Department of the Environment: \$3,544,646, departmental support services; \$55,217,150, pollution prevention and control; \$9,578,086 for land conservation; \$39,639,498 for water resources management; \$3,105,611 for environmental research; \$1,167,000, overview and co-ordination of environment conservation; \$8,838,658 for interdisciplinary environmental research and services.

For the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs: \$3,129,615 for intergovernmental co-ordination and research.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, it's proposed to sit in Committee of Supply again tomorrow evening. At that time we would begin with the estimates of the Department of Recreation and Parks and, if there is time, proceed with Government Services as well.

[At 10:32 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]

