

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**Title: **Friday, May 15, 1981 10:00 a.m.**

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

**head: PRESENTING REPORTS BY  
STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES**

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to table the report of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. This report results from a motion passed by the House earlier in the spring sitting with respect to various electoral boundary problems.

**head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**Bill 211**  
**An Act to Amend**  
**The Alberta Health Care Insurance Act**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 211, An Act to Amend The Alberta Health Care Insurance Act. There are really three basic principles involved in Bill 211: one, the elimination of extra billing by members of the medical profession; two, a system of negotiating fees; and three would be a system of indexing.

**Bill 215**  
**The Small Business Development**  
**Corporation Act**

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 215, The Small Business Development Corporation Act.

The purpose of this Bill is to provide a significant injection of equity funding for Alberta small businesses at a time when debt financing is extremely costly due to high interest rates. The Bill, based upon similar legislation successfully in place in other provinces in this country, will provide an investment vehicle through which government, without direct involvement in small businesses, can provide financial incentives to Albertans to invest in small businesses in Alberta. The Bill will also encourage the continuing diversification of the Alberta economy.

**head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the annual report of the Alberta Hail and Crop Insurance Corporation.

**head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me today to introduce to you, and through you to members

of the Assembly, a group of 30 grade 5 northern Alberta students — a typical group of bright, enthusiastic northern Albertans — who are visiting the Assembly today from the E. G. Wahlstrom school in Slave Lake. Their group leader is Mr. Schmidt, and they're also accompanied by parents Mrs. Adam and Mrs. Brennan. I'd ask the students and the group leaders to rise and receive the enthusiastic welcome of the Assembly.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 21 students from the Round Hill school in my constituency.

For more years than I can remember, I believe this school has each year been bringing their class to view the sittings of this Legislature. And for more years than I dare mention, their teacher Mrs. Ilnicki has accompanied them. They are sitting in the public gallery, and I ask that they rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. KNAAK: Mr. Speaker, this morning it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you and to my colleagues in the House 12 grade 12 students from Harry Ainlay high school, located in the constituency of Edmonton Whitemud. I've had the opportunity to visit Harry Ainlay high school, and it's really one of the fine high schools in the city of Edmonton. I would ask them and their teacher to rise and receive the warm welcome of the House.

**head: MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS****Department of Housing and Public Works**

MR. CHAMBER: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to announce today amendments to the Alberta pioneers' repair program, under which the Department of Housing and Public Works provides grants of up to \$2,000 to our senior citizens for home repairs.

First, we have adjusted the maximum qualifying incomes upwards by \$1,500 per year from \$12,000 to \$13,500, in order to keep pace with general income increases. The second significant amendment we have made will extend the program's eligibility to widows or widowers aged 60 to 64 whose spouse would have been 65 years or older if still alive. These two amendments will increase the number of senior citizens eligible for the program to approximately 12,000 in 1981.

I am pleased to advise that 7,624 senior citizens were approved under the Alberta pioneers' repair program in 1980-81. This brings the total number of seniors who have been given assistance under this program to 35,458 since the program was introduced on July 1, 1979.

**head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Hazardous Agricultural Chemicals**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my first question is to the Minister of Environment. Can the minister report to the Assembly on the problems that occurred in Turner Valley, where schoolchildren were left sick after the schoolyard was sprayed by a weed spray? Can the minister indicate to the Legislature what the Department of Environment is doing in monitoring weed sprays in this province?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, under The Agricultural Chemicals Act, we have very recently established categories of weed sprays and other chemicals of that nature. In categorizing them we have, by regulation, assigned certain responsibilities to individuals who use them. Depending on the category in which they fall, these people require certain kinds of training. At this point, we're simply administering the regulations.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Can the minister indicate what the provincial minister, in conjunction with his federal counterparts, does as to monitoring new sprays as they come on in this classification? Is the minister in a position to indicate if these classifications differentiate chemicals, or is there just a broad, general outline?

MR. COOKSON: We rely on the federal Minister of National Health and Welfare to be responsible for admitting sprays or any new types of chemicals into the country, also with regard to new developments within Canada. Because of their expertise and facilities, it's the responsibility of the federal government to assess and evaluate and, on the basis of the best knowledge available, determine whether the particular material should be safe to be used by the public.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. In monitoring the use of herbicides and sprays by the minister's department, can the minister indicate what monitoring the department does to enforce the proper application of herbicides?

MR. COOKSON: Under the present training procedure most field men at the municipal level require training as to use and sale of these products. We're in the process of upgrading the training of those who sell the product, not just at the municipal level but in terms of the private operation within stores, elevators, et cetera. It is then their responsibility to make sure that when this product is passed across the counter, they properly advise individuals as to how they should be safely administered.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a final short supplementary to the minister. Can the minister indicate what recourse the ordinary citizen or corporate entity has when an area sprayed causes financial losses. As the hon. minister knows . . . It's not a legal question, Mr. Speaker.

What responsibility, what recourse does the afflicted person have as to the incident, so the hon. member knows, where a greenhouse was practically wiped out because the owner had taken water out of a ditch that had been sprayed? What recourse does that owner have?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. acting leader, that's clearly a matter of law. Recourse is an opportunity to seek a remedy, and advice as to remedies of that kind is of course a legal matter.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Does the Department of Environment offer any assistance to people when an accident such as this happens?

MR. COOKSON: Yes, we do, Mr. Speaker. Within the department we have qualified people who are on call insofar as analysing water supply and taking samples. We work closely with the Minister of Agriculture on this, and we now have the lab facilities for analysis. Insofar as our

position, we simply make this information public. Beyond that, it's again a question of law.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Does the Department of Environment have a program similar to the disaster fund, so that where a financial disaster does occur, the department has a fund to compensate the landowner?

MR. COOKSON: No we don't, but the Minister of Agriculture might like to supplement.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, may I supplement the answer by my colleague the Minister of Environment to say that all applicators in the province of Alberta who provide a service, both through a municipality or as a commercial applicator, are licensed. That licence guarantees individuals the proper use of agricultural chemicals throughout the province. That licensing also indicates to those receiving the service that the individual is not only licensed but as a rule is covered in most cases, recognizing the liability involved. Having had some personal dealings with liabilities in regard to spray, I know all municipalities and indeed all private applicators, whether surface or aerial, carry liability insurance, recognizing the spray and drift problems that exist in the use of chemicals.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Environment. Getting back to the incident in Turner Valley, is the minister in a position to outline to the Assembly what steps the department has taken to meet with the officials of the Foothills school division, I believe, to determine whether the application of the sprays was consistent with federal and provincial regulations? Is the minister in a position to report to the Assembly as to when the government will have a report on this incident?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, we'll certainly do this.

While I'm on my feet, I just might say to the general public that as we get more refined in our operations, particularly in the area of agriculture and in other areas, there is more and more demand for a more economical, practical way of dealing with weed problems, et cetera. It's extremely important that the general public understands the danger of these chemicals. I can't conceive why a sprayer would undertake to spray in a schoolyard, for example, at a time young people are in attendance and, in particular, using the chemical Tordon. At this time I can simply say that if we don't learn to handle these chemicals properly and continue to abuse the privilege of using them, we'll simply have to take steps to ban them in the province of Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Have any discussions been held with power companies, particularly Alberta Power, which has been using extensive 2,4-D spraying in the Peace River area — and perhaps throughout the province, but I certainly know in the Peace River area — and spraying close to dugouts. Have there been any discussions with that company about the application of their spraying techniques along power lines?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, under our regulations, there is proper setback within the area of water courses. I'd be interested in any reports insofar as those setbacks may be abused.

**Edmonton Annexation**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my second question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs has to do with the resolution on the Order Paper this morning as it applies to the recommendations of the Local Authorities Board. Is the minister in a position to indicate when the debate on the Local Authorities Board recommendations will commence?

MR. MOORE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. It is intended that the debate commence on Wednesday afternoon, May 20, and if sufficient members require the time, continue on Thursday evening, May 21.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Can the minister indicate if the Legislature will be sitting as Committee of the Whole, as the Committee on Public Affairs, and agriculture, so public representation can be made?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, as House leader, maybe I can deal with that. I think the hon. member raised that very question earlier in the sitting, and I don't know that it was fully responded to at the time.

Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that that is an extraordinary suggestion, in the sense that the whole history of the Edmonton annexation situation, with all its difficulties, was one that the government concluded, after consideration, should be dealt with in probably one of the most massive public hearings ever conducted, certainly in respect of such a matter. A special panel of the Local Authorities Board was created to do that. If the suggestion now is that Edmontonians have not had an opportunity to make representations in a full and adequate way, I would frankly be astounded, given the history of it. Therefore the answer to the hon. member is that what will occur on Wednesday and Thursday is what should occur; that is, a debate by members of this Assembly.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the hon. Government House Leader or the Premier indicate if the statement by the chairman of the Edmonton caucus, the hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont, that Sherwood Park would be annexed but not the city of St. Albert, is a position of the government?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, to this date no decision has been made on that matter by the government.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question on the matter of Government Motion No. 1. Can the minister or the Premier indicate if the decision by the Assembly, whatever that may be — I presume the decision will come to a vote — will be binding on the cabinet?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the motion under government orders on the Order Paper was placed there under my name specifically to allow members of the Legislature who are interested, the opportunity to state their views, positions, and ideas with respect to the question before us. Having heard that debate, it will then be the responsibility of the Executive Council to make a decision on the matter.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, then can the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs indicate, after the debate in the Legis-

lature has terminated, when will the cabinet make a decision on the Local Authorities Board recommendations?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I said earlier, and I say again that it is my expectation that we would be in a position to make an announcement by July 1 this year. Obviously, something could delay that, but at the moment I believe we will meet that target.

DR. BUCK: My final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The decision cabinet will make — will the people in the affected areas have an opportunity, through the mechanism of referendum, to indicate to the government whether or not they wish to be annexed?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member would know, we've had a good number of expressions of opinion through the elected representatives, Edmonton city MLAs and the MLAs for the surrounding areas. In addition at least two expressions of opinion have been conducted during last fall's civic election. As far as I'm aware, there has been open access to the Premier's office, to my office, and to every MLA in the region. I think there has been adequate opportunity, as the Government House Leader said, for citizens to state their views. Therefore, it is not our intention to hold a plebiscite with respect to the decision that is made.

**Tourism Study**

MR. STROMBERG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to question the Minister of Tourism and Small Business. In light of the numerous requests from towns, cities, and villages, as well as the Battle River Tourist Association, will the minister explain why his reply to their request for a tourist designated area study for east-central Alberta was so negative?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, a good question. In response directly to the question, in one word it was called funding. Secondly, though, I think I should point out that I didn't consider my response negative, in the sense that they were wondering whether they would ever have the opportunity to have a study done in the area, and I indicated that yes, that could be considered. But at the time we were working on the five studies involved — four completed and one coming to us as quickly as possible — and with the staff we had in the department, I wanted to treat those studies in the fashion they should be treated and, as a result, did not have plans at the moment to include the east-central part of the province of Alberta in the tourism study.

MR. STROMBERG: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the minister's department commissioning the firm of Woods, Gordon to evaluate the needs and potential of east-central Alberta, will the minister reconsider his arbitrary decision and implement the recommendations of the Woods, Gordon report that one of the great potentials of east-central Alberta is tourism and should be further developed?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, as I stated a little earlier, I am certainly interested in following up on the recommendations of the one study done on the east-central Alberta area, relative to the business community, and certainly will take that into consideration as we move in the direction of preparing our budgets for next year.

MR. STROMBERG: A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. What was the cost of the Woods, Gordon report to the minister's department?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the exact cost before me, but I can get it for the hon. member.

#### **Hazardous Chemical Spills**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Environment. It concerns a PCB spill which occurred on March 20 at the Stelco plant in the city of Camrose. While the spill itself was quite small, it did contaminate some 12,000 gallons of slurry used in the welding process at the plant. My question very directly to minister is: what steps has the government taken to date to investigate this particular incident?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, the member continually digs out these spills. I don't check everything that comes into the department, so I think I'd have to take the question as notice and, if in fact there was a spill, determine what quantity and the way it was handled. If it's within the plant area, again, it would be the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's nice to see such prompt response on the part of the minister.

I direct this question to the hon. Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation. I'm advised by the union that the two people who cleaned up the spill were not wearing protective clothing and came into direct skin contact with the PCBs. In view of the minister's assertion on Tuesday this week that proper protective measures are always taken when people are dealing with hazardous substances of this kind, can the minister report what steps his department has taken on this particular matter, particularly with respect to the health of the two people who did the clean-up?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I too can only take that question as notice. It appears the hon. member does not wish to share the information with me before, so I can answer him. For that reason the members of this Assembly do not have the benefit of the answer in time. It has to be taken as notice. If the hon. member would just alert — as the good book says, I am my brother's keeper; the responsibility for our fellow man — I would be pleased to be able to respond on the day he asks the question.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm just sort of incredulous that we have a government here that supposedly has legislation that requires reporting. That leads me to the supplementary question. We've been advised by the hon. Minister of Environment that we have automatic reporting. My question very directly to the hon. Minister of Environment: is the reporting system in this province a statutory obligation or is it merely a moral request on the part of companies?

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member asking what is in a statute of the province?

MR. NOTLEY: No.

MR. SPEAKER: That's the way I understood the question.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, let me rephrase the question. Is the method of reporting spills in this province merely a moral request on the part of companies?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, under the licensing procedure that we operate, it's required to report spills, and we can revoke licences for not following through on this. It's both moral and, I would say, statutory in terms of the licensing procedure.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has a licence ever been revoked for failure to report? Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether the minister's impression — I use the word "impression" — is that all spills in fact are duly reported to the Department of Environment?

MR. COOKSON: I'm just trying to be clear on the member's question. Is the question: are we alerted to all spills?

MR. NOTLEY: Yes.

MR. COOKSON: I think I've made that clear: we have no knowledge of the total spills in the province. It's a moral obligation, and it's statutory. If there's a violation of this, we can exercise the due process of the law. Of course, it's awfully hard to find a mouse in the forest, and it's very difficult to exercise that at times.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I might refer to the '74 spill and further clarify the problem of spills. It seems that the member is having so much trouble getting news coverage this week that he has to go back to 1974. It's one of those weeks when he isn't getting much coverage. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: I shouldn't interrupt the hon. minister, but notwithstanding the latitude there has been in regard to these questions, it has not escaped the notice of the Chair that they don't strictly come within the scope of the question period, which is intended — and there's eminent authority to that effect — to deal with current matters rather than with matters of past history. Another stricture on questions says that a minister should not be asked concerning events which occurred during the tenure of one or more of his predecessors.

MR. COOKSON: I agree, Mr. Speaker. [laughter] I think we should exercise the statute of limitations on the member opposite.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not surprised the minister doesn't want to talk about his predecessors. He has enough trouble dealing with his own responsibilities. [interjections]

My question very directly to the hon. minister: to the minister's knowledge, has there ever been a case when a licence has been revoked for failing to report a spill?

MR. COOKSON: I'd have to take it as notice.

MR. NOTLEY: Again as notice.

#### **Kananaskis — Alpine Village**

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Tourism and Small Business. Earlier this week, in response to a question about a

possible townsite like Banff in the beautiful Ribbon Creek valley, I understood the minister to assure me that there would only be proposals for three buildings. There seems to be some misunderstanding somewhere that there will be 250 rental units, plus hotels, restaurants, and other facilities. Would the minister please clarify this?

MR. ADAIR: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate the opportunity to do that. That particular article is somewhat misleading, in the sense that the proposal package is for three separate units totalling 250 units: 150 in one and 50 in [each of] the other two. That is the extent of the facilities that will be developed, along with the day-use facility, and will be called the alpine village.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I might also point out that the alpine village will be located in Kananaskis Country, not in Kananaskis Provincial Park.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Once the private sector has constructed these buildings, who is going to operate them, and under what guidelines?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, the developer/owners will be operating the facilities as any normal hotel/motel facility in that particular respect. They will be responsible to the municipal authority, in this case the Kananaskis Country committee at this stage, and possibly along the lines of an improvement district authority.

#### **Community School Program**

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education regarding the community school program, which I believe has had much more interest and take-up this year than probably was expected. Is the program budget already allocated for this year?

MR. KING: Not entirely, Mr. Speaker, although we expect it will be shortly. When it is completely taken up, it will not have responded to the number of applications made. If my memory serves me correctly, in the order of 80 schools throughout the province have applied for community school designation. We have funding available to support a total of 35.

MR. BORSTAD: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister seek more funds to assist the other schools that wish to take up the program this year? If not, will the minister see that money is in the budget next year so those schools can take up the program?

MR. KING: I will certainly give the hon. member's representation very serious consideration, Mr. Speaker. But I should say that I might be more interested in an expansion of the program next year than this year. This will be the first full year in which the program is operating in any schools with provincial government support. While I certainly endorse the principle wholeheartedly, I think that for the long-term benefit of the program there is some advantage to having it operating, although admittedly on a limited basis, for one year before we seek an expansion in the program. But to the extent that I can persuade others, expansion is in my mind. I think it can be accomplished to some extent within the present budget of the department.

#### **Fatalities — Sherwood Park**

MR. MACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the hon. Minister of Environment. It's related to the very tragic deaths a couple of days ago in Sherwood Park. I wonder if the minister has had the opportunity to investigate the situation. Could he advise the Assembly what actions he might deem appropriate to ensure a similar situation does not occur?

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly the question could be re-phrased if the hon. member is seeking information as to plans the minister may have. As far as the minister's opinion as to what might be appropriate is concerned, that would be outside the scope of the question period and a matter for debate.

MR. MACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In my view the situation is environmental and has been of reasonable standing in that community. My question to the hon. minister: has he any plans to look into or investigate the matter?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, under the terms of our legislation we take responsibility for assisting insofar as leaks with regard to hydrocarbons and other materials in or on the ground surface, so our facilities are available for that. This was a tragic incident. We were contacted earlier and made our expertise available. In this particular case I think we assisted financially in instructions and, insofar as observatory methods, the observer wells were constructed on our advice. Subsequent to that the municipality concerned takes over the responsibility of monitoring and whatever action is necessary to make it a safe operation. So really that's where our responsibility ends. It then becomes the responsibility of the local authority to make sure it's properly constructed, in a safe manner, to protect the public.

MR. MACK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. minister. I commend the minister for taking steps or assisting the municipality, but very obviously the steps taken were not safe. Will the necessary steps be taken that remedial action in the situation is mandated?

MR. COOKSON: It really then goes beyond our jurisdictional responsibility. I think it would be wise for the member, and certainly the member who represents the area, to make representation to the municipal authority insofar as the procedures that were carried out are concerned. My understanding is that in this case the fire chief of the particular municipality was directed to take on that responsibility. We'd be happy to do anything further we can insofar as advice on how to cope with it is concerned.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in light of the context of the question, perhaps I could add that The Fatality Inquiries Act governs the manner in which inquiries into fatal accidents occur. I would be pleased to undertake for the hon. member to find out whether or not in this case the Fatality Review Board is recommending that an inquiry take place. My own impression is that it would be automatic in such a case.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation. Can the minister indicate how stringent the rules in the minister's department are to ensure that

workers who go into areas where there is a possibility of methanes and fuel oils must use a safety harness? I would like to bring to the minister's attention the fact that many people who go into septic tanks do not wear a safety harness. How stringently are the rules enforced, or are there any rules?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, the legislation is quite explicit. The worker has the right to refuse to enter any unsafe place. The regulations prescribe what equipment is to be worn. The information is constantly provided to all employers. I can only assure the hon. member that these work incidents that occur from time to time are, in many cases, human judgment and an error. But it's not that the worker knew, because I and my officials and inspectors are satisfied that in every case where there is an accident or a fatality, if the worker had known he would have done better.

The regulations are quite clear, and officials constantly communicate to work groups, unions, and employers the interpretation of the regulations that the worker carry out the work safely. Specifically with regard to safety equipment, at all times it must be worn.

#### **Olympic Bid**

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Premier. I was going to direct it to the Minister of Recreation and Parks, but in his absence I'll direct it to the Premier. It deals with the Calgary Olympic Development Association and its attempt to get the Winter Olympics in 1988. My initial question is: what assistance has the province of Alberta committed to the Calgary Olympic Development Association to date?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to take the question subject to checking, but I believe I can respond today that our position has been a general commitment of support, subject to review of final budget; secondly, specific important support to construct the Olympic coliseum in Calgary, which was initiated by correspondence from me to the mayor of Calgary on July 3 last year, in which we proposed we would provide, by way of direct grant from the provincial government, one-third of the cost of the coliseum, one-third to be provided by the city of Calgary, and the suggestion by the city of Calgary that the other one-third be requested from the federal government. Pending approval by the federal government, and contemplating that they might not agree to approve it until after the games were awarded in September of this year, we would finance the final one-third by way of a loan.

In addition I understand that we have provided, by way of operating funds to develop the bid, a sum of some \$200,000 from the province of Alberta. We've moved with regard to a number of projects in Kananaskis Country, in addition to the coliseum which is in the city of Calgary, to approve, upgrade, and accelerate facilities which would form part of the successful bid.

In short, what we've been trying to do is to move ahead with those projects which would have a long-term beneficial nature to Albertans in a way that would also facilitate the bid being made by the Calgary group of volunteers that are involved. There may be more than that, and I would therefore have to defer to the Minister of Recreation and Parks, who carries the responsibility for it.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. Have there been any discussions with the Calgary group with regard to the whole Spray Lakes area?

MR. LOUGHEED: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Again, I think that will probably require an elaboration by the minister, perhaps next week.

I presume the hon. member is dealing with regard to the siting of alpine events. My understanding of the position — and the Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife may wish to elaborate — is that we've agreed to an approach that would have alpine events in the Spray Lakes project area, subject to an understanding that we are looking at a project that would be developed for both long-term beneficial use by Albertans for recreational skiing and subject to the caveat that there be day lodge facilities but, at this stage of the game, not overnight facilities nor condominiums. That's been the general approach.

I might just say, because I think it's a broader issue, that we feel that with the advantage of mountain facilities in our province in a recreational way we do have a responsibility to expand recreational downhill skiing for our citizens because of the overcrowded nature of facilities in our national parks. That has some element of personal bias to it, but I think it's concurred in by a fair number of citizens of the province.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, not entering into the discussion of personal bias, I would ask this question in light of the comments made by Mr. Ed Zemrau, involved with the Canadian Olympic Association, when he indicated that there is some concern about Calgary's bid because of the attitude of some of the European and South American countries that in fact just from the standpoint of sheer economics, the cost of getting their athletes to the main competition, as opposed to getting them to Calgary: has the government considered the possibility of having the Alberta government's commitment for the operation of the Olympics in '88 include some assistance to help defray the very major expense that a number of European and other countries are going to face in getting their athletes to Calgary? A decision on this would have to be made prior to September so it could be included in the bid. The problem is going to be that all the work we do will be lost if we don't get the games, unless there is some kind of commitment like that.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, that's an important point. Certainly it hasn't come to my attention that any specific request has been made to the provincial government in that regard. But I would have to take notice of that point, discuss it, and either respond personally or through the Minister of Recreation and Parks. We do wish to facilitate the bid, and recognize that the distances for a large number of participants in the 1988 Winter Olympics would be extensive.

I just might add the caveat, though, that in one of these bids one has to be careful about the nature of proposals that tend to be out of line with the established practices. But with that caveat, only as a caveat, I'd certainly take the question as notice, and either myself or the minister will respond.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased today to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly, 22 members of a string orchestra from Crescent Heights high school in Medicine Hat. This group is visiting Edmonton for the long weekend to take part in a string workshop at the University of Alberta. They are accompanied by their leader Mrs. Andrea Ashton and one parent Mrs. Kohls. I'm very pleased that my daughter Cathy is a member of this very fine young orchestra, which is doing a fine job of bringing some culture to the people of Medicine Hat. I ask that they rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

### head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS (Committee of Supply)

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the Committee of Supply please come to order.

### Department of Environment

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege. When I was questioning the minister the other day, I tried to recollect from memory the throughput on the Pembina pipeline. I seem to recall it was around 20,000 barrels per day. I've since checked and it's around 120,000 barrels per day, not 20,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When we left the department the last day the estimates were considered, two people had indicated they wished to make some comments, the Member for Calgary McKnight and the Member for Spirit River-Fairview. We'll have the Member for Calgary McKnight now.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, I have just two brief questions I want to ask the minister. Concern has been expressed by the city of Edmonton that because of the water use practice in effect in the city of Calgary — water is not metered in Calgary, whereas it is in the rest of the province — we in Calgary were making unwise use of water and threatening the water supply of southern Alberta. I want to know the minister's response to that.

Supplementary to that, he mentioned — I'm not sure whether he said phosphorus; I imagine he said phosphate removal. I understand he's making contributions to that program in Calgary, and I wonder if the contributions could be lower if the water supply being used was reduced.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, a few comments with respect to the Department of Environment. To sort of

preface the observations I wish to make, as well as some of the questions I want to pose to the minister, I think it is appropriate to look back at some things the now government said when they were the opposition. I think it's appropriate that we put this in context, Mr. Chairman.

In 1970 we had a major oil spill on the Athabasca River. At that time the official opposition took great delight, and I think carried out a public duty, in nailing the former government to the cross on this matter. But a number of points were made by the environment critic of the Conservative opposition, along with the leader of the Conservative opposition. I'd just like to deal with some of those points and put them in context with the current discussion of the operation of the Department of Environment.

Mr. Yurko and Mr. Lougheed indicated that:

Polluters should be named, both for the types of materials they discharge and the amounts . . .

"This should be public knowledge," Mr. Yurko said. "Right now this is classified and known only to people in the environmental health division . . . The general public should know what individual industries are doing to streams or to the air."

Companies should be fined "heavily for breaking these standards and require them to clean up and pay for any spills". Then the requirement that industry should

absorb these costs and not the taxpayer. Thus the selling price of the resource, such as natural gas, must include all costs necessary to preserve the ecology.

These are some of the major observations made in 1970, Mr. Chairman. Quite frankly, I think they were rather appropriate observations. But when I look at some of the issues that have come up in the last several weeks, I wonder whether those guidelines still apply to the Department of Environment. The minister can get rather concerned about the fact that these matters have been raised, although I think it's probably fair to say that this week we have had more questions taken as notice than any time I remember in my 10 years in this Assembly.

Mr. Chairman, to the minister, let's start with the question of the PCB spills, both the one in 1974 and the one in 1978. Yesterday we had the minister tell us that the 1974 spill wasn't a very serious one; that just about a gallon was released, and it was cleaned up by a contractor who was knowledgeable in the area of hazardous substances. That's interesting, because even the public relations man for the company has indicated that it was somewhat larger than a gallon. We have witnesses who were there in 1974, who indicate it was at least 100 gallons. One of those witnesses was a management person in the firm. So we have some difference of opinion: the minister tells us it was just a gallon; we've got the PR man for P & G saying it's a little more than that.

But what is important, Mr. Chairman, is the clean-up of that 1974 spill. If in fact it was undertaken by a contractor who was knowledgeable in the area of hazardous substances, I ask the minister why P & G employees were involved in the clean-up. Secondly, if the contractor was knowledgeable in the area of hazardous substances, why did the people who did the clean-up not have proper protective clothing? We now have a woman in Grande Prairie, who participated in that clean-up, indicating that in her judgment much, much more than a gallon had to be cleaned up. We don't know for sure whether it's correct, but her view is that some of the medical ailments she's now suffering stem from that clean-up in 1974.

In the 1978 case, Mr. Chairman, there's no doubt there was a somewhat larger spill. But we have the minister telling us there was no real need to notify people downstream, not even officials in the town of Peace River whose water intake system was in the Smoky River at that time, because in contacting the P & G officials everyone was of the view that it was okay, that there was no danger. I say to you, Mr. Minister, through the Chair, that that kind of assessment cannot be made immediately. In my judgment the people downstream should have been notified.

We had a similar situation in the province of Saskatchewan, where there had been a PCB spill involving the city of Regina. The department had not notified the city of Regina, and was wrong in not notifying the city of Regina. We had a statement made on behalf of the government. Because I think it's very important, I'd just like to quote:

Quite properly, the question has been asked why the City of Regina was not informed. The frank answer is that it was an error, and a serious error on the part of our department. There is no question that the city should have been informed officially and this was not done. On behalf of the department, I accept responsibility for that error.

Mr. Chairman, as a consequence of that debate in Saskatchewan, we now have legislation which came into effect on March 17, 1981. It's the Saskatchewan environmental spill control regulations. I just want to outline them, because I think they're useful for the purposes of our discussion this morning. Number one, the minister can order a clean-up, investigation, time limits, and details of the work to be done. Number two, if a company doesn't act, the minister can order work done and bill the company. Number three, third party liability: the company must compensate all who suffer, physically or damage and loss of enjoyment of property. This is the question the Member for Clover Bar was raising today with respect to the use of sprays. Number four, a spill report centre. Number five requires immediate spill reporting and, within seven days, a written report; requires a company to detail how the spill was stopped, how it was contained, how the effects have been minimized, how the environment is to be restored to its original state, and how the waste was disposed of. Most important of all, Mr. Minister, the department issues a release announcing spills of public concern. [and] a list of all spills is made available to any interested party.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment this business of announcing spills, of making relevant information available to people who are going to be affected, is the most important matter that flows from this controversy in Grande Prairie. We can't look back, other than the important question of the health of the workers who cleaned it up. This is perhaps not directly under the responsibility of the Minister of Environment, but I think we in this Assembly have to insist that a list be compiled of the people who did participate in cleaning up the 1974 spill, and that they have proper medical checkups.

In terms of public policy, it seems to me that we have to insist that there not only be a clear reporting obligation to the department; not a moral obligation, but a clear statutory obligation so that if one doesn't report, there is a statutory fine, a penalty. And that penalty should be fairly strict. But beyond that, in my judgment there is an obligation on the part of the department — not at the discretion of the department; not if the department thinks it's okay and reasonable — to advise

people of potential danger. Mr. Chairman, this is not a case of yelling fire in a crowded theatre. It's a case of making available information of a relevant nature to people at the local level of government who have to be in a position to know. Surely with the PCB spill at the Grande Prairie pulp mill in 1978, it was not unreasonable that we should have contacted the officials of the town of Peace River. But to my knowledge, that contact was not made.

Mr. Chairman, I want to move from there in my general comments to deal with the question of sulphur and hydrogen sulphide emissions. I suggest that a discussion of this matter — both the Syncrude and the GCOS cases — is important now. With the government holding the Alsands and Cold Lake projects in abeyance, now is the time for us to perhaps take a closer look than we have in the past at some of the other fallouts of massive development. I'm not asking the minister to be responsible for social impact, but I am asking him to take a careful evaluation of the environmental impact of these projects.

Under The Clean Air Act, the minister has the authority to adjust rate of emission standards. I quote from the minister on May 7, 1981:

Under the section we generally agreed we would eliminate the half-hour standard, which is not required on the Canadian standards. Generally the procedure in setting rates is to determine in terms of efficiency and economics what the plants can practically keep down to a [minimum] in tons per day.

Then the minister goes on to say:

In fact I challenge the Member for Spirit River-Fairview on that basis alone. The one-hour standards are just as restrictive, if not more so, than the half-hour standards.

Well let's talk for a moment, Mr. Chairman, about this business of the emissions at the Syncrude plant. So there'll be no misunderstanding, I'm quoting from information that the minister kindly supplied to my office last year with respect to SO<sub>2</sub> readings in excess of the Alberta ambient air quality standards. On May 7 the minister suggested that there is no watering down of the standards at all by dropping the half-hour standard and just going to the hour and 24-hour standards. I say to you, Mr. Minister, through the Chair, that that is simply not accurate. Going over the information your office has supplied, 41 per cent of the violations listed here on a half-hour basis would not show up on the hour basis. Another 31 per cent would only show up as partial recordings. So to suggest that moving away from the half-hour standard is not going to make any difference is simply not accurate. I could go over the examples in the minister's own report here, chapter and verse, and document where the 41 per cent of violations would not be recorded on the basis of the hour standard.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the minister is saying that the standards we've set under The Clean Air Act are too stringent for Syncrude, then perhaps he should either issue certificates of variance and take the public flak that's going to come, or perhaps we should have a discussion of what is reasonable under these circumstances. Personally, I think Syncrude can sufficiently clean up their act that they can meet the standards set out in The Clean Air Act and The Clean Water Act.

I remind members of this committee that MLAs in the province of Alberta, including myself as an opposition member, are quick to point out wherever we go that we have good legislation in the form of The Clean Air Act



and The Clean Water Act. But the best legislation in the world isn't going to do much good if it isn't enforced. The enforcement is up to the Minister of Environment. The minister can say, well, we're not going to enforce this because we'd like to work with the companies. Last fall, on October 24, page 1218 of *Hansard*, when we got into this debate about SO<sub>2</sub> emissions, the minister said "it is interesting to note that it represents a total of [only] 2.03 days in two years" when the company was violating the law. Therefore, essentially, why worry about it? Mr. Chairman, to the members of the committee, what is the point of having standards and legislation if we don't enforce them, if we just say, well, you're only breaking the law two days out of two years. Somebody breaks into a store and he says, I've only broken into the store once in the last year; that's only one day out of 365; I shouldn't be prosecuted. The law doesn't work that way.

MR. R. CLARK: Once in 21 years.

MR. NOTLEY: Once in 21 years, that's right. We had President Nixon: a matter of one or two minutes on tape, and the President of the United States has to resign. Hours and hours of these tapes, and one or two minutes were the smoking gun; he had to resign. But here we've got a minister saying, two days out of two years. He admits that the company's violating the standards; no prosecution.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that if these standards are going to have any credibility, do one of two things. Either insist that the standards are enforced; or if you think the standards are too high, then let's be up front about it and say we're going to have certificates of variance and allow environmental pollution to continue, because in our view Syncrude can't afford to clean up its act. Let's do one of two things. Let's not have standards and not enforce them. Because by following that course of action you destroy the credibility of any environmental protection legislation. We have good legislation on the books. If we didn't, it would be a different matter. We'd be arguing for stronger legislation. But it's not the case; we've got good legislation here. The issue is whether it's going to be enforced.

There have been various cost analysis studies of Syncrude cleaning up their act. We have one here, undertaken by STOP, which argues that even if the public were to pick up the entire cost of cleaning up the Syncrude plant — I'm not suggesting we should do that — on a discount rate of 10 per cent over 25 years, the cost benefits would be overwhelmingly in favor of the clean-up, even if we had to shoulder 100 per cent of the cost ourselves.

I raise this matter very directly because last fall when I posed the questions to the minister in the first place, I made reference to the Federal-Provincial Air/Atmospheric Committee Report on Syncrude. I'm just a little disturbed by what I see in this report, because it would appear to me that the problems we have with Syncrude are not essentially of a technical nature. In the fourth paragraph:

Although Alberta Environment has firmly maintained that the 287 LT/SD sulphur dioxide emission requirements contained in the 1973 permit to construct reflects the best practical technology at the time Syncrude engineering ... was completed, it is apparent that the decision was a political, rather than a purely technical one.

What do you mean, "a political, rather than a purely technical one"? Not a financial one, but a political one. If

these decisions are made on a political basis, what kind of environmental protection is that? Paragraph 6:

Mr. Solodzuk, DM of Environment has stated that additional environmental impact assessment studies will not be referred to [this committee] for review and comment because of the difficulties — both technical and political — [experienced] with the Syncrude review.

Mr. Chairman, to the minister, I say as honestly as I can, let us say to the people of Alberta, either Syncrude can bring in the technology — I insist that they can. The evidence I've seen would indicate that the best possible technology would be well within the financial possibilities of a company enjoying a substantial increase in prices. I well remember when the Foster report, projecting the anticipated price for oil, was tabled in this province. Syncrude is certainly getting more than that today; no question about that. Why not force them to bring in the best technology? Or, if you're not prepared to go that route, let's be up front about it. Let's bring in certificates of variance. Let's say, all right, we'll give Syncrude a licence to pollute, and we'll set aside these standards. These standards won't mean anything. We'll let them pollute two days or three days or how many days from time to time. But, Mr. Chairman, let's not suggest we have legislation which is stringent, and then have an enforcement procedure which is just totally inadequate.

I want to deal briefly with the question of the oil spill on Sweathouse Creek, which is a tributary of the Little Smoky River. I raised that in the House the other day. It's my understanding that 20,000 barrels of oil leaked into Sweathouse Creek. It's also my understanding that it has been cleaned up. I am told that the ERCB held a private, rather than a public, hearing on the matter. As a result of that hearing, they reprimanded the company for their procedures.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, what is important is that if the environment is to be protected, it seems to me that it isn't appropriate to have these private hearings. The public has to know what's going on. It shouldn't be just a case of what we pick up as a result of a newspaper report or somebody contacting an opposition member. We have the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation asking ...

MR. R. CLARK: Are you your brother's keeper?

MR. NOTLEY: That's right, giving us a little lecture and suggesting that the responsibility is for individuals to sort of run around the province checking this out themselves. We've got a department, the Department of Environment. Of course we'll notify the Department of Environment. There's no better way of notifying the Department of Environment than bringing it up in question period. But it's rather appalling that this information is not readily at the fingertips of the minister. Where has this government been, and where have they gone from the rather eloquent comments by Mr. Yurko, the Member for Edmonton Gold Bar at that time, who later became Minister of Environment, and in my judgment was a very strong Minister of Environment. I had differences with him, but he was a very strong Minister of Environment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say more about the infrastructure in the Cold Lake area when we get to that vote. But I want to conclude my remarks in terms of general discussion by saying there isn't much point in having strong legislation unless we have very stringent enforcement. When I look at the PCB spill question in Grande

Prairie, when I look at the business in Camrose today, when apparently the minister wasn't aware of a spill — a small spill, one and a half gallons, but it contaminated 12,000 gallons of slurry. That's a substantial problem. What are we going to do with it? Where are we going to put it? We've got the union very concerned because two of their members had to clean it up, without protective clothing I'm told. Has the city of Camrose been notified about it? What are we going to do? Where are we going to dispose of this 12,000 gallons of slurry, because the contamination puts the reading far beyond the acceptable limit. We have the case of the spill at Sweathouse Creek. We have the sulphur and H<sub>2</sub>S emissions at Syncrude.

Mr. Chairman, what I see from just these recent examples is a problem that I think the Member for Olds-Didsbury raised when we got into the debate in the first place: do we have a Department of Environment which is a champion of the environment? Is there such a problem in this government today that in fact the Minister of Environment needs help, that he isn't able to win the battles in cabinet and in caucus for tough enforcement of environmental regulations. Where does this government stand on this crucial issue at this particular time? Mr. Chairman, I think we have to have a debate now, and it's appropriate that we have a debate now because the pause in the development of our megaprojects gives us an opportunity to reflect, debate, argue — perhaps heatedly, but appropriately so, because it's an important matter.

MR. BATIUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a few remarks. Hopefully I won't take as much time as the former speaker did.

One recommendation that I would like to make strongly to the minister is that he take a good view to give strong support for the disposition of surplus water through drainage. We constantly hear complaints that urban centres are using much of our very fertile lands. I guess it's come to a point that you can't very well stop that, because the communities have to grow as the population grows. But there is a lot of very fertile land that stands under little bits of water for a month or two in the spring. Then it dries up, but far too late for seeding. I believe that a program somewhat similar to what we have for irrigation — it doesn't have to be the same in dollars — could help considerably.

I used to serve on an irrigation committee, and I had a view of what it's like in southern Alberta and the benefits derived from irrigation. I've always given my support for irrigation. Furthermore I had the opportunity to be one of the three who went on the irrigation tour last fall. Even though the hon. Member for Clover Bar referred to it as a junket tour, I must say that when the government of this province commits a third of a billion dollars, there is place to look to get the best possible irrigation. Despite the benefits that I derived in southern Alberta, there is a lot of place for improvement. Irrigation in Alberta is the same as it was 70 years ago. It's really remarkable to see irrigation in countries where every drop of water is accounted for. I think that trip was well worth it. But regardless, I hope that some program is brought up similar to irrigation. I don't think as much money would be needed. But here again, as I say, we have to take a good look when one-third of a billion dollars is being expended by this government.

Another area of a bit of concern, Mr. Chairman, is the regional waterline between Edmonton and Vegreville. When we look back, in 1974 the Vermilion River flooded

and in a matter of a few days there was several million dollars' damage, yet a year later the town of Vegreville had to drain water out of sloughs from farms into the Vermilion River because they had no water. I knew that with growing communities the wells would never provide the water. It was costly and there was no assurance. I tried very hard, and I was very happy that approval for the regional waterline came.

But here again the real problem is that sometimes people have a tendency to get a bit greedy. I understand there are some problems with easements. This really perturbs me. There was an original offer of, I think, \$625 per acre. That was not an outright purchase, but only to lease it for the two weeks to put in the waterline, and the farmer could work on the land. Many people accepted that. However, quite a number felt that \$625 was too little. I think this was raised to \$1,000. I personally feel that the market value is not \$1,000 per acre, and anybody who receives that amount should consider it appropriate compensation. I understand that some are already looking for compensation of \$2,000 and more. Regardless of what it's going to cost, 80 per cent of that will be picked up by the government, which is the people of Alberta. The other 20 per cent will be picked up by the consumers or the people in the urban municipalities. I think something will have to go along quickly so we do not stall this waterline. If it wasn't for that bit of snow we had in Vegreville late this winter, I'm sure they would already have been rationing water. I strongly recommend that if a reasonable settlement can't come, the minister take steps for expropriation.

Earlier I mentioned the drainage of water. I would say that the southern half of the province has the problem of a shortage of moisture. In the northern half, you have these problems with it. I know the deputy minister is with us right now. And if the minister needs any information, I know very well that when the deputy minister took employment with the department, his first assignment was to settle a feud by a couple of neighbors in my area, because of drainage, blockages, and so forth. As I say, we have them all over. I think lots of this was because of the fashion of farming. Many people probably dammed up those waterways without even realizing they were doing anything harmful. With a little expenditure, I think we could bring on a lot of land. I hope the minister would give an indication of his intention when he makes his response.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we go to the next member who wishes to make comments, could the hon. Member for Camrose have permission to revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

#### head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

(reversion)

MR. STROMBERG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Today is rather a red-letter day for me, having two different schools coming in. This afternoon I'd like to introduce to you and to members of the Legislature a group of 35 from grades 7, 8, and 9 of the New Sarepta school in the Camrose constituency. With them are their two teachers, Roberta Hay and — I'm sorry, I don't have the name of their principal. They are seated in the public gallery, and

I would ask them to now rise and be recognized by members of the Assembly.

[No one rose]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe the hon. member has the wrong group.

MR. STROMBERG: If and when they do come, we'll call this an introduction.

head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**  
(Committee of Supply)  
(continued)

MRS. CRIPPS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to make a few comments in relation to the recycling of wastes. In today's disposable society the trend is to throw away, causing tons of accumulation of harmless and harmful waste. This accumulation itself is a massive problem. I believe the most efficient method of handling any problem is to create a favorable climate for private industry and, if possible, to add some government support. Today I'd like to mention three specific areas, Mr. Chairman. First, glass and bottles. I believe the program of bottle depots is excellent, but has any consideration been given to the collection of other glass containers and possible recycling? I realize there is one plant at Redcliff.

Secondly, there are a number of newspaper recycling businesses. I understand that since the federal government implemented their national energy program, a portion of their market has suffered the same downturn as many other oil-related industries. As a consequence, these paper recycling businesses are plugged and can't take any more paper. With regard to the paper war we are fighting in this country, the accumulation of this product is being added to daily.

The last waste I would like to mention is oil. Of course oil is a lubricant and is only efficient as long as it's clean. This lends to periodic replacement of that oil with a fresh supply. The problem we encounter is that all too often in industry, on farms, and on job sites, this used oil is drained out on the ground; certainly a waste causing pollution. This was a topic of discussion at a recent public meeting. The magnitude of waste and pollution caused by the average Albertan created an amazement to all people at that meeting. One member had changed oil in two twin-scraper buggies that day: 45 gallons of used oil wasted. He said he drained it on the ground and hadn't even thought of it at the time he was doing it. This is useless. Farmers at that meeting also indicated that they were negligent in saving used oil.

There was a consensus that there's absolutely no reason used oil can't be recycled, and that the government should take whatever steps necessary to ensure that used oil does not get dumped onto the ground and become another pollution problem. There are two ways: by rationing or making it necessary to return used oil when buying a clean supply. In other words, if a barrel of oil is purchased, it must only be purchased with the return of the oil it's replacing. I'm not sure that's acceptable or necessary, because there is an alternative and that's price. Right now the price of used oil is practically negligible. I think it's \$6 a barrel. The cost of recycling is such that the amount for the old oil does not encourage the average Albertan to return the oil and have it recycled. The other problem is that there are only a few recycling stations,

and it's almost impossible for a lot of people to return used oil to a recycling station. I'd like to suggest that the minister consider means of encouraging and assisting private industry to expand the recycling of used oil. This might be assistance in transportation or depots where it can be collected, and increased prices for the end product. I think we should take a look at the price of recycled oil.

The second area I'd like to discuss very briefly is the expansion of generation of electricity by coal. I refer specifically to Genesee. I'd like to mention three points in land reclamation. First, I think development and reclamation should be discussed at the community level, so the landowners have some input to that reclamation. Secondly, reclamation is of paramount concern not only to the people who are affected in the area but to conservationists all over the province. Thirdly, I would like to recommend that a study of the effects of such operations on ground water be implemented and that a long-term policy for ground water protection be initiated. I also have some concerns about emission controls. I'd like either the Department of Environment or the Alberta Research Council to initiate research on zero emission control. I think it's possible in the long run, and I don't think we've really attacked that problem before.

Thank you.

MR. BORSTAD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a couple of comments I wish to make. The other day the minister mentioned that gas plants had almost reached the number that could be removed on emissions. I think the emission standard was about 95 per cent. But I believe there are now gas plants that are up to 97 per cent. If there is any way of increasing those standards without totally destroying the financial capability of building a plant, I think those standards should be increased. In my area we presently do not have that many gas plants. I urge the government to do a base line soil study in the area, so we can see what's going to happen to that soil five or 10 years down the road. This is imperative because as we cover up our good soil in southern Alberta, we're going to have to use more of that No. 4 and No. 5 soil in the north. I think we'd better know what's going to happen to that soil.

I'd also be interested in some comments from the minister on the hazardous waste program. When will the site or sites be picked? How will they be operated? Are they going to be privately operated? How does he see these wastes being transported across the province? Today we have many hazardous chemicals being transported on our highways, and that probably needs looking into too.

I might say a couple of words about the municipal water and sewer assistance program. I think it's of great assistance to municipalities across the province. We only have to look at the expansion of the program over the last few years to see the uptake in it. I was pleased to see increased assistance for small hamlets, which will assist a lot of smaller centres especially in northern Alberta, although I was a little disappointed to see an increase in costs to some of the larger centres. I guess you can't win on both ends.

Many small, isolated communities in the province still do not have water and sewer. I know this is because of total costs of water and sewer installation, and it has to be pretty well limited to the larger centres. Somehow we have to work out a program or goal of having water and sewer in all communities of 75 and over. If we could get down to that standard in some of the more remote

communities, I think we might be saving a lot of additional costs in hospital beds.

Under the water resource management program, I was glad to see and receive the support of the Member for Vegreville on the drainage and soil erosion programs. I'd like to suggest that some sort of five-year program be initiated where we have proper funding to carry out the program of drainage and soil erosion across the province. Rather than, you might say, a band-aid treatment, putting some dollars in each year, I think we're better off to have a long-term program so we know where we're going, to clean up the problem that's been with us for a good many years. I appreciate the extra funds allocated in the program this year, but I strongly urge the minister to get into a long-term, five- or 10-year program with the other departments, where we clean up the problem and get rid of it once and for all.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to comment on a couple of areas in my remarks today. First of all, the other day when the estimates were before us; the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo raised a number of concerns with regard to logging in the south Castle area. I thought it may have been more appropriate to address those remarks to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources when his estimates were before the House. But since the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo commented on some aspects of his concerns with regard to logging in that area, I thought I would be permitted equal time to present some information which would shed some light on what is in fact taking place in the south Castle valley.

The statement was made that the area is overlogged. I don't know if that's a qualitative judgment one can make at this time. One has to ask why logging is taking place in the south Castle River valley. We have had a devastating attack of the pine bark beetle, which has infested stands throughout the Castle River area in southern Alberta and the Crowsnest forest. What has taken place in the Castle area and the south Castle River valley to date is in fact salvage of this pine bark beetle kill of timber.

There was a suggestion that perhaps there hasn't been public input with regard to the logging that has taken place to date. Before we got into the pine bark beetle salvage and prevention programs, I recollect that we did in fact hold public meetings in the Crowsnest Pass area. Input was requested from various groups with regard to the future logging practices which would take place. I know those meetings did in fact take place. There was a lot of input from concerned groups: from the Fish & Game Association of southern Alberta, the Wilderness Association, the guest ranch operators, and other recreation interests.

There was also a suggestion that there has been no regulation of the harvesting that has taken place in the area. In fact, with regard to buffer strips and the other practices which have been permitted there, they've been operating under the timber harvesting and ground operating rules. I've alluded to buffer strips along stream banks. These have been established in conjunction with the department of Public Lands and Wildlife.

Some question was raised with regard to clear-cutting versus selective logging practices. To date in Alberta I don't think it's been proven feasible or practical to engage in selective logging. Some question was raised with regard to the size of the clear-cuts, and some suggestion that they were some 600 acres in area. In fact, to date the largest clear-cut in the south Castle River valley has been 185 acres, and that has been subdivided into smaller

parcels by streamside reserves. When one looks at the question of selective logging, given the winds we have in that part of the province, in some of the cuts there we've experienced that if you leave behind trees in open spaces, you will have blowdown, and that it is more environmentally acceptable to clear the 20-, 30-, or 40-acre part than to leave trees behind because eventually they will blow down.

When we look at what has taken place in terms of the entire amount of logging in the south Castle in 1979 and 1980, 753 acres have been cut: 433 in 1979 and 320 in 1980. This is a total of 3 to 5 per cent of the vegetated area of the south Castle valley. Prior to 1979, a further 560 acres were logged in that area. The hon. member has alluded to lack of buffer strips along streams. I recognize that there is one area in the south Castle where, for a short distance — 100 yards or so, perhaps a little longer — a buffer strip was not left. Again, it was the question of blowdown. If the logs were left, they would have blown down in any event.

There has been some suggestion about watershed damage which may have resulted from the logging which has taken place in the south Castle. I think this goes back to the flood which took place in 1975. If one really examines what took place in '75, in terms of amount of precipitation we had in that period, a significant amount of snow pack developed in the April/May area, over 7.5 inches of precipitation. We had a further couple of inches of rain, some 7 inches, from May 20 to June 2, and then a tremendous amount of rain in the June 2 to July 1 area, for a total of 16 inches of precipitation in that short period of time back in 1975. At any rate, only 560 acres had been harvested in the south Castle valley at that time. With the extraordinary amount of precipitation in the south Castle, it's really questionable whether that contributed in any significant manner to the erosion and flooding which took place. So I do not necessarily think you can relate the watershed damage to the amount of logging which had taken place in that valley at that point in time.

Questions were raised with regard to practices of sustained yield logging in the south Castle valley and the Castle area in particular. When one looks at sustained yield, one has to look in terms of the variety of cover you do have in place in the forest management area. There is a variety of ages of timber in that valley, due to fire damage back in the 1930s. When you have mature timber, it is thought you should go in and harvest a certain percentage of it rather than have it become susceptible to disease or fire. So the question of whether sustained yield practices could continue in the Castle River valley is just because of the difference of the age of the timber due to previous fires. In fact the allowable cut that was going to be permitted there was over a 13-year period, and was extended to a 15-year period in order to follow good harvesting practices. When there was a shortfall in the quota in the area, the department of forestry did not relax its environmental standards and remove reserve blocks earlier. Rather they made up the shortfall by providing alternate timber quota in areas outside the C3 management unit.

The question was raised whether we should have more hearings into logging practices in the eastern slopes of the province. Within the last two years, we have just concluded a review of those practices by the environment conservation authority, and they came up with an excellent report on the environmental effects of forestry operations in the province. I think they made a number of

good recommendations, and departments are following through on a number of them and examining what can be done with the balance. So I don't see the need for us to get into another set of hearings with regard to forestry practices in Alberta.

The member also suggested we have some tourism or recreation study done with regard to that part of the valley. Recently the Department of Tourism and Small Business conducted a study on the entire southwestern Alberta area with regard to tourism destination, and considered the recreational and tourism potential of the entire area, which also included the south Castle area.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

I might point out that in terms of a co-ordinated effort with regard to logging in the Castle area, the department, in conjunction with a number of groups, worked out some very carefully co-ordinated plans to log at the Beaver Mines Lake recreation area and the Castle cross-country area. Perhaps these are the most intensive management plans that have been conducted to date by the department of forestry with regard to harvesting practices.

Really what we come down to, I think, is that the concerns that have been raised in the south Castle relate to whether or not the Scarpe Creek area should be logged. This is in a higher elevation area. I must advise members that the south Castle valley is a very scenic area and has a lot of recreational potential. The department has under consideration for logging some 200 to 250 acres which have been badly infested by the pine bark beetle. Within that 200 to 250 acres are some 5 million board-feet of timber. It has not yet been determined whether the Scarpe Creek area will in fact be logged. The department wants to go in and have a ground survey to determine whether the area should in fact be logged.

It might be noted that in the south Castle valley to date, the Alberta Forest Service has excluded areas from logging. In particular, Grizzly Creek was excluded at the specific request of the Alberta Wilderness Association in 1975. Jutland Creek will not be logged, and plans to log in the Font Creek area have been cancelled because of representations that have been made. I guess the question which relates to Scarpe Creek is whether or not logging can take place in an environmentally acceptable manner and recover a valuable resource to the province.

My approach to the entire question of how we go about recovering from the devastating effects of pine bark beetle infestation is that we should first of all develop a control program to attempt to stop the northward infestation of the pine bark beetle. That is currently in place, and work is taking place at this time to try to limit the infestation from proceeding north of Highway 3. There are pockets of infestation in the Porcupine Hills area and farther north into the Crowsnest forest. For the benefit of hon. members I might note that on the British Columbia side of the border, the pine bark beetle infestation has gone as far north as a point directly west of Kananaskis Country and Banff National Park. If anyone has had the opportunity to venture into the Castle area or into Waterton Lakes National Park, you will be able to look at the devastating effect this little beetle has had on our forestry resource and on the recreational potential of the area. It is not a very pretty sight.

With regard to salvage, the position I have taken is that where we have merchantable stands of timber — and I might note that we have only two years in which to

salvage this timber — we should move in and remove it where it is possible to salvage it in an environmentally acceptable manner. If we don't do that, I believe we'll have increased fire hazard as a result of the pine bark beetle infestation. The other question is: if these stands are left there, will they in fact attract other types of infestations and insects? And the other question is that if these stands are left, the blowdown that will result will affect the regeneration of future stands and, again, create significant problems.

Again, with regard to Scarpe Creek, my mind is still open on the question of whether Scarpe Creek should be logged. I think I'd like to see the results of the ground survey. I recognize it is in a very scenic area. But one has to question whether if the resource is not salvaged — you have a loss of 5 million board-feet of timber — the material will be left to rot and eventually fall down. I suggest that would be aesthetically unpleasing. If the salvage is conducted in an environmentally acceptable manner, proper controls are in place, and access roads are put in in a very careful and controlled manner and put to bed after the salvage has been completed and the area has been replanted, perhaps the longer term effect would be to increase the wildland recreation potential of the area. But as I say, my mind is still open on whether we should go into Scarpe Creek. Other than that, another 75-acre parcel farther down the valley was left over from the previous salvage program scheduled in the south Castle area. At this point in time, those are the only areas under consideration for logging in the south Castle area.

It might be noted that concerns have been raised about previous harvesting practices. This spring I had an opportunity to have an aerial view of the area, and I'd like to get in on the ground to have a further look at exactly what took place with regard to harvesting in previous years. So the question in the south Castle really relates to whether or not this one 200- to 250-acre area can be logged in an environmentally acceptable manner, also taking into consideration the recreational and wildland potential of the area.

I want to turn briefly to the question of Coleman Collieries' operation in the Crowsnest Pass. It has been of ongoing concern to me and to the residents in that area. When I was first elected in 1975 and Coleman Collieries was a booming operation employing some 650 people, there was concentrated effort to reduce emissions from that plant and in fact relocate it out of the valley floor. The efforts I made from 1975 to 1978 were to look at alternatives to the operation of that plant so close to the residential area. In 1978, Coleman Collieries announced they were closing down because the quality of their reserves was not such that they could continually be economically viable. So from 1978 to 1980, my concentrated efforts were to try to find an alternative in terms of the resource; to take those steps which would see Coleman Collieries continue as an economically viable unit, still respecting that there was a question of the environmental effect their plant was having on the area.

Coleman Collieries closed in 1980, and there was significant economic dislocation in the Crowsnest Pass. Their employment reduced from a previous high of 650 to about 80, who have basically been involved in a rewash operation of coal slack piles on the south side of the valley, which were a result of earlier mining operations. The community had to weigh very carefully the benefits of continuing to employ 80 people versus the longer term effects of having that operation continue. Assurances were given that the level of dust pollution which would

occur from the operation would be significantly less than that which had occurred during the time Coleman Collieries had been an active mining operation.

During this time, Coleman Collieries has been seeking a market for these some 5 million tons of coal piles which they intended to reprocess. To date they have not found a market. It has been evident to citizens in the area that the amount of pollution which has been coming from the rewash operation, in terms of experimenting with different combinations of operating the plant to achieve the necessary product, has resulted in an increased amount of dust fall. The citizens of the area are quite concerned that for the next five or six years they have to live with the conditions currently taking place with regard to the experimental process Coleman Collieries is undergoing. It's not acceptable to the majority of members of the community, and neither is it acceptable to me.

The Minister of Environment has set up a ministerial advisory committee to look into that particular question plus a number of other unresolved questions in the Crowsnest Pass with regard to reclamation of coal slack piles and the future location of infrastructure to service the coal resource in the Crowsnest Pass. I trust that the committee, which I will be chairing, will be able to come up with some solutions to the particular question of the rewash operation in Coleman, and come up with recommendations which will have a positive effect on future coal pile reclamation and location of infrastructure.

I now want to turn to some of the remarks of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview with regard to the Syncrude operation. I think it should be noted that I believe Syncrude as a company has operated in good faith with regard to the environmental guidelines put down by the province of Alberta, and that they have been very conscious and made an extensive effort to comply with and work within those guidelines. Let's look at the question of when they have in fact exceeded provincial air quality standards in the recent period the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview suggested. In that two-year period, the plant exceeded 29 times in 30-minute periods, 18 times in 60-minutes, and twice during 24-hour periods. It should be noted that that represents less than 0.3 per cent of the total time the plant has been operational.

Syncrude has always had a good corporate philosophy that it would work within and comply fully with Alberta's clean air standards. One has to ask what caused the occurrences in which they exceeded the standards? Basically the causes were equipment breakdown and adverse weather conditions, both of which were beyond the control of the company. It should be noted that none of these violations was deliberate. When you look at a plant like Syncrude, when a certain piece of equipment breaks down, do you in fact shut down the entire operation, which includes the cokers and all the very complicated process in which you have to co-ordinate the effort to keep that plant operating? Sure, it would be easy to say we should close it down because we are exceeding to some degree the standards the province has set. [interjection] Well, it's very easy for the hon. member to say we should shut it down. That can result in a 55- or 60-day shutdown, because a coker has been turned off and it takes that amount of time to turn it around and get it back into operation.

I might also note that the design of the plant at Mildred Lake was finalized in 1973. That was three years before newer sulphur-control technology became commercially available. The 1973 design incorporated the best available practical technology and satisfied all legal and

environmental requirements. The question could be asked: do Syncrude's emissions beyond the standards pose a threat to the environment? I don't believe that the health of animals or plants has been harmed by the incidents which have occurred.

The hon. member was referring to economics at Syncrude. I don't believe the participants in Syncrude are at this time receiving a rate of return on their investment which would justify the initial investment in the operation. The other point I would like to make: the Ottawa national energy program has an adverse effect on the corporation's investment decisions in terms of expansion of the plant to increase supply to an additional 75,000 barrels on stream. The hon. member suggests the economics are there; I suggest a more careful examination would suggest that the participants are not at this time earning a rate of return which would justify the initial investment on the operation, and again state that I do not believe any threat to the environment has been posed by the 0.3 per cent of the time the plant has been operating that they have exceeded the limits.

Syncrude has an exhaustive monitoring program in place, monitoring the stack emissions on a regular half-hour to hour basis. They have monitors within a 15-kilometre area around the plant site. It is all computer related into the plant site. Alarms are raised when sulphate droppings reach half the permissible level, not when they get right to the point where they are exceeding. So they are very environmentally conscious in terms of the operation of their plant.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before we continue in Committee of Supply, may the hon. Member for Camrose and the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight revert to introduction of visitors?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

#### head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

(reversion)

MR. STROMBERG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the second time I would like to introduce to the members of the Legislature the New Sarepta school grades 7, 8, and 9 from my constituency. With them today are their two teachers Roberta Hay and Mr. Olesky. I might add that after this afternoon they'll be visiting the 'met' office at Nisku airport. I've requested that if it's going to rain on my farm this afternoon, they will let me know. They are seated in the members gallery, and I ask them now to rise and be recognized by the members of the Legislature.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to thank you very much for allowing me today to introduce to you a distinguished citizen from the city of Calgary. He's a famous war hero, newspaper publisher, politician, and the former Solicitor General of this province. He is now chairman of the Alberta Racing Commission. He is seated in the Speaker's gallery. I'd ask Mr. Roy Farran to rise and receive the greetings of the House.

#### head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

(continued)

(Committee of Supply)

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to fly in the

face of tradition this morning and be brief. I'd like to ask the Minister of Environment if he would be good enough in his remarks to give us some kind of update with respect to the former CIL explosives plant in southeast Calgary, as to the disposition of some of the hazardous wastes which had been buried on the site, also the matter of progress with respect to the demolition of the buildings on the site and perhaps even the process of demolition. In that regard, he might also like to give us an update with respect to what kind of mechanisms are in place for the disposal of hazardous wastes which have been on the site. Where will the new location be?

MR. L. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to bring up a point to the minister that was brought up by my colleagues from Grande Prairie and Drayton Valley. It's the emission of sulphur dioxide into the atmosphere from some of our gas plants. I guess the question is: do you have an allowable amount that you can release into the atmosphere? I was wondering if your department takes into consideration that they might have six or seven plants in an area, say, 30 miles in diameter. I'm wondering if you're taking into effect the cumulative effect of these pollutants in an area. I've had several people complain that in the northern part of my constituency they are now putting in, I think, the seventh plant within a radius of 25 miles. They are beginning to be worried about the amount of pollution that's going into the atmosphere.

One other quick comment, Mr. Minister, on the regional landfill sites and the regional garbage disposal they set up in the Drumheller constituency at quite an expense to your department. I understand that some people are saying that they don't wish to partake in this new regional system, and are going back to what we call a modified landfill, which loses all control of the site, so to speak. They allow burning and almost anything to be buried in there. That could eventually run into our water supply and ground water. I'm wondering if you could comment on what your department can do to discourage the return to where we were before in modified landfill sites, and to try and keep this regional system running which, with the co-operation of the people and MDs involved, would I'm sure be pretty beneficial to the whole area.

Thank you.

MR. STROMBERG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The minister is quite aware of a specific problem we have in our constituency. He's certainly had the mayors and aldermen from these villages into his office on several occasions. I speak now of Bittern Lake, Armena, and Hay Lakes. These three communities have outgrown their water amplifier and are running into a very . . . [interjection] Well, whatever. They've run out of water supply. They've outgrown it, and run into quite a serious problem. I find it rather discouraging that with the many programs that not only the minister's office but other departments have for the small towns and villages of Alberta to enhance growth, such as the main street improvement program, decentralization, and a number of grants — to me, to encourage these towns and villages with funding is like paving a road into a desert. No one is going to live at the end of that paved road if there's no water. I understand there are a number. I would like to know how many communities in this province are outgrowing their water supply.

If you take a look at the situation of Bittern Lake, Armena, and Hay Lakes in my constituency, Imperial Oil

made application to the ERCB, and it was granted and approved by cabinet, to run a water pipeline from the Cold Lake reservoir across country, passing one mile from the village of Hay Lakes, for a flood injection scheme they had in one of their oil fields. The communities in the Camrose area felt that if that pipeline had been bent, and the province had picked up differential in length, and serve the communities of Gwynne, Armena, Bittern Lake, and Hay Lakes . . . When you realize that the pipeline is within a mile of Hay Lakes — the only alternative they had then was to build their own pipeline another mile away, a large reservoir, and collect ground water.

It seems to me that Imperial Oil came up with just about every imaginable excuse why it was not feasible to supply a little extra water to the town of Hay Lakes. I might say that the minister's office was not that encouraging. But what would happen to the number of towns and villages now in Alberta that have just an adequate supply of potable water? If, say, another 100 families come in and their wells are depleted, will we then be looking at a program of regional water supply, or will they be given a death sentence that without water you cannot grow?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There's no one else on the list. Would the minister like to respond to the participants?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, before I commence, I'll express a well-known expression by a great friend of mine and an ex-colleague who is not with us anymore. The hon. Clarence Copithorne said: the first thing I'm going to do is oil my boilers. And subsequent to that he took a drink of very good environmental water.

[Mr. Cookson sipped from his glass of water]

No PCBs in it.

AN HON. MEMBER: It's not like the John A. Macdonald water.

MR. COOKSON: To commence the number of comments and contributions in the discussion, I guess I have to go back to last Wednesday when the Member for Olds-Didsbury raised some questions with regard to the ERCB and the ECA, their jurisdiction, and so on. As members know, the Environment Council of Alberta comes under my jurisdiction, and part of the allocation for funds is in here. The Energy Resources Conservation Board comes under Energy and Natural Resources. They hold hearings on various projects throughout the province.

The question is with reference to whether the Environment Council could or could not make presentations to the ERCB. Best of all I might refer the member to a letter to Mr. Crerar, which dates back to December 18, 1980, in which the very same question was raised. I made the comment in the correspondence that

I believe there is considerable merit in having the Public Advisory Committee as an intervenor at ERCB hearings where environmental matters are of importance. It is conceivable that an appropriate sub group, whether by discipline or representation, could prepare an intervention and then provided that it met with the approval of the Committee, present it as the Committee's intervention with respect to that particular application. It should be pointed out and I

think this is often overlooked that an intervention can be both positive to the application as well as in opposition ... or merely comment on the application outlining the positive and negative features ... of environmental problems.

In filing an intervention, it would give the committee the opportunity both to examine the applicant as well as other intervenors as well as be subjected to cross examination by the applicant, other intervenors, board and departmental staff ...

I go on to say that

this could be developed as a positive means by which the Public Advisory Committee could comment, influence, and communicate its position with respect to ... energy-related applications.

I suggest to Mr. Crerar that one might

also consider having the ECA technical staff provide some of the technical assistance to the committee ... I personally believe that this could be an excellent opportunity for the various organizations which are representative on PAC to make their views known on environmental matters.

However, I clarify this by saying that "it would, however, be important that the intervention submitted be reviewed and endorsed by those respective organizations" they represent, so that there is no misunderstanding as to their responsibility.

The question has been raised with regard to biologists or sociologists:

Secondly, the concept of having biologists or sociologists represented on the board hearing panel is an interesting question. At the present time, the only panel members other than permanent ERCB members are the Deputy Minister of the Department of the Environment and the ... Assistant [Deputies] of the Department and the Executive Director of the ... Environmental Centre at Vegreville [and] Chairman of the ... Planning Board.

So I simply suggest that there may be some merit in a biologist or sociologist submitting. Mr. Chairman, I think that answers the question. As far as I'm concerned, I think it's a good opportunity for the ECA to make representations.

The Member for Olds-Didsbury quoted from comments I made at an Environment Council of Alberta convention in Calgary. I can't recall the total phraseology, except that the most significant part the member quoted was as to the responsibility for the words suggesting that some ministers do not have a particular interest in matters of environment, and therefore internal problems with regard to environmental matters. What I primarily implied by that comment in Calgary was that all of us have responsibilities within our own departments. In each department we have responsibilities that, in a sense, override other departments. The Minister of Agriculture has an internal responsibility for making sure, for example, that he defends and protects the use of agricultural chemicals. As Minister of Environment, I have no quarrel with that. In terms of his department, the minister of economic affairs has a proper position to defend the development of industry. I'm sure the opposition members have no quarrel with that.

In the comments in Calgary, the implication I made was that, keeping all this in mind, and there are some 28 departments or so, I had to sell the concepts which I promote from time to time with my colleagues and the caucus. Now some of them I win, and some I lose. I suggested to the Environment Council that they could

help me in my responsibility, if they in turn could go to other departments on some of these issues. It's a suggested strategy that they go directly to a particular minister with an issue that has an environmental concern. That will help complement the case I make before my colleagues. Really that was the intent of the comments.

MR. R. CLARK: How can they do that, Jack, with a 19 per cent increase in their budget? I'm not trying to be overly argumentative here. I think the suggestion that has been made to the ECA is very good. But there's a 22 per cent increase in the budget over last year, and yet when I look at the ECA estimates, up 19 per cent, which is 10 per cent behind the rate, how in the world is the ECA going to be able to do what I think is a good suggestion with the kind of allocation in the budget?

MR. COOKSON: Well, that's a good point. Perhaps it can be raised at the time we — unless you want me to address it now, we could raise it at that time. Okay, we'll go on then. I think that dealt with the two major concerns of the member.

Then we get to the Member for Calgary Buffalo. Mr. Chairman, I thought that the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest did such an excellent job of responding to the member's concerns, particularly with the Castle River area and the logging situation, that I just sort of stroked that right off my comments. I think sufficient has been said in that area.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

Insofar as the internal operation, it might help the member to understand how we attempt to work together as departments. Our land reclamation conservation legislation is effective over the total province. We have an interdepartmental committee made up of members of the different departments who rule and make decisions on things that happen, particularly on Crown lands — and this would be Crown land. Subsequently, those recommendations go to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources and are administered by the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife. So under the land conservation and reclamation Act, we have a reclamation council, and we also appoint members at large to administer reclamation. In that list of people we include members of the forestry service under Public Lands and Wildlife. They are primarily charged with the responsibility of carrying out the guidelines of land reclamation. So quite a number of the comments I could make with regard to forestry operations could be far better answered under Public Lands and Wildlife insofar as logging, et cetera, is concerned. I think the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest did an excellent job of reviewing that specific area, and what they're doing. You may want to follow up from that.

You wanted to know about the Peace River-Sweathouse spill. [interjections] The member did amend and qualify his original question. On that particular, I could give you just a little update on the information I have before me. The spill was on December 6, 1980, 1800 hours, Peace Pipeline near Section 36-70-20 W5, and the spill was later estimated at 40,000 barrels:

The oil was contained in a tributary to Sweathouse Creek, which subsequently flows into the Smoky River. Attempts were made to recover the oil, but due to ... cold inclement weather, sections of the ... area were ignited. On December 15, 1980, the



two final sections containing oil were burned. It was estimated [at the time] that [about] 95 per cent of the oil that was contained . . . was burned. The decision to burn was made by the Energy Resources Conservation Board . . .

which comes under the Department of Energy and Natural Resources, in consultation with other departments like our own, fish and wildlife, Alberta forest service, and the pollution control division in our department. These decisions were based on, and took into consideration, possibility of environmental damage. Subsequent to that, the ERCB held an inquiry on January 26. In their wisdom and their quasi-judicial position under Energy and Natural Resources, they can proceed to hold a public or private hearing. If it's of a general public nature, it's a judgment decision that they'll hold a public hearing. If not, they feel that a private hearing is sufficient. As a result of the hearing — and these go on continuously; the Mill Woods break was classic, where new regulations had been brought in — they "have upgraded their spill detection equipment for this [particular] pipeline and a rehabilitation program is now under way in the affected area". The ERCB will continue to monitor the progress that the company is making.

You asked with regard to railway control. Fort Saskatchewan is one of the areas we're having some concerns with. At this time maybe I can just say that we are moving quite rapidly because of the hazardous chemical problem, as you know, because of the transportation federal legislation dealing with the problems of railway transportation. I would like to think there is going to be something in place by this fall that will help deal with the problem of the Member for Clover Bar. Don't quote me on that too much, but I think we can work on that.

A question about the Pincher Creek situation was asked. Let me respond in this way. There are two plants in the area, the Waterton and the Gulf. The most recent work by Alberta Environment was a survey completed in March '81. The plants themselves are operating well below the licence limit. They're averaging about 50 per cent below the licence limit. The Department of Environment is now in the second phase of a selenium study which, I believe, is related to SO<sub>2</sub> emissions. That should be completed within a month. As you know, the health unit in the area became involved because we had gone about as far as we could in terms of our own expertise. It was subsequently referred to the Department of Social Services and Community Health which, first of all, is assessing the work to date to determine what other studies should be taken. The terms of reference are being put together, et cetera. It's really gone from an environmental issue, in which we've exercised all the expertise we can, to an issue which the Department of Social Services and Community Health is operating.

The other comment you referred to was with regard to research.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Probably the hon. minister would direct the remarks to the Chair.

MR. COOKSON: Sorry, Mr. Chairman. The other comments of the member referred to the monitoring of SO<sub>2</sub> [interjection] I do a better job than the Member for Calgary Buffalo, don't I?

Our present requirements are that incinerator stacks have to have a continual monitoring service. We have to monitor the ambient air quality. We also require independent monitoring twice a year. These monitorings are

submitted to Alberta Environment. In addition, we'll occasionally pop in with our own monitors and do our own independent monitoring of plants where there may be some problems. To answer the member's question, technically we believe a plane can be used. The Department of Agriculture has used plane work on occasion for detecting ambient air quality. It's quite expensive, but we think there is perhaps some place for use of this facility in monitoring the air over a large area, not specifically on the site but in general. Our intention is to follow up on that. I think that answers most of the questions the member raised.

The Member for Bow Valley is not here, but I would like to respond in this way with regard to sewer problems. The member specifically mentioned the Brooks problem. I think it's important that all members understand the responsibilities in this area. In the department of course we have the administration of the water and sewer programs, and we have the shared funding. When a municipality asks the province to fund through Environment, we must lay before that municipality certain requirements in order to meet the objectives of the clean air standards. Therefore we dialogue with that municipality, but at all times we make perfectly clear that we will not recommend that they should hire any specific consultant or that they should accept any specific person for tender. Let me clarify that. Generally speaking, unless there are some mitigating circumstances, we would expect that the low tender be accepted. So in all this communication with the municipalities, they should always clearly understand that Environment is primarily interested in the end product, when it leaves the lagoon in this case.

In the particular Brooks problem, Brooks subsequently employed their own consultant. Following that they tendered and, because of our approval, they accepted the low tender. Subsequent to that, Brooks had failure of the pipeline, et cetera, but we would not take any responsibility for that. The consultants and contractors are all bonded. It's extremely important that municipalities understand this procedure, and we continue to remind them. Therefore we can't accept the position that Environment should have any responsibility for failure by a contractor and/or consultant. We have made that perfectly clear. One can understand the reason for that. These tenders are all over the province. If we were to exonerate engineers or consultants from their responsibility, we might as well do the work ourselves, and we don't want to get into the work.

That's really the position we take. We said to Brooks that because of the unfortunate circumstances and because of our formula, we would be prepared to look at some of the reasonable litigation costs incorporated into our water and sewer program, but that we would not give them a credit and thereby reduce their per capita debt load because of the failure. That's really where that situation is at the present time. A letter primarily laying out our position went to Her Worship the Mayor on the 13th. Insofar as I know at this time, we're helping them all we can in terms of our own expertise, and they're proceeding to solve the problem. It has caused some real anxiety downstream, but we think this thing will work its way out if everyone will just be patient. It takes a little time to do these things.

The Member for Calgary McKnight raised the interesting problem of where our legislation is insofar as a municipality charging for water. Personally I feel badly that a municipality will not undertake to charge a fee for water supply. There are several reasons for that. The

most important is that it encourages inefficient use of water. In addition, inefficient use of water unfortunately reflects on the total capital cost of water and sewer facilities. Since Calgary picks up the total cost of their water and sewer — with the exception of our phosphorus program; we're providing some funds — it's in the interests of the city to get their operation economically viable so they can balance their books in this area.

I think the facility of the city of Calgary for handling sewage is one and a half times the requirements for the city of Edmonton. They have both the Fish Creek and the Bonnybrook facilities. These are huge capital facilities to handle the extra volume of water because nobody turns the tap off. My understanding is that in new subdivisions, et cetera, the council agreed to provide monitoring and charge accordingly. I'd be interested in further comments in that area if I'm incorrect. We just can't afford this luxury too much longer in this province, particularly in the southern part where we have a considerably limited water supply.

The question was asked with regard to the phosphorus program. As you know, our government has gone to a phosphate removal program. In this case, I'm happy to say that Calgary is the first major municipality to initiate this program we are funding. I think some funding has gone out already. They're accelerating the program, and it's excellent news for downstream users in particular because, as you know, the deterioration of the Bow River has been a long-standing concern. That's ongoing. It won't have any impact on water use except again to say that the more water supply that's carelessly used, the more sewage effluent, and therefore the more requirement for more phosphorus control. Theoretically, because both ferric chloride and alum are used — I'm not sure which the city will be using — these are expensive requirements, and they'll add to the operational costs because of the larger volume of water. I am happy to say that the new plant that's opened in Calgary is already resulting in some improvement in the quality of the Bow River. That's good news.

The Member for Spirit River-Fairview asked a number of questions, if I can pull them all together. One comment was with regard to advisement procedures as far as spills. Perhaps I can put into the record how we generally proceed insofar as spills are concerned:

Emergency release of materials to the environment is evaluated on an individual basis as to whether or not an announcement is made to the public of possible hazards. The evaluation is based on:

1. The type of material released.
2. Size of the episode or quantity of material released.
3. Concentration of any potentially hazardous materials.
4. Area impacted.
5. Proximity of population in the area.
6. Potential or real risks to the population.
7. Sensitivity of the receptor.

These are the procedures we follow, again depending whether it's a truckload of butter or a truckload of dynamite that tips over. When you weigh all these, you use different procedures for different materials. If there is even the slightest possibility of effects on people, based on criteria such as the '78 guidelines for Canadian drinking water quality, and for national air quality, the pollution control division will advise municipalities that may be affected, the local medical officer of health, and Alberta Disaster Services of the situation and will recommend

what course of action should be instituted.

Industries such as gas processing plants have their own emergency plans that can be put into effect almost immediately. They are almost self-contained. These plans, which are registered with us under the pollution control division, spell out actions to be taken in case of emergencies. Part of their procedure is to inform the various government departments, municipalities, and the public of the emergency. In effect, that answers the question about the advisement of spills.

The member also commented on the Procter & Gamble PCB spill, which everybody seemed to get excited about this last week. In further discussion and confirmation with the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation, in 1974 there was an overflow of PCBs from a transformer containing 500 gallons, no rupture of the casing, and only a small portion of the fluid was lost. We have no quantitative data on how much. As I suggested in the House yesterday, my information is that there was about one gallon of this. We have no report of the incident, but that's not unusual because of the procedures of companies who periodically do away with their files. The important thing is that in 1974, there was no real information as to any toxicity of PCBs and no real reporting procedure. The company has no record of any injuries, and it has been checked out with the Workers' Compensation Board to see if there are any claim records. In addition, the Hon. Bill Diachuk has provided me with the information, including the fact that the resident officer in Grande Prairie will visit the plant to make additional inquiries regarding this. So that, in a sense, deals with the 1974 spill.

The question with regard to the sulphur emissions was raised. I'd like to say this with regard to sulphur emissions. So far we've done pretty well in Alberta, but I'm not totally confident. I think we can probably do better. Where we have to be continually alerted is the cumulative effect of these materials and, in addition, the possibility of larger uses of coal in the province. Fortunately, coal in the province has a low sulphur content, but the removal of sulphur from coal is not an easy process. Through Economic Development, our government is continuing to look at other methods of handling coal. For example, somewhere down the road we may be able to convert coal into gas, coal gasification. We're looking at these developments right across the world. In South Africa they have some very advanced technology in this area, and we hope we can pull some of that together before we get too far into it.

I would like to comment on a document by the Alberta Society of Professional Biologists. It was a Subcommittee On Acid Rain of the House of Commons Committee on Fisheries and Forestry. It was a public hearing held in Calgary. I think page 6 of the document sums it up very well. I'd like to quote what these people said about the problems of sulphur dioxide:

To conclude this presentation, we wish again to point out that our concerns are not specifically with damage from acid precipitation in this region of Canada. As far as we are aware, biological damage from acid precipitation has not been demonstrated to have occurred in Alberta. Furthermore, much of the land surface in this Province is overlain with glacial deposits, which tend to be neutral or slightly alkaline. Most of these . . . deposits, with the exception of sands and sandy or organic [materials] which may appear on the surface, have a high to moderate buffering capacity. Consequently we do not expect a

widespread acid precipitation problem in Alberta, because of the relatively low amounts of acid-forming pollutants, as well as the capacity of the surface to assimilate these compounds.

I think that's a pretty significant statement by professional people who have no vested interest in giving that kind of assurance unless it's their very best professional/technical knowledge.

I now want to say that — and it's been raised by the Member for Grande Prairie — we do have some sensitive areas of the province, and we're not going to let our guard down with regard to those soils which are slightly acidic and could become more so because of  $\text{SO}_2$ . We are continuing to do further upgrading studies in the area. We're working with the Department of Agriculture. I also want to remind members that when one looks at the acidity of lands, everyone continues to look at those stacks that are up in the air. But every person who operates and manages soil in the province should also look at what they're doing insofar as fertilizing is concerned, in particular anhydrous ammonia. My understanding is that all these materials, and of course fertilizers with sulphur, should be carefully looked at if they are starting to add to a detrimental pH level. So it is a total problem, and one has to continue to be alerted to it.

The member also talked about the — I'm spending a lot of time on this guy, but once in a while one has to put it on the record. The Member for Spirit River-Fairview is kind of a hit and run guy; he hits you and then he runs. He continues to go back to half-hour monitoring, and I thought the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, as the member on Syncrude, reviewed very carefully the half-hour and the one hour. If you followed the logic of the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, you would be flying in the face of the criteria for national air quality objectives for  $\text{SO}_2$  and all the other materials we are concerned about. Quite clearly it is laid out that one-hour averages are sufficient and accurate for our purposes. We're required to have the one-hour average, the 24-hour average, and the one-year average. The one-hour is 0.17 parts per million, the 24-hour is 0.06, and the one-year is 0.01. If you followed the member's logic, we should do away with the one-hour and the 24-hour and go to the one-year, because it's lower than the half-hour. There's no logic to that. It simplifies the operation: it doesn't reduce the standards, and it still accomplishes the job.

The Member for Spirit River-Fairview also raised the Sweathouse Creek report with regard to the spill referred to earlier. I appreciated the comments of the Member for Vegreville on the drainage program which will be in our budget, and adjustments to take care to balance the high funds we've allocated for irrigation in the south. We've done that, and I hope the opposition members will support my budget, because there's quite a bit of money in there for drainage. Secondly, the member spoke about the importance of our regional waterlines. I appreciated that. It was important that he laid out that this government is not an endless fountain of money. Where we have to run waterlines under agricultural land — which does not sterilize the land or require that you have setbacks because of danger with regard to explosions, and where the land can be farmed forever — for goodness sake, we need some co-operation. Moving water around the province is going to help everyone. The people who need this water are those in the smaller municipalities that in turn serve the farmers. So the thing works both ways. We can only provide so much money. If projects are held up because we run out of funds out of a very generous

budget, everybody suffers.

The Member for Drayton Valley raised some interesting comments. I appreciate those. I agree with the member. I visited a very interesting individual in her constituency who reaffirmed the importance of private enterprise, particularly in handling waste. I hope we'll be able to follow through on that. The member commented on the importance of oil waste. We have some interesting projects. As you know, Turbo is building a new plant at Calgary, and they have done an excellent job of re-refining used oil. About 14 million gallons a year are floating around the province. We're going to take more initiatives. We're going to encourage collection of used oil. I've instructed my people to get on the ball in this regard. We're going to fund some storage containers. We're going to get with it. I hope all the farm people co-operate with this, because we can turn this back and make it into a positive program.

We're doing some further work on glass and paper recycling. We are at the mercy of the industry, especially with regard to paper, but our department continues to fund containers for paper storage. We hope we get support to continue to do this. Insofar as finding a market for the paper, it flows up and down and causes all of us some problems. In the case of Genesee, as part of our permission to operate in the area we have an agreement with the company concerned that a local citizen group will participate in all the reclamation, and we'll continue to operate in this area. I agree about the worry about the ground water. We're doing research in that. Zero emission is a great ideal. I hope we'll be able to meet that someday.

The Member for Grande Prairie raised some interesting points. We are trying to get up to 98 — I hope I'm not giving you incorrect information. In the case of sour gas plants, I think we're up to 98 to 99 per cent recovery. In fact, I think we've gotten close to 99 per cent in the member's area. I'm not sure we can get beyond that, but that's a pretty high recovery rate. We're lower on the tar sand plants. I mentioned that the ongoing review is being held in the area insofar as acid soils. The Minister of Agriculture has an excellent program in place now for liming to neutralize. Thanks for the compliments on the water and sewer. I know there will always be difficulties, but we'll continue. If we can get the opposition to support this massive funding for water and sewer, we'll do our best to get that money out there and do the job we expect it to do.

More information on long-term drainage: I appreciate the comment there, and we'll do our best to look at a longer term solution in that area. We have a few drainage districts in the province. I'm not sure they're as successful as we'd like to think they are, but the legislation is there. They are more of a long-term nature, and maybe we have to do more in that area.

The Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest clarified the Castle River work for the Member for Calgary Buffalo. His comments were well taken. The member commented on the Coleman Collieries situation. As he mentioned, we've selected a committee, of which he is one, to give us some direct input as to how we should handle that problem. Calgary Millican — I guess I didn't get a note down here. I'll have to take the question as notice. I'll give you an update on the CIL plant.

The Member for Drumheller: yes, we do take the cumulative effect into consideration. In other words, if 300 tonnes are going into the air from the one plant, we'll allow them an additional, so long as they stay within that

maximum 300. We're concerned about the regional land-fill sites, that we may get pressure to go back to those little dumps, the burning, and the problems there. I'd like to say to the members that we are looking at the possibility of an incineration type of garbage disposal unit. I'm not saying we'll be able to accomplish this, but it seems to me there is some merit. We've looked at them in Ontario. They're highly costly, but we'll continue to keep our options open on the possibility of burning under emission controls.

Finally, to the Member for Camrose, I'm sorry we weren't able to fulfil that water program insofar as the municipality of Hay Lakes and others are concerned. I note your concerns about limited funds, and I appreciate your support to continue to expand those funds. It's one of the best programs in the province as far as I'm concerned. One point was raised that I think I should just touch on. We need to co-ordinate any applications by industry for water injection prior to their establishing the line, so we can determine whether any municipalities within a reasonable area could make common use of that line. In this particular situation, the line was almost in place, we had made proposals to Hay Lakes to apply and so on, but somehow it got lost in the jumble of paper. But we'll continue to work at that.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I move that 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, next Tuesday afternoon the period following the question period has been designated for government business. Perhaps I could just outline what we propose for that time and the additional time in the week. This morning one of my colleagues indicated that Wednesday afternoon and Thursday evening, if required, would be used for the annexation debate.

Subject to the probability of calling second reading of Bills at some appropriate time later in the week, not Tuesday, we would simply continue in Committee of Supply for the various remaining purposes. We would begin again on Tuesday with the Department of Environment. Some miscellaneous matters haven't been addressed yet, in the sense of the Legislative Assembly estimates and the special warrants which have to be voted on. We'll try to fit those in at appropriate times. As to a major department, whether it follows specifically after Environment or after some of the incidental matters I've mentioned, the next one would be Hospitals and Medical Care.

[At 1 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]