

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Wednesday, May 27, 1981 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce to you and to Members of the Legislative Assembly the Hon. Pat Binns from Prince Edward Island. Pat is the Minister of Community Affairs, as well as the minister responsible for the Prince Edward Island Housing Corporation. We had the pleasure of having Pat as our guest, a representative at the wildlife conference we held here in Edmonton. I should also point out that Pat is a former resident of my constituency, as well as of the constituency of the hon. member from High Prairie. I would ask Pat to stand and receive the greeting of the Assembly.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

Bill 56
The Mines and Minerals
Amendment Act, 1981

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 56, The Mines and Minerals Amendment Act, 1981. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill proposes a number of technical amendments and, in addition, proposes four areas of principal amendments. The first deals with the department's capacity to accept refundable work deposits. The second deals with the capacity of the government for greater access to the records of lease owners or operators. There are also extensive provisions dealing with the division of leases after the deeper rights revision date, which is now in the legislation. Finally, it proposes to provide access by geophysical crews to certain roadways that are either leased or closed.

[Leave granted; Bill 56 read a first time]

Bill Pr. 12
The Burns Memorial Trust
Amendment Act, 1981

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill Pr. 12, The Burns Memorial Trust Amendment Act, 1981.

The purpose of this Bill is to change the words "any moneys received" to "the annual income". This clarification is sought to distinguish the spending of revenue funds from the spending of the capital funds.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 12 read a first time]

Bill Pr. 14
The Richmond Gate Trust Company Act

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill Pr. 14, The Richmond Gate Trust Company Act.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 14 read a first time]

Bill Pr. 13
The Calgary Foundation Act

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill Pr. 13, The Calgary Foundation Act.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 13 read a first time]

Bill Pr. 15
The North American Commercial
Trust Company Act

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill Pr. 15, The North American Commercial Trust Company Act.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 15 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have the honor today to table the annual report of the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1980.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree to revert to Introduction of Visitors?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**
(reversion)

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon it's certainly a pleasure for me to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, the Vice Governor of Gangweon, Mr. Young Chin Kim, and Mr. Young Kee Ham, the assistant public information officer of Gangweon province in South Korea.

The delegation from our sister province of Gangweondo is here to familiarize themselves with Canadian livestock development. It is our hope that meetings such as these will further Alberta's association with Gangweon in the future. It's certainly a personal pleasure for me to have the opportunity to return some of the hospitality shown to us when we had the opportunity to visit their province and country. Mr. Speaker, they are seated in your gallery, and I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the Legislature.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure today to introduce to you and other members of the Legislature a group of 33 people from the

constituency of Three Hills. After meeting them today, I would say that they are more advanced in wisdom than in years. They belong to the Golden Years Club in Beiseker, and I would ask them to stand and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly — and I hope they're there this afternoon, because I didn't have an opportunity to meet them prior to Assembly — 35 grades 5 and 6 students under the capable management, I hope, of Mr. Jim Sturgeon, who is the teacher concerned. They come from Clive, Alberta, a beautiful part of my constituency. Some would be residents of Clive, and some of the rural areas. So, hoping they are here, would they stand and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon it is my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you, 44 grades 6 and 8 students from the Mundare school in the Vegreville constituency. They are accompanied by teacher Mrs. Moroziuk, an adult supervisor, and their bus operator, who is also a teacher.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that in the past concern has been expressed in the Legislature and outside concerning class sizes and how they affect instruction and discipline. I would just like to say that over the many years I served as a school trustee representing the Mundare area, teachers had almost as many children in their classrooms, and I never saw any education deficiencies or discipline problem. There were no Kratzmann rules to abide by. The only difficulty was that it was hard to get that many seats in a classroom. I believe education in Alberta rates as high as it does because of such dedicated teachers.

They are seated in the public gallery, and I would ask that teacher Mrs. Moroziuk, parent supervisor Mrs. Dembicki, and bus operator and teacher Mr. Shupenia rise and receive the welcome of the Legislature.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, a class of grade 5 students from St. Lucy school located in the new Castle Downs area in the north part of the constituency of Edmonton Calder. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Maglioco, and their principal, Mr. Arendt. I might say I recently had the distinct privilege of attending the opening of the school; it is indeed a beautiful building. They are located in the public gallery, and I would like them to rise and receive the traditional greetings of the Assembly.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Emergency Telephone Service

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my first question is to the Associate Minister of Telephones. It relates to the possibility of an emergency situation that could occur in the province, such as occurred in Mississauga, Ontario. With the development of petrochemical facilities, research parks, and so on, the possibility does exist in Alberta. In contacting some of the AGT operators we have found that emergency procedures and directives don't seem to be in place for the operators when an emergency such as that occurs. I wonder if the minister could indicate

whether that is a fact, not only in these specific cases but in general across the province?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, there is an emergency process in place. AGT has emergency portable equipment, in terms of mobile units that can be moved into a location where there is an emergency. If the main central exchange office is destroyed or damaged in some way in an emergency situation, it's critical that these mobile units get in. However, in most emergency situations where the central exchange is not damaged or put out of control, it makes it much easier to deal with. But certainly a policy is in place.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. The information we gathered was that the manual provided for telephone operators was written sometime in the 1950s. We asked the operators certain questions, and said: look, if we wanted to contact a family or reach some type of agency that could assist us in a disaster, what are your instructions; what training do you have to direct our call to the right place or to take the right action? I recognize that there are emergency radio telephone communications, as the minister has indicated, but there are no instructions to the AGT operators as such. I was wondering if the minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member making a ministerial announcement?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister is: has he had the opportunity of reviewing the training manual for AGT operators with regard to special attention to emergency situations?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I would be very interested in getting the information the hon. Leader of the Opposition has indicated he has, and in reviewing that information and getting back to him at a later time.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Then could the minister indicate that he is not aware of any manual or emergency procedure in place for AGT operators in cases of emergency, or is he going to explore the matter at this time and report back to the House?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I know there is a procedure in place. However, we would be happy to review the information the hon. Leader of the Opposition seems to have, to see whether or not it's satisfactory.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. During this session could the minister table the training manual presently made available to AGT operators that deals with emergency situations, so we're totally aware of what is being told AGT operators in situations such as this?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, I would be happy to receive the information the hon. member has, then report back to the House or to the hon. member in terms of the process and procedures in place at AGT.

MR. R. CLARK: Why won't you table the manual?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. I really didn't want to ask a further question. Is the minister aware, and can something be

tabled? Will the minister take this matter under consideration and report to the Legislature this week?

DR. WEBBER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I certainly can take the matter under consideration and report back this week.

Clover Bar Research Facility

MR. R. SPEAKER: My second question is to the Minister of Housing and Public Works and follows yesterday's question with regard to a concern with a potential emergency situation, such as the one I have been talking about to the Associate Minister of Telephones, that could occur at the Clover Bar research facility. I wonder if the minister has had the opportunity to review the questions I raised yesterday and the request of the county of Strathcona that the Clover Bar facility be brought up to the building code standards of the area so residents in the area could be assured adequate protection.

MR. CHAMBERS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have done some research on this. The question might more appropriately have been put as a written question; but regardless, as I recollect — and I'm not quoting directly here, but I hope I'm quoting the intent of the question — the first question was: have any changes been made in the facility to meet the building code, also to avoid any disaster such as the county is concerned about? In response, we have commissioned a study by independent consultants who specialize in the safety aspects of the processes carried out — or will be — in this facility. Their conclusions were that there is no major disaster potential with the processes presently being carried out in the building and that the facilities are generally in accordance with the provincial building code requirements, therefore no changes are required to meet the Alberta Building Code.

The second question was: could I indicate whether my office is presently aware of the building code concerns of the county? Yesterday I responded that I was aware of that. My department is fully aware of the concerns of the county of Strathcona and has addressed these concerns by obtaining independent consultations, as I mentioned with the preceding consultants' report.

Could I indicate whether any new trailers had been added to the facility within the last two months? I checked that out. New trailers have been added, and we don't see any hazard with the location of these facilities. The Leader of the Opposition also asked me whether the coal research operation has been moved or is being considered to be moved at the present time. At this time the coal research facility has not been moved; however, as members are undoubtedly aware, this operation will be relocated as a first phase of the new facilities to be constructed in Devon.

The Leader of the Opposition also asked me whether funds are available in my budget to make the changes at the Clover Bar site. Yes, funds are included in the budget for the functional upgrading of the facility. The building is of course a number of years old, and the building codes change. Functional upgrading will of course include any minor changes to bring the building up to today's code standards.

The Leader of the Opposition further asked me if the program will meet all the building codes of the county of Strathcona and if I could indicate what action will be taken, et cetera. In looking at that and at the report commissioned by my department, it's our opinion that no

further specific action is required to meet the Alberta Building Code, with the exception of some minor items which are included in a tender we recently let.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Could the minister indicate to the Assembly if the consultant's report, which in fact differs substantively from the report of the county of Strathcona No. 20, has been shared with the responsible officials of the county of Strathcona? Has the minister or a senior official of the department sat down with the people in the county of Strathcona? Does Strathcona in fact agree with the conclusions the consultant has arrived at?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I know a meeting is scheduled — it was either yesterday or perhaps today — between officials of my department and the county.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Was the meeting scheduled or in fact held yesterday or today?

MR. CHAMBERS: It was held either yesterday or today; it had been previously scheduled.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is the minister in a position to table in the Assembly the consultants' report? Does the minister just offhand happen to recall who the consultants were, and how much the report cost?

MR. CHAMBERS: No, but I'd be happy to take that under consideration and advise the Assembly. These are questions of appreciable detail which would probably more appropriately be put on the Order Paper, but I'm happy to take them verbally and respond to them. If there is any other detail the members would like, if you want to give them to me now, I'll be happy to look them up and respond.

Alberta Research Council Building

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister with regard to the Alberta Research Council. Could the minister indicate whether renovations are being completed on the 87th Avenue Research Council building adjacent to the university campus? Has the minister funds available for those renovations?

MR. CHAMBERS: Again, Mr. Speaker, I was really happy to respond to any questions during the afternoon I spent here on the budget the day before last. I think I had at hand all the detail I needed with respect to my estimates, which are of considerable size and volume. I don't have that specific data on hand. I know that project is under way, but without checking I cannot respond as to what stage, in terms of planning or dollars, because I might not be accurate. I would never want to mislead the Leader of the Opposition or any of my colleagues in this Assembly. I will certainly be happy to take that. Again, if there are any other questions you would like to add to the list, I'll take them all. I'll be happy to respond tomorrow.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to that question. Could the minister report to the Legislature as well whether a special warrant will be required to complete the facilities and renovations on the 87th Avenue property?

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, [inaudible] if the minister might indicate the total cost of the renovation on the 87th Avenue project, and how long the Research Council plans to use that facility.

MR. CHAMBERS: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, there are problems with the sound system in here at times. I didn't hear the question from the Member for Olds-Didsbury.

MR. R. CLARK: Two matters: the total cost of the renovation at the 87th Avenue research centre and, secondly, how many years the Research Council plans to use that project. What future use has the government for the project after the Research Council moves to its new facility here in Edmonton?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I'll be happy to respond to that question.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. members who are putting the questions and to the hon. minister, I think it's becoming increasingly apparent that this topic should be dealt with by way of the Order Paper. Otherwise we're in a situation where we have questions involving a great deal of detail and a minister in effect reading a lengthy answer which ought to be tabled instead.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Sometimes that information is not available to us for months and even up to a year. So if we feel that it's a matter of urgent concern, we have no other choice but to ask it in the question period. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: There are ways of protesting what does or doesn't go on on the Order Paper. But we can't change the nature of the question period for that purpose, unless hon. members wish to change the *Standing Orders* and the usual parliamentary practise in this regard.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, with great respect. I would simply draw to your attention, sir, and to the attention of the Assembly, a comment made by my colleague the leader yesterday, when he said the information came into his hands simply yesterday. I think it's fairly obvious that in fact the session is in its last days. If the information could be made available, we appreciate the willingness of the minister to co-operate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Strike three.

Explosion — Fort Saskatchewan

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Environment. Can the minister indicate to the Legislative Assembly this afternoon if he has any information as to monitoring any emissions that may have escaped when the explosion occurred at Dow Chemical this morning in Fort Saskatchewan?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I can give some information on the monitoring of the particular plant. It was the vinyl chloride plant in the area. The explosion was at 7:10. Subsequent to that, our air quality control branch of the pollution control division was on site to investigate the incident. In addition, Dow Chemical themselves also monitored for potential contaminants.

Approximately a half-mile from the vinyl plant we detected a reading of 0.5 parts per million of vinyl ch-

loride. Also a continuous monitoring station located about 1,000 yards southeast of the plant recorded a peak reading of greater than 0.5 parts per million vinyl chloride. All the measurements for chlorine and hydrogen chloride gas indicate values below Alberta Environment standards, which are 0.1 parts per million of chlorine on the half-hour average, and 0.065 parts per million hydrochloride on the half-hour average. The sum total of these assessments is that the health effects for vinyl chloride are related to long-term high level exposures. The incident was of a short duration, therefore there were no concerns with regard to health.

Emergency Response Program

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister responsible for Disaster Services. This question is similar to what the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked, to do with the involvement of the minister's responsibility for Disaster Services. What co-ordination or involvement is there with the minister's department and the industries in the Fort Saskatchewan area when a potential disaster could occur?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, every community in Alberta, with perhaps some few exceptions among the smaller ones, has in place a very comprehensive program to respond to emergencies and disasters. Indeed, that is the case with the town of Fort Saskatchewan. In this case, the town works together with other municipal jurisdictions, the industries involved — in the case of Fort Saskatchewan, they're involved very extensively — and Disaster Services to develop an emergency response and contingency plan. That takes various forms, including the utilization of all the available resources of the Fort Saskatchewan fire department, and co-ordinating that with other fire departments, police departments, and so on, in the event that a larger contingent of assistance is needed. As well, that involves emergency communication programs. All I can say is that that emergency response program immediately comes into place in the event there's a disaster of such consequence that it cannot be handled by the normal functions of the company involved and perhaps the local police and fire departments.

Although my information is not complete, my understanding of this morning's explosion is that it was not necessary to signal an alarm of the nature that might have brought in other emergency teams, ambulance, fire, police, and so on; rather, the matter was handled by those involved in a normal way in the town of Fort Saskatchewan's emergency procedures.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Can the minister indicate what procedures are in place in the event of a major evacuation of the town of Fort Saskatchewan? What procedures are in place that would co-ordinate that with the town, the surrounding municipalities, the city of Edmonton, and the surrounding hospitals? What mechanism is in place for a major evacuation?

MR. SPEAKER: I have some concern whether a question of that scope can be answered in the question period. Obviously, we're going to have rather extensive detail involving an entire program for dealing with an emergency.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, with due respect to the hon. minister, what I'm asking for is what co-ordinating mechanism is there, or is there one?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, you were correct in saying it would be difficult to answer that question in total in the question period.

I would be pleased to provide details of the emergency response program that has been developed by the town of Fort Saskatchewan in consultation with other municipalities and the industry that might be involved. That is fairly detailed. I do know, however, that there is what I would consider a very good emergency response program available for that community. Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to provide copies, to the extent that the hon. member would have all the information he needs.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Really the minister has answered that there is a plan in effect. That's basically the question I was asking.

Explosion — Fort Saskatchewan (continued)

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation. Is the minister in a position to indicate if he has been in contact with the officials of Dow Chemical to find out what problem there was in the laboratory that exploded this morning? Were all procedures followed according to the direction, or in conjunction with the co-ordination, of the department for which the minister is responsible?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member well knows, the explosion is under investigation. Until the cause of the explosion is known — and as of about 2:15 this afternoon my office was advised that the cause has not been determined — we will not be able to establish whether it could have been prevented.

Sulphur Exports to South Africa

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of State for Economic Development — International Trade. It concerns the shipment of Alberta sulphur to the apartheid regime of the Republic of South Africa. Is the minister in a position to confirm to the House that of the 700,000 metric tonnes of sulphur shipped to South Africa, approximately 64 per cent, or about \$43 million of sulphur, came from the province of Alberta?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, considering that the major export of sulphur is from Alberta, namely in excess of 6 million tonnes, one could assume that this is so. However, any export of material, manufactured equipment, or commodities from Canada is really under the jurisdiction of the federal government. So I think he could maybe ask his colleague Mr. Broadbent to put the question to the federal House.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, knowing that the government here has all the information on almost every item, I'll put it to the hon. minister. In view of the concern of a number of people that sulphur is being used by the Republic of South Africa for arms and munitions manufacturing, and in view of the concern this government

should have for its own Bill of Rights and the International Declaration of Human Rights, has the government of Alberta undertaken any steps at all to ensure that Alberta sulphur is not used to repress the black majority in the Republic of South Africa?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I think one should correct the inference that sulphur is being used to manufacture arms. I think technology has now advanced to the stage where really other materials are used, for instance, for the manufacture of explosives. Having just come from the very successful sulphur conference in Calgary, which 18 nations from throughout the world attended, I can only say that the major proportion of sulphur is being used for the manufacture of fertilizer to grow food for the hungry of the world. Again, regarding the question he has put to us, I'd have to say he should really ask the House of Commons in Ottawa, because all that matter is really under the jurisdiction and/or consideration of the federal government of Canada.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In view of the concern expressed by a number of organizations, including the World Council of Churches, concerning the possible use of sulphur for arms manufacture, my question very directly to the minister: has any effort at all been made by the government of Alberta to determine that Alberta sulphur is not used either directly or as a substitute for sulphur used for this purpose? Is the minister in a position to advise whether the department has taken any steps, or is that simply somebody else's department?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I find it rather curious that at one time the hon. member indicates in the House that he would prefer the federal government to take over all and sundry industries in Canada, especially the oil industry. He now wants our government to initiate the questions and searches which, surely, are definitely under the jurisdiction of the federal government.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Notwithstanding the minister's effort to get us off on a wild goose chase with a good deal of inaccurate information, my question to the minister is: have any steps at all been taken through the minister's department to encourage the marketing of Alberta sulphur in the Republic of South Africa?

MR. SCHMID: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. In view of the UN General Assembly statement on the sale of strategic . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Surely we don't have to go to the United Nations to ask questions.

MR. NOTLEY: With great respect, Mr. Speaker, I think we should be concerned about some of the decisions of the United Nations, and that's appropriate in this House. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. My concern is not directly with what goes on in other countries, and so on, in connection with our question period, but it is a concern for fairness to the hon. members of the Assembly, regardless of their affiliation. These topics are brought in. I'm

sure that on very many of them, hon. members have some pretty strong opinions. Yet because the topics are raised in the question period and not in the period allotted for debate, hon. members are required to sit silent. The hon. member who is asking the question then has a monopoly to debate the topic without the other members having an opportunity to participate.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order. Certainly, if we're going to do that, that's fine. On the other hand, I think you must be equally conscious that in answers given by hon. ministers, they not precipitate a debate either. We've just seen some answers today ... [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I have to recognize that what the hon. member is saying is very valid. But when a question contains barbs, innuendo, and implications that something is improper, it would be totally unfair if an hon. minister answering the question were not given equal time to deal with such implications.

MR. R. CLARK: It always starts on this side of the House.

MR. NOTLEY: That's right. Always.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I regret to interrupt the hon. member again. Whether what goes on in the House is appropriate is not the sole concern of the Chair. I think I have indicated on a number of occasions that if any members find that any replies given are out of order, they are fully at liberty to raise points of order with regard to those replies. I must confess that has seldom occurred.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, be my guest, because we've just heard some replies from the hon. minister which frankly go far beyond the bounds of *Beauchesne*. [interjections] Just listen a minute. So if we're going to use *Beauchesne* and apply it to people asking questions, I think *Beauchesne* ought to be applied literally to people answering questions as well.

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary very directly to the hon. minister: in light of some of these precedents of international declarations, particularly with respect to the Republic of South Africa, has the government of Alberta given any consideration at all to a policy with respect to the shipment of what might be described as strategic items? Has any policy at all been developed by the province of Alberta in this respect, or is that exclusively the jurisdiction of the federal government?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, in fact the hon. member answered the question himself. I should say this much: first of all, the shipment of commodities from Alberta is definitely by private companies, producers of commodities and manufactured goods. Because it is a shipment out of the province, it would definitely be the jurisdiction of the federal government.

Now, as a matter of policies between the federal government and the provincial government regarding export activities, maybe I should refer that question to my hon. colleague the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. That would involve a policy that would possibly

interest the federal government, as to how far a provincial government should be involved in dictating to the federal government where they should be with their international trading policies and/or agreements signed under the British North America Act, again which his colleague in Ottawa [inaudible] Anyway, as I was saying, that question could be referred to my colleague the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

DR. BUCK: What did you say, Horst?

Rural Gas Pipelines

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Utilities and Telephones. Could he indicate what progress has been made with regard to replacing faulty pipe installed by rural gas co-ops over the past few years?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, as a result of a decision taken by the government about two years ago to bear the entire cost of replacing polyethylene 3306 pipe, approximately two-thirds of the pipe has now been replaced.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The government policy was in replacing faulty pipe in the gas lines, with the exception of the yard installations. Have there been any amendments or changes in the policy as far as replacing faulty pipe within yard installations?

MR. SHABEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that's been looked at carefully over the past months. There are a number of yard services where the same type of polyethylene pipe was used. Recently we made a decision to assist in the replacement by covering 100 per cent of the cost of replacement of yard service pipe where PE 3306 pipe was used.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister a ballpark figure of what the cost has been for the replacement of this pipe? Do they still have inspectors inspecting the pipe in the field, as far as rural gas co-ops are concerned?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the exact amount of dollars expended thus far, but to date the approximate cost of the replacement is about \$12 million to \$15 million.

We have initiated two testing programs, one last year where pipe in the manufacturing plants or the plants of the extruders is being tested before it goes in the ground. This year we've also commenced a new program to test pipe that is in the ground, and has been in the ground for a number of years, in order to help the rural gas distributors in planning their long-range replacement programs. So that program is being initiated this year.

Mobile-Home Sites Legislation

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs arises from the debate in this Legislature last fall on Bill 219, The Tenancies of Mobile-Home Sites Act, during which each and every member who spoke in the debate voiced support for that legislation. Given the minister's position of last spring, at which time he indicated he was anxiously awaiting the results of the debate on Bill 219, what specif-

ic steps has the minister taken towards the implementation of such legislation since that very positive debate?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, the question is a very useful one. One of the concerns that arises from providing for special legislation for the tenancy of mobile-home parks is the concept of the entry fees and the exit fees. When the Institute of Law Research and Reform considered special legislation in this area, in my mind they did not reach a definitive conclusion on our approaches in this area. My concern is that if we eliminated reference in legislation to the opportunity for charging entry and exit fees, that might result in an increase in the present monthly rent payable by tenants. I want to pursue that further before considering separate legislation in this particular field.

We are compiling a list of all the mobile-home parks in the province. This summer I expect to be able to write to the operators of these parks and to the mobile-home owners' association for advice on this very specific point. I would like to receive that advice before considering legislation in this specific area. I'm very pleased that the hon. member raised the question to give me the opportunity to make that public announcement.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: A supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I point out that the legislation does not provide for either entrance or exit fees. The supplementary question arises from reports I've received that representatives of the minister's department have been making visits to certain mobile-home parks, making inquiries of the owners of the parks as to their view of legislation, but in fact have not been making any inquiries of the tenants, in this instance, the mobile-home owners. Could the minister advise whether such visitations have taken place and, if so, why the mobile-home owners have not been consulted about this legislation, and only the park operators?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, last year I had an excellent meeting with the executive and representatives of the mobile-home owners' association, the association representing the owners of the homes rather than the owners of the parks. They brought forward their position on a number of items they felt should be included in any legislation which would deal specifically with the type of landlord/tenant relationship they are involved in.

They raised the matter of the entrance and exit fees with me. At the time they discussed this with me, they could not be sure that if we prohibited by legislation the charging of entrance and exit fees, that that would not be recovered elsewhere by a substantial increase in the monthly rent. My concern is that I would hate to see mobile-home owners, tenants of pads, having paid an entrance fee, paying again by an increased monthly rental, because we had prohibited the charging of entrance fees.

So this is the area we're now investigating. Depending on the investigations, the outcome of that investigation would determine whether or not this concept would be included or excluded in the legislation, probably otherwise very similar to what the hon. member introduced in the previous session.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Without wishing to engage in debate again, I would reiterate that the legislation would not prohibit entrance or exit fees. I suspect the minister's reference is to the fact that it

would prohibit forcing tenants to sell their mobile homes through the owner of the park.

But quite apart from that matter, I ask the minister whether we could expect to see legislation in some form in the fall sittings of the Legislature.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, it's presently my intention to pursue this, hopefully by the fall sittings, depending on the outcome of the present investigations going on.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Given the fact that the minister does intend to have some further consultations with persons involved in this question, could he give an undertaking to this Assembly that if he is going to have representatives of his department meet individually with various park owners and operators, he will give a similar opportunity to owners of mobile homes who may wish to make individual representations to his department?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that can be accommodated through the mobile-home owners association.

I should also take this opportunity to indicate I wasn't inferring in my remarks to the hon. member that his Bill contained provisions that it didn't in fact contain. I was dealing with a representation made to me by the mobile-home owners association, subsequent to the introduction of the hon. member's Bill, that additional provisions should be considered in this legislation. Before I considered that, I wanted to embark on this investigation.

Cabarets

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was asked a question by the hon. Member for Clover Bar about a notice sent to operators of cabarets. No written notice has been sent, but the board's inspectors have advised operators of cabarets of a change in their present licences. The Alberta Liquor Control Board will indeed be requesting operators of cabarets to apply for licences which can be granted under the new legislation, The Liquor Control Act, 1980.

There is, therefore, no change in government policy. That policy is contained in the new legislation, which provides for the categories of licences that can be granted. There is no licence category for cabarets under the new Act, nor under the old Act. I understand that because many years ago, under the old legislation, dancing was not permitted under a beverage room licence, some operators were granted an extended dining lounge licence. They called the licensed facility a cabaret, as dancing was permissible under the dining lounge licence, and the licence permitted the serving of liquor without food after a certain hour. The board believes that most of the so-called cabarets can be licensed under the new licence categories as either a beverage room or a night club, as a dining lounge licence is really not appropriate for this type of facility in most cases. Dancing has been permitted in beverage rooms since 1977, and of course in night clubs under the new licence categories. Operators can still continue to call their facility a "cabaret" if they wish to do so.

The board has, therefore, asked each operator to contact the board licensing officials to discuss their situations, to work out the most appropriate licence category for the facility being operated. Most cabarets have been phased out. Only a very few are left, apparently 27

compared to several hundred at one time. The reduction occurred because of the change in 1977 which permitted dancing in facilities licensed as beverage rooms.

Acid Rain Study

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Olds-Didsbury asked several questions yesterday with regard to the agreement we arranged in terms of sulphur emissions in the north, particularly with regard to our plants. The agreement was between Canada, us, Saskatchewan, and the Saskatchewan Research Council. I think I suggested yesterday that the report would be completed by '81 or '82. The report is practically completed and should be available within a month or two.

Perhaps I could just briefly quote the terms of reference of the report:

... to assess the nature and magnitude of environmental effects of air emissions from industrial development in northeastern Alberta and northern Saskatchewan;

... whether there are any areas particularly sensitive to air emissions from industrial development in northeastern Alberta and northern Saskatchewan;

... [whether] there is a need to recommend research studies on monitoring projects which will enable a better understanding of potential effects from air emissions.

Those are the terms of reference. When the report is publicly available — in fact, we're now in the process of striking a further committee to expand on the present terms of reference, which will include the province of Manitoba because of the possible effects of movement of sulphur from that province into Saskatchewan. That will be an ongoing future study.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Member for Wainwright revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS (reversion)

MR. STEWART: I believe we have in the members gallery this afternoon some visitors from my constituency. They are 22 grade 10 students from the Dr. Folkin school. I think they are accompanied by Brent Allen. I would like them to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS (Committee of Supply)

Special Warrants

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the Committee of Supply please come to order. We are considering the supplementary estimates of expenditure. When we adjourned yesterday, we were dealing with the Department of Culture. We had

held the Department of the Attorney General for the time being, and will be going back to the Attorney General as soon as we have dealt with Culture.

Culture

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if at this point, just for a moment or two, I could raise with the Provincial Treasurer the concern we have. In each one of these we want to assure ourselves about the urgency of the special warrant, and that's very accurate. I would like to raise with the Provincial Treasurer one specific question at this point in time, and then comment with regard to handling one of the special warrants. I'd like to use some examples that possibly the minister could comment on. The first three examples I'd like to use are special warrants that I feel are not under the category of urgent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sorry to interrupt, but could we please have order. I'm sure it's very difficult for the ministers concerned to hear the remarks being made by the Leader of the Opposition, so I hope we would have more quiet within the committee.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The first special warrant I would like to refer to is by the Department of Social Services and Community Health: funds required for the amalgamation of some districts in the south. The special warrant was requested on November 28, 1980, and approved on December 17, 1980. Two points: one, our session ended on November 27, one day before the special warrant was passed. The question then raises itself: why didn't we have special supplementary estimates in that fall session? The second question raised is the urgency of it. We have a time period of November-December, at least a month or more before the special warrant came into effect, and most likely it was ready during the time we were sitting in the fall session. So there was a two to three month period of time. That's the first one: one day right after the session we have a special warrant.

The second one I'd like to refer to is a similar example. The Department of Environment: a request to provide funds for the purchase of lands within the Edmonton and Calgary restricted development areas. As we all know, that isn't a quick decision. It may be desirable, but not what I feel to be urgent. Again, session ended November 27; the warrant was requested on December 3 and approved on January 1, 1981. The warrant was requested six days after the session. The principle is, why not supplementary estimates when we're here, so we could have dealt with that if it was that important. The second point is, is it urgent when three months — November, December, and January — have passed? A three-month period of time really doesn't indicate a quick and urgent matter.

Mr. Chairman, the third one I'd like to refer to is a special warrant of the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. This is an example where the special warrant request, as I look at the document here, was made on October 8, 1980, just before the session started in the fall. It was approved on December 17, just after the fall session. So it was in the mill during that period of time, indicating as well that, one, there didn't seem to be a lot of urgency and, secondly, it could very easily have been a supplementary estimate because it was being planned and was available during the session period.

The last one I'd like to refer to is, I think, an excellent

example that meets the requirements of The Financial Administration Act. This is really a good example of my definition of urgency, and is the type of use for which a special warrant should be provided. The example is the Department of Energy and Natural Resources and its supplementary funds for fire suppression requirements. The request was on May 23, 1980, and was effectively looked after on May 28, 1980. That's urgent. That means it's requested; quickly put through by cabinet; signed by the minister, the Premier, and the Lieutenant-Governor; and it's in effect. That's urgent, whereas the others were close enough to session that the technique of supplementary estimates could have been used, but was not. There was a time period of two to three months which, to me, isn't an urgent demand. It's a type of program that may be desirable but could very, very easily be put off to the next session or even to the next budget. I'd like the minister to comment on that, because that's the basis for our discussion about special warrants and, certainly, the use of Section 30 of The Financial Administration Act.

Mr. Chairman, the second point I'd like to make at this point is for not only the Provincial Treasurer to comment on but possibly the Government House Leader, and that is the procedure we're going to use again today for voting on the \$20 million for McDougall school. Yesterday the feeling was that a vote would be called. Mr. Chairman, again I want to just place our position on the floor of the Legislature. As far as the purchase is concerned, that may have been desirable and may be possible. We're not talking about being against that purchase. The second thing is that, as we recognize, the matter is before the court and we agreed informally here yesterday that we wouldn't discuss the details of that special warrant. If today the government feels we should vote, we would like to move a motion in the Legislature indicating that the matter not be proceeded with and that we hold it until such time as the court has dealt with the matter. We intend to move that resolution when the vote comes up, Mr. Chairman. I just give notice at this point in time.

Following that, if the government feels that they must proceed and have a vote on the matter, it's my intention to stand in the Legislature and clearly express our position that we are unable to vote on the matter because we feel that discussion has not been appropriate or could not be carried out here today in a proper manner. So we would certainly ask to abstain from voting, and that would mean withdrawing from the Legislature at that point in time. Mr. Chairman, I only make that remark to give notice so consideration can be given, that it isn't something we just spring on government at that point.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make those two remarks right now so we could proceed with haste and deal with special warrants maybe a little faster today and with better terms of reference.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, on the first item raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I think we explored this at some considerable length yesterday, and there's not much more I can add to that. The details with respect to the various items of urgency regarding the four portfolios he mentioned should be directed to those four ministers, pursuant to the approach which is clearly set forth in Section 30 of The Financial Administration Act.

Certainly the suggestion that, for example, during a fall sitting a series of weekly supplementary estimates should be brought forward to cover amounts large and small, which would in effect take the place of special warrants, is novel. It's foreign to the procedures and customs of this

Legislature if not all of those in the parliamentary commonwealth. We've indicated that in the past, on occasions where there were unique situations requiring supplementary estimates, those would be brought forward, and they have been. But as the hon. member knows, during a fall sitting or any sitting of a legislature, it's not legal to bring forward or have special warrants. Therefore at the end of any session special warrants are brought forward and passed, as they have been for many decades; That's entirely proper, I suggest, and within the parliamentary custom, and in no way reduces the degree of accountability of the government.

As I indicated in my remarks yesterday when we discussed this at some length, we are prepared to look at the question of supplementary estimates in future to see whether or not changes could be made in that. But I don't think an approach involving a series of supplementary estimates on a daily or weekly basis during the session is either called for or required, or in any way assists the review of the warrants and expenditures.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, just to reflect on that point. The point I wanted to make to the Provincial Treasurer was that when a special warrant is sitting there latent during the holding of a session — and I gave an example of one that was initiated prior to the session; it sat in a latent position during the total fall session of the Legislature. Others were brought in immediately after the day the session closed, which indicated that the government decisions had been made. Mr. Chairman, the point I wish to make to the minister that I'd appreciate clarification on: if there were urgency — and that's the criterion for The Financial Administration Act — then supplementary estimates should have been presented to this Legislature. If it was urgent to have the funds supplied for an expenditure, it should have been urgent to get it into the Legislature. But it wasn't urgent. A delay could be made till after we closed the Legislature. There's no predictable date when the Legislature quits. For example, we're now predicting Tuesday or Wednesday of next week. Who knows? We may have debate go for another three weeks. The urgency isn't there.

If the matter is urgent, it's got to come to the floor of the House and get done. The funds must be put in place and the purchases made. But when I find it can be delayed till after the end of the session — and I've noted that some of these were in place during the session — that's why I was referring twice to special warrants to the Minister of Housing and Public Works. Hopefully we'll find out about that in question period tomorrow. From information that has come to me, my understanding is that he has a special warrant sitting on his desk waiting for the session to end so that he can put it in place to make renovations to the 87th [Avenue] building. My only way to legitimize my information is to ask here in the House.

If that matter is urgent, it should be urgent enough to put a supplementary estimate in a Bill in this House. I certainly want to indicate to the minister that I am not saying there should be a series of Bills — it may take one or two or three — but I'm sure that if the government plans well enough and are able to group them into one Bill and bring them to us, we can have a discussion on it. It's the criterion of urgency. When we are able to delay until the end of session, it is not urgent.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. minister. Might I simply say in form of debate to the minister that

in the course of discussions we had with individual members when the select committee on the constitution was in Ontario — and this wasn't part of the mandate of the committee — we discussed this question of special warrants. If my recollection is accurate, it was indicated to me by more than one member of the Ontario Legislature that the special warrant route is hardly ever used in Ontario; that in fact the situation of supplementary estimates is used quite regularly. I file the caveat with the minister, Mr. Chairman, that this was simply discussion I had with one or two members of the Ontario Assembly and, if my recollection is accurate, they weren't from the opposition side of the Assembly. I simply raise that and say to the minister that it may very well be possible that on this occasion Ontario may have some kind of system we in Alberta could profit from. There are some things in Ontario we wouldn't want to import to Alberta, such as the Ontario House sitting something over 200 days a year.

MR. HYNDMAN: I'd be pleased to follow up on that interesting bit of research. I might mention, though, that of course the province of Alberta is growing and has been growing at a much faster rate, certainly until recently, than the province of Ontario. When provinces grow at that rate, there is a need to reflect developing trends in society faster. I'll follow up on that but, as I say, I detect a feeling, put forward by the Leader of the Opposition, that there is a lack of understanding that government goes on — at least in our philosophy — 12 months of the year. It can't go on for six months and then stop for six months. If there are new programs such as day care programs which, after decisions are made, it's deemed should be put into effect when there's a general feeling in the population they should be put into effect right away, a special warrant is the only way to go. So I have difficulty understanding why governing should stop, decision-making should stop, and improvements to programs should stop or go in jerks of four to six months. Essentially that's what we're getting into.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I like the way the minister is trying to deflect what we're saying. That's fine and nice to happen in debate. That's what it's all about. But I felt the last point I was making was illustrated by the examples I gave: special warrants that could have been brought in as supplementary estimates were available to the minister during the time we were in session, but were not passed until a few days after the session closed. Information here shows that one of them, from FIGA, was brought forward on October 8, as I indicated, before the session, and sat latent till after the session. We could have brought it forward in the Legislature and got a supplementary estimate, but it wasn't done that way. The urgency isn't there.

Certainly I agree on the point the minister was making that there are times between sessions when the government must make a decision and act upon certain things to continue programs, to show there are certain financial benefits to proceeding at a certain point to meet a public demand. But the criterion of being urgent, not whether it's desirable, is paramount in making that decision. I'm not talking about stop-and-start government; we could make some political comments about that. I'm just saying that there are situations where special warrants are known to government while we're in session. Why not do it then? If they can be delayed till after the session, they weren't urgent.

Vote 4 — International Assistance

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to respond to a question asked yesterday. This past year, 60 agencies received matching grants for 283 projects in approximately 80 countries. I've given a great deal of thought to what the Member for Olds-Didsbury requested, and I find that it would be an extremely difficult situation to address oneself to. If we said it was going to be November, the majority of agencies which have some very special projects they would like to get funded — having been involved in the volunteer sector, I know everyone thinks their own project is very important. If all projects were received at the beginning of the year, how do we determine which project has priority. Do you deal with a project related to a water system, or do you deal with a project related to food. So I'm saying that although I think it has some merit, I would find it a very difficult question to address ourselves to.

Agreed to:	
Total Vote 4 — International Assistance	\$1,500,000
Total Vote 5 — 75th Anniversary Celebrations	\$2,644,481
Department Total	\$4,439,481

Attorney General

Agreed to:	
Total Vote 3 — Legal Services	\$100,000

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I want to make just one comment. Here again a special warrant was passed on March 25, and the Legislature was in session on a short-term basis. We could have had a supplementary estimate or, potentially, it may have been that that type of thing could have been put in the 1981-82 budget. Because we had a large special warrant of \$2.3 billion for early expenditures in this current fiscal year, I think that type of thing could have been accommodated. I just can't fit the urgency criterion on that one.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a comment in respect to the expenditure of \$100,000 by way of special warrant in these circumstances. These were for legal services, and the hon. leader is making the point that since the House reconvened in its 1980-81 session on March 30, that might have been an appropriate time to deal with the matter or it might have waited until the next fiscal year. The particular vote in the estimates in respect to legal services is fairly large — something approaching \$3 million, as I recall — and the funds are required on an ongoing basis throughout the year in order to pay for legal services provided to all departments. We had an unusually pressing period in the past year in regard to constitutional matters. Many, many items, in the sense of payment of legal consultants and advisors, were necessary and had to be paid.

The point I think the hon. leader may be missing is that where the circumstances are not, for example, a new program, in which case one may well question whether or not the exercise of a minister's discretion to determine that it is urgently required is something that could be the subject of debate, when you're in a position where you have ongoing obligations and commitments that have to be paid for in an existing program, and all that has happened is that it has run over because of extraordinary

pressures on that particular type of service being provided, then of course the people who have provided the service are entitled to be paid, and really are entitled to be paid when it's due. So with items like that, if there is a situation where no transfer between appropriations is possible, then the warrant route is the correct one, and I just want to point that out.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this occasion to provide some information that the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury asked for about the time my estimates came forward, as to some of the law firms we had consulted in respect to constitutional matters. Although this imposing pile of paper has the necessary information somewhere in it, I haven't laid my hand on it. I will try to do so and give that information shortly.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 9 — Gaming Control and Licensing	\$131,400
Department Total	\$231,400

Economic Development

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, two questions to the minister. What is the medical accelerator research institute? Don't give me a lot of detail, just where it's at and one function it performs. I guess that's all I'd like to ask on that.

MR. PLANCHE: Through the Chairman. An ion accelerator is a possibility as an employer and part of a critical mass for high technology in the province of Alberta, with a fallback in the health field. There are about five in the world. We had an opportunity to visit the one in British Columbia. It has an exceedingly attractive potential. But because of its highly technical nature there will have to be considerable study and opinion from technical expertise, certainly in Canada and the U.S. and perhaps worldwide, before a decision can be made. The \$20,000 was the beginning of this initiative to get an initial reaction as to yes/no, to proceed into some kind of study, which we will be doing shortly.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 1 — Economic Development and International Trade	\$20,000
--	----------

Vote 3 — Financing — Economic Development Projects

MR. NOTLEY: My understanding is that this is something the city of Lethbridge has been requesting for some time. Why the necessity for a special warrant? I would have thought this could have been planned ahead and could have been considered in the estimates in the normal course. I think I remember this being talked about 20 years back when I was in Lethbridge. Why all of a sudden?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Chairman, railway location is a tricky business to venture into because the communities in Alberta are all structured differently around the railroad over different periods of time. One of the functions I think the province can perform to assist communities is, first of all, to get involved in the negotiation because the province collectively has more muscle with the railroads than individual communities do; secondly, to assist in the

economic forecasts of the likelihood of selling the land at certain prices, and as to what level of activity might accrue because of the movement of rail.

In the case of Lethbridge, as the Member for Spirit River-Fairview indicated, we had been working on this for a great many months. We came to an agreement with the railroad on price and all the detail involved in the relocation to Kipp about the middle of the summer. It was then incumbent on us to declare in time for the city of Lethbridge to take it to plebiscite in the municipal election. We had to have an indication that our 60 per cent funding for the land would be in place of course before they could go to plebiscite. So it was a function of timing, and for that reason a special warrant was indicated. Of course this is not an expense, it's an investment. It will be recovered by the province as the land is sold.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I believe that explanation helped. In circumstances such as this, can a government indicate to the local municipality that they are committed to provide the funds through the next budget? Can that kind of arrangement be made? I'm sure Lethbridge didn't require that money immediately, but they needed a commitment. Could that process have been used? I question the urgency unless, when the plebiscite was going and a vote was taken, it had to be in place; every citizen in Lethbridge had to look at that money. Then, okay, it's urgent. But a commitment of government could have been put in the next budget, and we could approve it at that time. Many contracts are made that way. Could it have been done that way? Was that possible?

MR. PLANCHE: The problem with that, Mr. Chairman, is that when you're trying to pin down solid dollars in an inflationary spiral, something has to be done to accommodate that. You can either guess at escalation as the money is spent, or you can put the money in trust and allow the interest to accumulate to compensate for the inflation as the thing develops. In this case it was elected to do that, to get firm numbers and because it had to go to plebiscite, to make the negotiations more clear so that the Lethbridge ratepayers could vote on their 40 per cent subsequent to our commitment.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, just a quick comment. Whether the money is in the Provincial Treasury in general investments or in that special trust fund, hopefully it earns the same interest and, in terms of Alberta taxpayers, we're still in the same financial position.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Chairman, I can't respond on the specifics of how the funding is done in that context, other than to say that part of the agreement was that the money was in place in trust, earning interest as of a certain date. On that basis we were able to secure a commitment from the railroad for firm numbers and allow Lethbridge to go forward with firm numbers to the ratepayers.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 3 — Financing — Economic Development Projects	\$17,745,000
Department Total	\$17,765,000

Education

Vote 3 — Regular Education Services

MR. NOTLEY: Just before we agree to this, I understand the first one. But the second one, "Required to establish a Student Evaluation Branch", is really something we have been talking about before. I can remember questions being put in the Legislature. Surely we don't just establish these branches on an *ad hoc* basis. Why was that not given some consideration? Presumably it was, if I remember the discussion in question period. Could that not have been put in the budget for last year?

MR. KING: I really appreciate the question. I was concerned that I might be forgotten. Mr. Chairman, hon. members will appreciate that for some time we have been considering the process of student evaluation in the province and the involvement of the provincial government in the process of student evaluation.

This is an excellent example of the difference between fluid decision-making in government and making decisions in fits and starts. At the time of the previous year's budget cycle — that is to say, December 1979 and January 1980, we were receiving a report from Dr. Mowat and at that time could not have made a decision about an appropriate course of action for the provincial government. Had we done it at that time, I expect that some hon. members would have accused us of prejudging the recommendations of our advisors and of having made decisions without regard for the legitimate input of the public and interest groups. It wasn't possible to have made any decision or to have budgeted for it in the time frame of December 1979 or January/February 1980. Alternately, having received the benefit of input from the public and the interest groups, we made a decision in November, which was communicated to the Legislative Assembly in the form of a ministerial statement.

As the hon. member will know, at that point we are midway through a fiscal year. To have waited another six months would in effect have deferred the impact of the decision for a full fiscal year. If the hon. member is advocating that we should have returned to provincial involvement in student evaluation in 1983 rather than in 1982, I can only say that it was the considered decision of the department, and ultimately of the government, that we should be involved, and that we should be involved in 1982 rather than 1983. As a result, the decision was made to establish the student evaluation branch as soon as possible following the announcement made in the Legislature.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to belabor this, but again it seems to me that this is the kind of thing that if we had a practice of supplementary estimates in the fall session, the statement the minister made reference to, which I recall was in the fall session, could have been dealt with in the fall session. I don't say that to zero in on this particular minister, but rather to make the general point that it seems to me we should be making more use of supplementary estimates than we have.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 3 — Regular
Educational Services

\$1,278,025

Energy and Natural Resources

1 — Departmental Support Services

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, with the consent of the committee, I wonder whether I could respond to some questions asked when the department's estimates were going through. I undertook to come back in some form at some time with the responses. If the committee is agreeable, I would like to give those responses now.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition commented on and asked for an explanation of the fact that the non-renewable natural resource revenue shown in the document published by the Department of Energy and Natural Resources on November 17, 1980, was substantially different from the non-renewable resource revenue shown in the budget recently delivered by my colleague.

First of all, perhaps I should say that we have taken the liberty of adjusting the numbers shown in the November 17 document, which were on a calendar year, to the budget year in order to make the time period the same as in the budget. Putting the document of November 17 on the calendar year 1981-82, which was the fiscal period referred to in the budget, the total non-renewable resource revenue indicated in the November 17 document would have been \$5,373 million. The total shown in the budget is \$4,646 million. So it is some \$727 million lower in the budget than in our November 17 document.

Mr. Chairman, I'll endeavor to go through the various items that make up those totals and explain the differences. First there was a difference of \$655 million in crude oil royalty, with the November 17 document being \$655 million higher than the budget document. Approximately \$84 million of that difference occurred because, in preparing for the budget, deductions were made with respect to enhanced recovery royalty relief and royalty holiday on wildcat wells. Now these were reductions in royalty payments. We didn't make those deductions in the November 17 document because we regard them as discretionary payments. For that reason, because the basis of preparing the November 17 document was a little different, we didn't deduct them there. Of course they are properly deducted when calculating the budgetary revenue, because it is revenue we wouldn't receive.

The large difference between the two estimates is about \$475 million that arises out of our production cutback. When we prepared the document on November 17, we had not finalized the decisions with respect to the production cutback, and no allowances were made for that in the November 17 document. When we make allowances for that in the current fiscal year, there is \$475 million less in crude oil royalty revenue.

There's a difference of about \$22 million, which really accounts for a reassessment of production forecast over the relevant period. Subsequent to November 17, we were able to make a more detailed assessment as to how we felt the national energy policy would reduce production by lack of infill drilling, the shutting down of some marginal producing wells, and the slight downturn in new discoveries. So there is \$22 million less in the budget than in the November 17 document. Finally, Mr. Chairman, the November 17 document was prepared on the basis that crude oil production was 80 per cent Crown owned and 20 per cent freehold. Of course that number changes as

time goes by. The actual percentage which should be used is about 78, and that was the percentage used in the budget.

Those differences account for the \$655 million difference between the calculations in the November 17 document and the calculations in the budget, with the very large percentage of that simply arising from the fact that we weren't calculating a production cutback in the November 17 document. Of course we did in the budget, because by the time we were preparing the budget that cutback was in place and the decision had been made.

In respect to natural gas royalty and by-products, there's a \$344 million difference, with the November document being that much higher than the budget. Mr. Chairman, I will now go through the reason for that difference. When the departmental estimates were going through, I said I thought it might be because we used different export volumes. On checking I find that isn't the case; that we hadn't adjusted our anticipated export volumes by the time we prepared the November 17 document, so for both that document and the budget we were using the same export volumes. But we were using a somewhat higher gas export price forecast in the November 17 document and a higher forecast of domestic natural gas volumes than was used in the budget. Mr. Chairman, that accounts for \$193 million difference, and that really arises because between November 17 and the time of preparation of revenue estimates for the budget, we were able to get a better feel for what we anticipated the export prices would be during the fiscal year, and also a better feel for what the domestic gas volume sales would be.

Another \$32 million difference between those two numbers is accounted for by differences in price forecasting for propane and butane; \$10 million in the case of propane, and \$22 million in the case of butane. Members of the committee will recall that neither of these products is price-regulated, so your price forecasting is subject to considerable uncertainty. As the period we were dealing with drew closer, we were simply able to do a more accurate price forecast.

As with the oil royalty forecast, in the November 17 document we had used an 80 per cent Crown, 20 per cent freehold division. On closer examination, that 80 per cent is too high and the percentage of natural gas that we actually expect to be produced from Crown lands during the current fiscal year is closer to 76 per cent. Those three things account for the differences in the natural gas and by-products numbers appearing in the November 17 document and in the budget.

Next there was a difference of \$15 million arising from the synthetic crude oil royalty, the November 17 document being that much higher. Again, Mr. Chairman, that difference occurred because as we approached the budget date, we got in a revised good-faith estimate from Syn-crude as to their anticipated production levels, and they were \$15 million lower than the good-faith estimate we were working on when we prepared the November 17 document. Now that comes to about a \$1 billion difference between those two numbers. But then there are some numbers added in the budget which we did not include in the November 17 document. They are, first of all, \$9 million with respect to coal royalty, and \$87 million with respect to rental fees. Neither of those was included in our November 17 document. In addition a \$400 million revenue item for land bonuses was included in the budget, but was not included in the November 17 document. But from that \$400 million the incentive cred-

its of \$209 million were deducted, leaving a net addition of \$191 million. Mr. Chairman, I think I've gone through in detail the explanation for the differences between the revenue forecast in the November 17 document and the revenue forecast shown in the budget, keeping in mind that we have adjusted the November 17 document to put it on a fiscal year basis rather than on the calendar year, as that was the form in which it was published.

The only two other items I would like to, refer to deal with the question raised by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview regarding the reduction in the forestry research vote. During review of the departmental estimates, I indicated that I thought that reduction of about \$60,000 probably occurred because we had included some capital expenditures in the earlier vote that we weren't including this year. On checking I find that that was not the case. The reduction doesn't represent any reduction in the mandate of the research unit or in our commitment to forestry research, but as a result of our year's experience we have modified downward the costs of personnel within that unit, and that explains the \$60,000 difference.

Mr. Chairman, the final matter dealt with the question asked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition about the total cost of MARS. He referred to an original cost of \$364,600. I had responded by saying I knew that was the number included in the Auditor General's report, but had some question as to whether it should be regarded as the original cost. Without belaboring that, it was an original cost estimate, but by the time we had reached the design stage and had refined the design and decided on the system that should be put in place, the estimated cost was \$753,013. The total actual and estimated cost to March 31, 1982, which will complete the system, will be \$1,323,995. I simply want to point out that the movement from the initial figure up to [\$753,000] did involve some changes in the quality and design of the system, and the movement from [\$753,000] to what will actually be completed on March 31, 1983, at a cost of \$1,324,000, also involved some enhancement of the system.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that covers the items that I indicated I would respond to further while the department's estimates were going through the committee.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, just one question to the minister with regard to the \$4.7 billion. Is it adjusted for the two proposed cutbacks, or were there any other future considerations in terms of cutbacks?

MR. LEITCH: I think the number being used by the Leader of the Opposition is in error. The difference, \$475 million, between the November estimate and the budget estimate is accounted for by the fact of the cutback. That would contemplate the cutback, implemented by Executive Council following the debate in the Assembly, of 60,000 barrels for the first three months of the period, 60,000 for the second and, at the end of six months, rising to 180,000, and that would continue until the end of the fiscal period.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, on Vote 1, is the \$499,850 exclusively related to the MARS program? As I recall the minister's answer, we started with an estimate of \$364,000, which I assume would have been in the estimates. We then went to \$753,000, and now to \$1.3 million. How is that made up in the special warrant? Does that special warrant overlap different fiscal years?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, I take it the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview is on...

MR. NOTLEY: Page 411, at the bottom.

MR. LEITCH: All I was going to respond was that in asking about the MARS special warrant, I think he may be ahead of the vote presently before the committee. The answer is that the number he referred to does deal with MARS. The only question I have is whether the committee wishes to deal with the first item under Vote 1 before it reaches the second; that's all.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$11,775,850
--	--------------

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to clarify this \$499,000 before we go beyond it. I'm just trying to run through in my mind the figures the minister gave us. We started at \$364,000, which I assume would be in the estimates. Then we go to \$753,000. But we have a special warrant here, not of another \$390,000 but of \$490,000. At that stage you must have gone through part of another step in deciding that the warrant should be for \$499,000 instead of what would appear to have been the second step the minister outlined to us.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, the member is correct, but not all that special warrant dealt with the cost of putting in MARS itself. I think the special warrant that was \$315,350 went directly to MARS, but another \$284,500 was required with respect to consulting services. That was included in the special warrant. Those were the two items. Funds of \$100,000 were available within the department. Deducting that from the approximate \$300,000 requirement for the system and the approximately \$285,000 for consultants left the balance required of \$499,850, which is the amount of the special warrant.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 3 — Minerals Management	\$13,037,000
Total Vote 4 — Forest Resources Management	\$35,500,000

6 — Fish and Wildlife Conservation

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, on the \$110,000 for trappers' compensation, I'd like to ask the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife to indicate what part of the province the compensation to trappers was in and what trappers qualified.

MR. MILLER: We instituted this program last year, following consultation with the trappers' organization. Basically speaking, it was to enable the program to be established. We allowed for the hiring of three field staff who would act as co-ordinators of the program, to set up and staff an office.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, my question again is the urgency of it. Was it a matter of its having to be done at that time? Could it not have been predictable? It's a matter of hiring people to do a job. Were the jobs not predictable? Could it have waited until a session of the Legislature? Could it have waited until this fiscal year? I would be interested in that answer.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I think it's like a lot of programs where we felt that the way resource development was taking place, as soon as we could get the program in place and in operation would be to the benefit of the trappers. Certainly it could have waited for another year or two years. However, we did have requests from the trappers' organizations, and we responded by setting up the program.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, could I make a point in regard to the continuing comments of the hon. Leader of the Opposition? He is suggesting that the government lay over programs or activities if, in his terms of definition, they aren't urgent. He's suggesting we should wait nine months or a year until we bring something in.

Mr. Chairman, I have xerox copies of a number of special warrants that the member was responsible for when he was minister of social development. It's interesting to note that he brought in one of the largest sets of special warrants when he was a minister in the Social Credit government. Secondly, a lot of them were processed by Executive Council shortly before the Legislature opened. I'll give you an example.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. I have some difficulty with the remarks made by the Member for Edmonton Glengarry, because they're not relevant to the discussion we're carrying under the fish and wildlife conservation vote.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, I beg to differ. The hon. member raised a couple of questions on this vote, and he's been raising them consistently through the discussions this afternoon. My remarks are consistent with his remarks, and I think I am entitled to make my point. With that, I would like to make the point that the member ...

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. COOK: I have the floor.

MR. NOTLEY: Not on a point of order you don't.

Mr. Chairman, surely while discussing the estimates it is perfectly appropriate to raise in discussion of supply any matter that is relevant to the issue at hand. If the hon. member wishes to raise questions relating to the trappers' compensation appropriation of \$110,000 and why that could or should have been done earlier or wasn't, that would be perfectly in order. I think the widest ranging discussion would be in order. But to bring up something that happened 10 or 15 years ago in another department, social services — we'll get to that. The hon. member was too impatient. We'll get to that, but let's do justice to the issue of trappers' compensation. It happens to be an important issue, and I think the remarks should be related to that issue.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, my comments are confined to the concept of timing of special warrants, and this is one special warrant that the hon. Leader of the Opposition raised, questioning its timing, not its value. I will confine my remarks to the concept of timing of special warrants.

When the hon. member was minister ...

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, my question of timing was related to the special

warrant that is under consideration. I asked whether it was urgent, whether it could have been delayed. I did not question the need or desirability of the program, because those are political decisions that have to be made by government. But I am talking about the utilization of a piece of legislation that guides the financial direction of this government and is basic to the use of special warrants. I want to apply the concept to each item. If the hon. member can do that, I'm satisfied with the debate. Anything he wants to raise as to what I did years ago, fine. Maybe I was wrong. If I have to admit that, I will. But I don't think the item on the agenda is debating pre-1971; it's debating 1981, 10 years later. There are grounds for a beautiful political speech right now, but I think we should stick to topic.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, again, on the point of order the hon. members have raised, I'd like to point out that in the Legislative session which opened on January 29, 1970, the hon. member was responsible for a special warrant that was brought forward on January 27, two days before the Legislature opened.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. I have difficulties with the remarks made by the Member for Edmonton Glengarry. I ask him to hold his remarks to the relevant question that is under debate in this House at the present time. We're on fish and wildlife conservation. What happened before 1971 has nothing of significance to do with the special warrants of 1981. That is the ruling I have made. We'll continue with Vote 6, fish and wildlife conservation.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 6 — Fish and Wildlife Conservation	\$610,000
Total Vote 10 — Petroleum Marketing and Market Research	\$117,000
Department Total	\$61,039,850

Environment

2 — Pollution Prevention and Control

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have several questions relating to Vote 2. Since they all relate to different sections of Vote 2, to save time I would put them to the minister and then we could have a response. That might save some time during the discussion.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, the question of the total funding for municipal water and sewer programs: I know we've dealt with this in Oral Question Period, but I have some difficulty understanding why we have very substantial reliance on special warrants. In both '79 and '80 we went from a budget of \$19 million to \$39 million, so we're almost \$20 million in excess. In 1980-81 we went from \$46 million to \$124 million, \$78 million in excess. Frankly, none of us in this committee question the funding and getting on with the job. No question about that at all. I want that to be absolutely clear. But what I think needs to be explored in discussion of these special warrants is why the planning process did not allow us to have more realistic figures in the budget. I relate not just last year's expenditure, Mr. Chairman, but the year before. We're dealing with last year's expenditures, which necessitated the special warrants before us, so perhaps most appropriately we should stick to those figures. It really raises in

my mind whether there is a serious problem with our planning process if we aren't able to be a little more specific.

Also under this particular section we have the point of the land purchases that the Leader of the Opposition raised. I was out for a moment or two, so I don't know whether the minister had an opportunity to answer the questions of the Leader of the Opposition on the RDAs. If he did, I won't ask him to go over it again.

I want to deal specifically with the special warrants for Cold Lake and Grand Centre. We had special warrants of \$2.5 million and \$1.3 million for Cold Lake-Grand Centre approved on October 1, 1980. Again I think this could have been handled by supplementary estimates in the fall. But that's an argument I have with the government in total, not specifically the minister. Even assuming the special warrants were approved on October 1, one would have thought that the reason for approval would be to get the money out. But the communities still had not received the money by April 1, 1981. I gather that they've got it at the moment.

Mr. Chairman, in dealing with these special warrants, I think this particular committee study allows us to find out what happened perhaps in a little more detail. Obviously, if there was the urgency that compelled the government to go the route of special warrants as opposed to bringing in an estimate, it strikes me that it would have flowed through the system so we could have got the money out to the communities more quickly, and they wouldn't have had to deplete their own funds and run into all kinds of problems with paying accounts because this money hadn't come in. My understanding is that the agreement was that 50 per cent of the money was to be awarded when 80 per cent completion took place, that the communities met the completion target, and that there seems to have been a rather serious problem in the department in terms of getting the money out. So perhaps we might just take a few minutes and discuss this matter.

It seems to me that if we're going to be getting into very substantial use of special warrants — and in Vote 2, we've got special warrants of \$79 million. When I find that even after the use of special warrants that some months down the road the communities still haven't got the money, it seems to me that we have to have a fairly detailed answer by the minister on this matter. Perhaps the minister could outline not only what steps the government took in general but specifically the steps the minister took from the date the special warrants were approved to the final resolution of the matter.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, on the first question, to do with the weakness of the planning process, perhaps I can just take a minute or two and explain the procedure we go through in attempting to correlate with the demand across the province. If you go back to the spring of 1979, we incorporated a new program for water and sewer — I might say, a very generous program. At the same time, we allocated \$500 per capita to the municipalities, and they were requested to reduce certain municipal programs to the zero figure. Subsequently, because now that municipalities were primarily out of debt, they decided it was time to upgrade their facilities. So it's fair to say, because of the large funding of the province — we're talking now [of] upwards of 90 per cent of a per capita cost figure to a maximum — the program was just overly received. While we attempted in our budgetary process to estimate that, we were certainly far off the estimation.

What happens out there is that as soon as the municipi-

palities are aware of a program of this nature, and keeping in mind the growth of the province, they immediately start to incorporate the required stages of development. It's a fairly complex process. We require a proof of requirement, a detailed document between our department and the municipalities. They have to indicate to us their preference with regard to consultants and their projections for a 10-, 15-, or 20-year period. Most of our works are 15- to 20-year programs. It's a lengthy process. It's complex in that they're working away with their own budgets and trying to vie for position in the provincial program. We take these applications as they come and start the process through the system. The result is that there's considerable lag time between the time the initial letter is written to our department and when we finally sign the document, over my desk, and the shovel is in the ground, so to speak. Because of this and the popularity of the program, it was extremely difficult.

Once these applications started to come in, the next process was tendering. We take a look at the tender to see if everything is proper, and they proceed to construct. All these things are also dependent on weather conditions; you just don't operate easily at certain times of the year. As they progress, we agree to pay a portion of the costs: up to 50 per cent when we're satisfied things are rolling, and a further 30 per cent, depending on the stage it's in, and so on. We have no real knowledge of the progress being made out there, and it's dependent on weather conditions. So these come in, and there is a tremendous lag between the time they start and [the time] we get the request for final payment. Because of this, it's just very difficult. We now think that we have a better handle on the oversubscription of our funding. We have a specific amount in our budget for the year '81-82. It might be interesting for members to know that two-thirds of the '81-82 budget is already committed.

The dilemma is that once we're up to our maximum — and I think we'll have to do that this year — we'll just have to advise the municipalities that it's all over for another year until we get our next budget. That's one route we may choose, and it's a pretty tough route because some of them are already locked into certain stages of development. Or we'll have to prioritize on the basis of recommendations on the state of their facility by Social Services and Community Health. Maybe we'll just have to come in with a special warrant on those special, urgent ones. I hope we can sort this out in this coming year.

I think that answers in a sense the problem of the weaknesses in the planning area. I don't fault municipalities any more than our own department for trying to co-ordinate it. We're attempting to do a better job, and our correspondence to the municipalities in the last month or so has been very clear that we'll be watching much more closely and be more cognizant of overruns.

Cold Lake-Grand Centre has been an ongoing problem for us because of course at the stage of working out our budgets, and so on, we're in the midst of energy negotiations. One would have to go back over the timing procedure but, as you know, it still is an off-again on-again thing. We didn't want to be caught with a facility perhaps two or three times the size needed if the projects didn't go ahead, and so I asked that we watch very closely and attempt to monitor the possibility of this problem as carefully as we could. In doing so, the decision was made that we would not include some of these so-called regional projects which involve two or more municipalities in our regular budgetary process.

In this case we consulted with Cold Lake and Grand Centre as to how they wanted to proceed on a regional basis, with regard to both water and sewer. Because of the complexity of the thing, we made the initial offer that we would initiate it, front-end it, and so on, and then the calculation would work back on a per capita basis. Subsequent to correspondence, the two communities made the judgment decision to proceed on their own, and they employed their own consultant, engineering firm, and so on.

I answered sometime earlier in the House with regard to the delay. I felt it important that we not lay out the fault publicly; it's easy enough to fault municipalities and/or fault engineers or consultants. I thought the department had done the best it could in the dialogue in this particular exercise.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

In retrospect, the two municipalities concerned probably would have been wiser to allow the department to proceed with the regional system. As one looks back to the detail of the correspondence and so on, it's quite clear that in one instance, because of a misunderstanding on the part of the municipality, the correspondence discontinued for, I think, two to three months. Our people are busy with their own responsibilities across the province, and we rely on the municipalities to follow through on their problem. So there was a considerable delay.

We now have the water system pretty well in place at Cold Lake-Grand Centre. I can perhaps give you a breakdown on that if it's requested. We are now in a difficult situation with regard to the sewer project, and we have been consulting with the member in the area. We think something can now be worked out to proceed with the regional sewer system. I'm hoping I'll have sufficient in my present budget to cover that but, if not, we may have to deal with part of it too in a special warrant. I think Grand Centre has sufficient capacity within its own individual system for one or two years. But the Cold Lake one is quite urgent, and we want to move as quickly as possible. It is a joint agreement not only with the two municipalities, but also with an Indian reserve in the area and the air base.

I don't know whether that's helped to answer the question. The special warrants were primarily designed to pick up where we left off in our budget because of our inability to determine whether those projects would be ongoing. This is extremely important because, for example, we have great difficulty projecting the population growth. There has been a time delay because of this, and the special warrant is to pick up that deficit which normally would be in our budget.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I'd like to make a comment with regard to the special warrant for regional water and sewer programs. It's a good program; I support it totally; it's an excellent idea. I want to comment on the process, though. In May 1980, I raised the question about my own constituency requiring money. All requirements were met, they were ready to go to work, Westwind Construction had the motors running on all the machines, and they were eager for the go-ahead by the department. The Provincial Treasurer indicated that immediately following the session, because of this great program — and admittedly it was a fine program, which we all agreed to — there would be a special warrant. As I look back at that process and review the discussion we have had, I would

suggest that at that point in time supplementary estimates would have been an excellent move by the government, to bring it before the Legislature and put a figure in place. It didn't happen. The urgency wasn't really there either, because we waited until November 1980 before the special warrant was put in place and the money made available to the communities. My local community is still out some \$30,000 in interest, and others across the province suffered the same type of tax difficulty.

Mr. Chairman, I think in principle we're talking about, one, desirability of the program; urgency, in the sense that we had a commitment to municipalities — it waited for months. It became urgent because we didn't deal with it in that spring session, in the month of May, when it was raised in this Legislature. Talking to people in the department, some accurate projections could have been made at that time, but all the i's and t's and x's had to be passed. An estimate is an estimate of programs in place, Mr. Chairman, and I would just like to put on record that the urgency was created by poor planning and also the government's not reacting when the matter was brought to its attention.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 2 — Pollution

Prevention and Control \$79,360,510

Vote 3 — Land Conservation

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, first of all perhaps either the Treasurer or the minister could advise the committee in terms of the way the special warrants are listed here. We have Vote 3, land conservation, but obviously Vote 3 is not Vote 3 at all, but is Vote 6, land assembly. Why was the description of the Department of Environment special warrants made in this way? It is somewhat confusing to someone reading it. It would seem to me that we want to be as helpful as possible to the citizenry in providing this information. What we have here is a different vote heading and a different description than appears in the estimates. Perhaps we could start there.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, I don't know the specific answer to that, but I'll certainly look at the suggestion. As members know, the estimates today contain far more comprehensive information than they have in previous years. Each year, we try to update them and provide it in the most easily understandable form, realizing that we're dealing with a large number of figures. Therefore I'll certainly take the suggestion under advisement.

MR. NOTLEY: Taking that into account, Mr. Chairman, we have moved then. We'll take Vote 6, estimates with respect to the acquisition of land, land assembly. We see a very, very substantial overbudget as a consequence of special warrants. I gather this relates to the RDA acquisitions, but perhaps we could have an explanation first, and then I may have some supplementaries.

MR. COOKSON: That's essentially correct, Mr. Chairman. Again because of the unpredictability of purchase, the procedure has been to deal with the funds by way of special warrants. We are at present exploring perhaps a better way of doing it under special legislation. I might say that this past year and a half, I personally have been deeply concerned about the escalated price of land. For example, if it continues on the pattern it has been, land is

inflating at between 50 and 100 per cent in both the Edmonton and Calgary area. It was a judgment of mine that if one has to make a choice between putting money in the bank at 15 to 20 per cent, since we will eventually need the land, it would be good business to invest that money in land assembly.

Based on that judgment, I've recommended to my colleagues that we escalate our purchase. We do this on the assumption that land is going to continue to follow the same pattern. That's speculative; it may fall back. But anyone who has had any experience lately with land values finds it won't happen very easily. So on the basis of my recommendations and the support of my colleagues, we have escalated land purchase in the two restricted development areas.

That is not to say we will continue this policy. We may make the decision that it's beyond the revenue of the province, and perhaps we should get out of the business entirely. I don't want to leave any false impressions out there that somebody has got a built-in escalated price because of what I'm saying here today. Those decisions will be made. On that basis we have prioritized our purchases as much as we could, in terms of the need particularly with regard to transportation and utilities. We are attempting to step up that process. So we are proceeding on a special warrant route. I might say at this time that the allocated funds and any special warrant funds are pretty well spent. We are again in a state of limbo insofar as purchase in these two particular areas is concerned. Again I want to make perfectly clear that that may go on for some time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I certainly don't want to quarrel with the business judgment of the department in escalating the purchases. I also realize that there are certain problems in creating higher prices through expectation, if you're obviously saying to everybody that you're a major purchaser in the market place.

But in terms of dealing with the use of special warrants, as I look at page 173, our actual expenditures for the '79-80 year were \$40,800,000. So we obviously bought a lot of land in 1979-80. Then we have estimates, Mr. Chairman, which are brought before the committee, which we're expected to authorize, and we plummet from \$40,800,000 right down to \$5,300,000. I just can't understand that kind of difference. It seems to me that it raises all kinds of suspicions. Are we trying to somehow make the total increase in the budget a little less, and we have a ridiculous underestimate? It strikes me as that, if you go from \$40,800,000 of actual expenditures one year and we all know that we have to make purchases in a restricted area, then estimate \$5,300,000 but spend \$129 million. Now I can accept the business judgment of the minister in saying, yes, we've got to move ahead and purchase some of this land. But what I find difficult to understand is to go from \$40 million to \$5 million estimates which come before the committee, and then we spend almost \$130 million, 2,000 per cent more than we estimated. Now this year we're going back to \$31 million.

I just have to say to members of the committee that as I look at this pattern, I really wonder what the strategy is in terms of our approach. I can understand some of the difficulties in the purchase of land, but here we're talking about a committee of the Assembly which is entrusted with the responsibility of dealing with estimates. I cannot help but stand in my place and say that last year either the minister was misled or we were. Surely the government had to have more plans at hand than \$5,300,000,

when we spent \$40,800,000 the year before and it turned out that in fact we spent \$130 million.

MR. COOKSON: I'm trying to track down where the member is getting the figures, but I see it's under 6.2. The comparable was \$40 million, the estimate was \$5 million, the forecast was \$129 million, and our estimate is \$31 million. Under the \$129 million is the forecast, which will include the special warrants issued as part of the '80-81 budget. In other words, the special warrants we approved here bring that figure up to \$129 million. We have budgeted \$31 million again within Environment. Those are lands specifically for environmental use, the same as, for example, Municipal Affairs has budgeted \$250,000. There is nothing for Culture, \$4 million for Recreation and Parks, and about \$4 million for Energy and Natural Resources. As we see them, those are the specific amounts that will be required. What those departments predict in terms of land purchase is submitted to us. Environment has predicted that we will need \$31 million for buying, for example, land that is not necessarily in the restricted development areas of Calgary and Edmonton. We have other restricted development areas. We have to buy land for pipelines and this sort of thing.

Depending on the wisdom of this government, what will theoretically happen this next year, if we proceed on the course we're going, is that the '80-81 forecast will again jump to a figure like maybe \$129 million, or whatever, because it will include the special warrants we will expend this coming year. However, if we change our route somewhere along the way or decide not to purchase any more, then it won't show up and we should stay within the \$31 million budgeted. If we decide that it may come out under another piece of legislation dealing with this, then that decision will have to be made and legislation come forth.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the minister is telling us then that the \$31 million budgeted this year is as a result of estimates provided by the department. Am I to understand that the estimates provided to the department last year were only \$5.3 million, despite the fact that we spent almost \$41 million the year before and turned out spending \$129 million? That's the thing I really find a little puzzling: how we can have this massive fluctuation in an area where there should be, if not total consistency, at least some kind of idea. Because you just don't get into planning pipelines, rights of way, and things like this in a restricted development area.

I just have to wonder about that \$5.3 million figure and the kind of planning the department has in place. It's so under what we spent the year before, and then of course way, way under what we ended up in fact spending. None of us argues, Mr. Chairman, that we obviously have to undertake commitments. You can't have planning around the two major cities without substantial funding. But I think all of us are a little puzzled about that really quite small figure for the estimates last year.

MR. COOKSON: I could get further detail for the member. One has to remember that we have embarked on a pretty substantial regional program insofar as water supply. Some 21 municipalities are involved in the general area of Edmonton. We're heavily involved in purchase of right of way.

I don't quarrel with the \$31 million, because I'm sure those funds are going to be necessary. This also applies to regional systems in other parts of the province. There are

some other areas of purchase that Environment's involved in. I don't want the member to be deceived by the figure of \$129,535,000, because it does include those special warrants we need for the judgment decision on the two restricted development areas.

Agreed to:	
Total Vote 3 — Land Conservation	\$129,838,450
Total Vote 4 — Water Resources Management	\$21,500,000

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. At this point I'd be interested in special warrants that are potentially proposed for 1981 and '82. Has the minister made a list of those, and what type of special warrants may be on the list at present?

MR. COOKSON: Is that a loaded question?

No, Mr. Chairman, at this point I can't really predict what we will have by way of special warrants. For example, in the area of land assembly, I've already advised my people that there are no special warrants during the session. I think we will have to make a decision as to whether we do any further purchasing in the RDA area. If that decision is made, then the only route is by special warrant. We leave that option open.

Insofar as water and sewer, I have also instructed my people that they're to communicate with the municipalities, and make perfectly clear that when the funds are used up, of which a good portion is now, I suppose any special warrants which would be passed would be based on urgency insofar as the breaking down of a system out there. Some municipalities collapse because of a water supply or sewage problem. I think we would still have to ask for special warrants for those things.

I guess those are the most critical areas that we deal in. I don't know of any other areas that... We have the Cold Lake-Grand Centre area, which we still have to sort out insofar as the sewage is concerned. It may very well be that because of inflated costs, we'll perhaps be looking at a special warrant in that area if we haven't got the normal funding. If, for example, an agreement is signed insofar as the energy thing and everything's gung-ho, than we may have some urgency insofar as the facility. Just running through these possible areas of special warrants, maybe that gives the members some idea of the critical areas we're in.

Agreed to:	
Department Total	\$230,698,960

Executive Council

Personnel Administration

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we could have an explanation as to why it is necessary for us to use a special warrant to make additional funds available for career recruitment advertising. Surely the government must have some fairly clear plans in terms of its personnel. I find it rather strange that we have to budget this kind of money through a special warrant. Why could that not have been part of the estimates last year?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, this is the one area of personnel administration that is very difficult to predict. We do work with the departments in analyzing their manpower needs, and in making our best judgments as to

the needs each year based on retirement and other voluntary changes. But in the case of Alberta's economy, we have a number of areas that are very difficult to recruit. So basically half of the \$620,000 warrant that was presented and is before us now is involved in recruiting in those difficult areas and providing for the upward mobility of staff. For example, we've had a number of situations where a position will be vacated, an advertising program will create candidates, a candidate will be selected, and that candidate will in fact lead to further vacancies.

We also have to face the situation each year as we have in the last three to four years of a 15 to 20 per cent increase in lineage rates. We do not have any way of predicting those, but in the last two years that has happened as costs have developed in the various media we use. We've also developed a new format. That was done in the fall, in response to the kinds of advertising programs we are in competition with. We developed a new format to try to make the opportunities for government employment more attractive to a wide cross-range of Albertans and indeed other Canadians, so that we might attract interest. In this competitive market, that was our effort. The remaining \$320,000 of the warrant was for the special program developed in co-operation with Social Services and Community Health for social workers for the child care area.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, what were the total expenditures last year of Personnel Administration on career recruitment advertising, so that we have some idea of what this \$620,000 represents? Is it 25 per cent? Perhaps we should have the figure for career advertising, then we'd be in a position to know.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, had the member been present when the estimates were debated, it would have been helpful. I believe those figures have all been broken down and made available to each member. I assume that those are in front of the member. The members do not have the breakdown of manpower?

MR. NOTLEY: We're talking about the special warrants. I want the breakdown on the career advertising budget of the Personnel Administration department.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, I believe that additional detail should have been sought at the time of my estimates, but I'll be happy to provide that information.

MR. NOTLEY: With great respect, we're now talking about special warrants. It's a relevant question that relates to special warrants. I think we want to know to what extent we've gone beyond the budget that was allocated. All the things the minister said in response to my first question would no doubt have been considerations in drafting the budget, the estimates last year. It's not surprising that rates have gone up. We know that. No doubt some consideration would have been given to that in drafting the advertising budget. The turnover rates in the department, the problems of recruiting people in an economy that is overheated: all those things would have been taken into account. The question is: to what extent does the \$620,000 represent an increase over what was budgeted?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, I thought we were here to debate and discuss this particular warrant. If you would like additional information as to the breakdown

for advertising for the entire budget that was presented and approved a few weeks ago, I would be happy to provide that to you.

MR. NOTLEY: No doubt the minister will just be a moment getting that information. We can come back to this section.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreeable to committee?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 10 — Disaster

Preparedness and Emergency Response \$76,781.86

Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs

Agreed to:

Total Vote 1 — Intergovernmental

Co-ordination and Research \$568,000

Department Total \$568,000

Government Services

Total Vote 3 — Government

Transportation \$260,000

Total Vote 5 — Public Affairs \$228,000

Department Total \$488,000

Hospitals and Medical Care

Total Vote 2 — Health Care Insurance \$10,826,000

Total Vote 3 — Financial Assistance
for Active Care \$40,904,703

Vote 4 — Financial Assistance for Long-term Chronic Care

MR. NOTLEY: Before we agree with this particular special warrant, I'd like the minister to outline perhaps the steps under the second section, "Operating funds required for nursing homes reclassified to auxiliary hospitals and additional operating funds for auxiliary hospitals". I can understand that the additional operating funds for auxiliary hospitals no doubt flow from the salary agreement, but I assume that the reclassification would be planned. It wouldn't be an accidental thing; it wouldn't come up by surprise. So why would the government have to use a special warrant for the reclassification of nursing homes to auxiliary hospitals?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, just one was involved, the veterans' home which was taken over at the time of the Camsell transfer. When we're budgeting for these, we put in the *per diem* support at the time of the hospital classification. If there's a classification through the year, because we can't transfer funds from one vote to another there's an unexpended credit on the one hand — it's no longer being supported as a nursing home — but on the other hand, there is the need for a special warrant to give that *per diem* support under the new classification. There's really no way of accurately determining if and when such a reclassification will occur.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 4 — Financial Assistance for Long-term Chronic Care	\$6,333,140
Total Vote 5 — Financial Assistance for Supervised Personal Care	\$1,262,286
Department Total	\$59,326,129

Housing and Public Works

4 — Planning and Implementation of Construction Projects

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I gave notice a little earlier that I'd like to move a motion at this time as to how we deal with Vote 4. As I indicated, it is a matter that is before the courts and under discussion through the civil court system. On precedent and on understanding in our debate yesterday, the matter would not go into intensive debate or any debate. However, the government indicated at that time that they may want to take a vote on the matter. On that basis, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move the following motion from our side of the Legislature:

That consideration of approval for the expenditure of the sum of \$20 million for the purchase of the McDougall School site in Calgary as outlined in Vote 4, Department of Housing and Public Works Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure for fiscal year ending March 31, 1981, be deferred until the courts have had the opportunity to deal with the question pending on the special warrant used to make the expenditure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand the hon. Leader of the Opposition has copies available. We have one here. We'll just wait a minute until those are circulated.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a few remarks in regard to what is, in effect, a proposed amendment to the estimates. The first of the two or three points I think should be made might relate precisely to the fact that this is, in essence, a motion to amend the estimates that are before the Assembly for passage. In order to do that, it would be necessary for the Assembly to conclude that the government's financial program is deserving of amendment at the instance of the proposed amendment put forward by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I don't think any member of any Assembly would underestimate the significance of such a proposal. That by itself really calls forward the inevitable result that members who are members of the government are going to vote against it; that would be clear. There would be no other possibility. The suggestion that that is a useful or appropriate course in virtually any parliamentary system is not an argument that can be made out.

In putting it that way, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that he not confuse legislative and judicial processes. At the instigation of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, a matter in respect of events in March 1981, I believe, relative to the passing of a special warrant may be before a judge in due course. As a result of steps taken by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, that is the situation. No one has any objection to his undertaking to do whatever he thinks is best in that regard. But at no time in those proceedings or here has the hon. leader suggested that it is inappropriate in any way for this Assembly to deal with the matter. I would point out to him that what is now proposed is that the Assembly deal with the matter.

Mr. Chairman, it is almost beyond rational under-

standing to find a reason for not doing the clear legislative function at this time. If the procedure which is afoot, in the sense of the court proceeding in respect of this item, were all it took to cause any parliament to defer any budgetary matter — budgetary matters, as we all know, being matters of the highest importance to the confidence in which the Assembly holds any government — then it would be a simple enough matter to commence more than one. It would be a simple enough matter to commence them in respect of estimates in Parliament and bring proceedings there to a halt. If it's good enough for one, it's good enough for every item here to be attacked in some way. We would find that the Assembly could not budget, and could not pass its estimates and make its necessary appropriations. It would be an historic day indeed, Mr. Chairman, if this Assembly were to embark upon a procedure that would allow something like that to occur.

I say again to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that what is probably at the heart of this is the confusion of a judicial process and what must be a legislative process. There is nothing whatever, in the sense of any absence of propriety or correct procedure, in dealing with this matter as it is now before the Assembly.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, in rising to participate briefly in this debate, first of all I take issue with the suggestion the Government House Leader made that basically what you have here is a motion that, if passed, would lead to the immediate collapse of the government. Governments can accept motions of this kind. It would seem to me entirely appropriate. We're not dealing with the entire budget. We're dealing with one special warrant, which has been approved by the government. Should the Legislature decide to delay approval of that until such time as the court case is decided, that is certainly not a want of confidence in the government, especially if the government members support the motion of deferral.

The reason I think we have to consider this, Mr. Chairman, is that as I read yesterday's transcript — I'll just note your remarks, sir:

As far as the committee is concerned [now], I think a member would have to make his or her . . . decision as to whether they want to comment in that case. In the past I think courtesy and good judgment have prevailed, and in all cases that I could find, members have refrained from discussing any matter before the courts in any way. I hope this committee will do the same.

Then the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo asked: Just for clarification, please, Mr. Chairman. Does that mean you will not be calling a vote on that particular item when we get to it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll be calling the vote, but I would hope that it wouldn't be discussed in detail.

Mr. Chairman, the problem that all members of the Assembly have is that if we are going to honor the commitment not to discuss in detail this particular special warrant, we are put in the invidious position of approving a special warrant we cannot discuss publicly, or have been advised by the Chairman of the committee not to discuss publicly.

Under these circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I urge the government to give some consideration, between now and tomorrow afternoon when the committee sits once again, to holding this special warrant until the matter is determined one way or another, so that the appropriateness of the special warrant can be discussed in the Assembly, as it

should, rather than approving a special warrant we are not able to discuss in any kind of detailed way, according to the Chairman's ruling. In my judgment, that is not doing the public business. What is at stake here is setting aside a decision until such time as we can have a court decision so we can fully debate the rights and wrongs of it in the House.

I say to the Government House Leader, why not think about it over the next 24 hours? Tomorrow, when we reconvene committee study, we can perhaps set it aside and go on to consideration of the other special warrants, and not get ourselves into a situation where we have to pass something we cannot adequately discuss. I do not believe that is something any of us can justify to our own constituents.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, it is not in any way our intention to hold up the budget of the province of Alberta. I respect the comment that we cannot fully discuss the item before us because it is before the courts. We do have the fall sittings of the Legislature, which is still the session of the fiscal year. The item we have before us can be held until that time. The rest of the budget can be passed. The activity of the government functioning as the guardian of the taxpayers' funding can proceed. That's basically what we're speaking of, because the matter is before the courts.

The fact that for many years we have been advocating the use of the fall session specifically for supplementary estimates for special warrants is just an indication that that mechanism could work. If we have a contentious special warrant, as we have before us, the fall sitting of the Legislature could be used to pass that special warrant.

Mr. Chairman, it's basically that. We're not trying in any way to hold up the budgetary process. Funds have to be expended, funds have to be voted, and funds have to be spent. But what we're talking about is one portion of the special warrants before us. We will not discuss the merits — if it is or is not a wise decision. Mr. Chairman, what we're saying is that the opportunity is before us as members of this Assembly to pass this portion of the special warrants at the fall sitting of the Legislature. Mr. Chairman, that is why we feel the motion proposed by my colleague can be dealt with. Basically that's why we have the motion as read by my colleague the hon. Leader of the Opposition before the committee.

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

