

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTATitle: **Tuesday, December 1, 1981 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the 18th annual report of the Alberta Racing Commission for the year ended March 31, 1981.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of all members of the Assembly and particularly since the debate last night on farm safety, I take pleasure in filing with the Clerk a copy of the Farm Safety Almanac produced in co-operation with the Farm Equipment Dealers Association, Alberta farm safety program, Alberta Agriculture, and Alberta Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation. One copy will be distributed for every member of the Assembly. I trust this is evidence of some of the work being done voluntarily in Alberta.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I draw the attention of the Assembly to the presence in the Speaker's gallery of Mr. John E. McDonough, who has been appointed research director in the Legislature Library. Mr. McDonough will be responsible for administering the library's new research section, which will include oral briefings, background papers, and other related services for members, committees, and possibly some delegations.

Mr. McDonough earned a master's degree from Queen's University and subsequently completed the academic requirements for a PhD at the University of Toronto. His major area of concern in his studies was Canadian federal and provincial politics and, more particularly, federal/provincial relations.

He's had a number of teaching assignments at three Canadian universities, has completed numerous research studies for Members of Parliament in Ottawa and for the Canadian Senate and has had a number of articles published in *The Parliamentarian*, the *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, and other publications.

I'm looking forward to Mr. McDonough's service in the library. I'm sure all hon. members will welcome this addition to the outstanding quality of service the library is rendering to the members. I ask Mr. McDonough and our distinguished librarian, Mr. McDougall, to stand to receive your welcome and recognition.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Heritage Savings Trust Fund Auditing**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Provincial Treasurer, and it's in the opposition's pursuit

of information. At this point in time, I'd like to ask whether the management letters with regard to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund — the documentation of the \$60 million realized loss, in terms of the loss itself and the management procedures put in place — could be tabled in this Legislature.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated on six or seven previous occasions, the Auditor General of the province of Alberta, as an independent officer of the Legislature, has reviewed thoroughly all aspects of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund and has confirmed on more than one occasion that no moneys have been unaccounted for or mislaid; that there is no evidence of fraud or collusion; that there is no evidence of mismanagement; and that the moneys referred to, the \$60 million losses with respect to bonds, must be balanced against \$1.6 billion of gains.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the minister. Will the minister table, for the information of members in this Legislature, the three management letters made available to the minister and his deputy minister?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, the answer again is no. We've had that debate on several occasions and, as I indicated, the need for candor on the part of the advice of the independent Auditor General is essential. As well, it's important that the control systems, which are and have been set up by those involved in the investment area, are kept confidential so we can be assured that there will not be opportunities for fraud or collusion.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, at this time I'd like to table in this Assembly, for the information of members, the one document I have available to me in terms of the management letters. I also have copies of the management letter available for other members of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question to the Premier is in light of the '66-67 document, *What Do We Stand For?*, which the Premier distributed across the province of Alberta. In that document the Premier said very clearly: "public laws should be made in public"; public discussion should be public in the Legislature. At this point, would the Premier consider tabling any future management documents that go between the Auditor General and any minister, specifically to the Provincial Treasurer or Deputy Provincial Treasurer from the Auditor General? In light of commitments to the people of Alberta, will all those management letters be tabled in this Legislature in future?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, although I have some recollection of the document waved at me, which I recall others have waved at me from time to time, I recall that my wording was that "public laws should be made in public". Obviously that's the case. The Auditor General's law was made in public. It was debated in this Legislature. It's clear specifically what's involved. I believe it is very important that within the management of the government, The Auditor General Act be followed and that there be an opportunity for candid communication between the Auditor General and the Provincial Treasurer. If the Auditor General is not satisfied with the response of the Provincial Treasurer, he is an officer of this Legis-

lature and in due course will no doubt report if he feels it's necessary.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the Premier. The decision not to table the documents in this Legislature is political, not legal. In light of that specific decision and in terms of the statement made some years ago by the Premier to the people of Alberta that the public has a right to know, I ask the Premier . . . We have a realized loss of \$60 million under the Heritage Savings Trust Fund in the province of Alberta. We need the documentation of how that loss occurred. Would the Premier review the matter to see if documentation can be provided in this Legislature so we fulfil that obligation that the public has a right to know?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, certainly the public has a right to know. They have a right to know that there's \$66 million of realized losses and some \$1.7 billion of realized gains. They have a right to know that, and in fact they know it.

The situation is that the hon. Leader of the Opposition followed the appropriate parliamentary course. He brought forth a Bill, as he's entitled to, to amend The Auditor General Act. I was impressed with the fact that he brought that forward. I was so impressed with it that I thought it was useful to have it debated. It was debated, and my recollection from Votes and Proceedings is that it was defeated.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question to the Provincial Treasurer. I've tabled in this Legislature a document the minister says he cannot table. Under the precedent I've just established, on what grounds can the minister defend the position that he is not tabling the management letters?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is clearly debate. The hon. member is not seeking information; he is trying to get some further debate. Try as I may, I can't change the rules of the question period except to act in a way which is unparliamentary and contrary to proper order, and I'm not about to do that.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question to the Provincial Treasurer: is the main reason for not tabling the management letter political or legal?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, lest we get into a debate which might also examine the reasons for the hon. leader's questions. If the hon. leader wishes to seek information and not repeat under a different guise the question he asked before, I'd be very happy to recognize him.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has the Provincial Treasurer sought legal advice as to reasons the management letter cannot be tabled?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, The Auditor General Act, debated in this Assembly some years ago, is very clear. At the time the Act was debated, and debated fully by the hon. Leader of the Opposition and others in the opposition, it was decided that one of the sections of the Act would be that the management letters, the audit advice letters, of the Auditor General would not be tabled in the Assembly or before a select committee. That's what the law says; that is what this Assembly says. I am

following the orders and directions of this Legislature in taking the position the government is taking.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Today I'd also like to table legal advice which indicates that the management letters can be tabled.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm not aware that we are at that stage in the proceedings. The hon. member can give the Clerk anything he wants, of course, but I question whether it qualifies as a tabling. If he would like to get unanimous consent to revert to tabling documents, the House might consider that.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. As I look at Standing Order 35(3)(a), it doesn't require me to obtain unanimous consent. It says that if an hon. member wishes to table certain documents in the Legislature . . . I would like to quote from that section on the point of order:

Documents presented to the Assembly by a member for the information of the members may be

(a) tabled if accompanied by sufficient copies for distribution to all members,

Mr. Speaker, I refer to that section. I certainly have the document, and I have copies for all members.

MR. SPEAKER: Quite so, but that doesn't say it can be done at any old time. If the Assembly agrees, I'm happy to suggest that we revert to tabling of documents.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS** (*reversion*)

MR. R. SPEAKER: I would like to table the document agreed to by the Assembly and provide my legal advice for other members of the Assembly. It's weighty. Fortunately, it's not mine but is by a very reputable firm in the city of Edmonton, supported by a reputable accounting firm as well.

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

Heritage Savings Trust Fund Auditing (*continued*)

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question to the Provincial Treasurer is: after reviewing the documents tabled in this Assembly by me, the Member for Little Bow, would the Provincial Treasurer reconsider the position he has taken in this Legislature?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, my understanding was that the Legislature makes laws, and those who interpret the laws of a legislature are the courts of Canada and Alberta.

MR. BATIUK: A supplementary to the Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker. Just a few days [ago], the Leader of the Opposition strongly voiced his opposition of you providing a tabling of the Member for Spirit River-Fairview. I wonder if the Provincial Treasurer could

advise us whether the hon. Leader of the Opposition got the blessing of the Auditor General to table this report?

MR. SPEAKER: First of all, there is some difficulty in arranging for cross-questioning during the question period. In the second place, although I have some misgiving about the propriety of tabling such a document, I really don't want to say anything about it unless some member is excited about it or I have to read it.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question was not a cross-examination across the table. I was asking the Provincial Treasurer whether he was aware if any blessings were provided to the Leader of the Opposition to table this.

MR. HYNDMAN: I'm not aware of any blessing at all provided to the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Provincial Treasurer in regard to the law he referred to a minute ago. The law says quite specifically that if an inadequacy occurs over more than one year, it should be brought to the attention of the Legislative Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member telling or asking?

MR. SINDLINGER: I'm telling, and I'm about to ask . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps he could do that at a "telling" time.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, the question I'm about to ask is: in view of the fact that an inadequacy was identified by the Auditor General over a course of two years and possibly three, why was it not reported to the Legislative Assembly, according to the law?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General reports any matters of substance, concern, or inadequacy in his annual reports. That's what the Legislature has said. The Auditor General Act should state. Therefore, we abide by and will be responsible for the annual reports of the Auditor General as set forth in these various documents, which indicate that a very rigorous and thorough review has been conducted of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund accounts.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to put a supplementary question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, for clarification with respect to the question by the Leader of the Opposition on whether the government had obtained outside legal advice. The minister has indicated that he is not able to table the management letters because of the law. Very specifically, my question is: has there been any effort on the part of the government to obtain a specific legal opinion with respect to whether the minister has the discretionary power to table this kind of document?

MR. SPEAKER: That's really a clear and outright repetition of a question already asked. However, the hon. minister may be anxious to deal with it.

MR. HYNDMAN: I think I've answered that, Mr. Speaker. As well, not only does the law of the province state that those letters should not be tabled but I think the reasoning applied when the Act was first passed still

applies. There are certain reasons the situation and the arrangement for the audit of the Auditor General are set up the way they are; that is, to make sure his advice is the most candid that can be found, also to protect the system set up for the reduction of any possibility of fraud or collusion.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. I did not ask him for the reasons. We've had the government's reasons time immemorial for the last five or six weeks. My question very directly to the minister, which is simply yes or no: was there an effort to get an outside legal opinion?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That's the third time that question has been asked. Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition wish to ask his next question?

MR. R. SPEAKER: This is the important question.

Oil Workers' Overtime

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address this question to the hon. Minister of Labour. It is with respect to compulsory overtime at the Suncor plant. On May 21, 1981, on page 854 of *Hansard*, the minister was quoted as saying:

The work schedules were followed, as approved, at six days per week, 10 hours per day, for the short term of taking the plant down, out of production.

Then he makes the point:

The reason is that it becomes a question of safety.

To the hon. Minister of Labour: has the government had an opportunity to review concerns by the McMurray Independent Oil Workers Union that in the process division, rather than seven days of 10 hours, workers have been working seven days of 12 hours per shift?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, several initiatives have been taken with respect to concerns emanating from the Suncor and McMurray Independent Oil Workers relationship. First of all, there was concern about the fact that the union brought a grievance which was not sustained. In short, the union lost the grievance under its collective bargaining agreement, indicating a deficiency with respect to its collective agreement, from its point of view. Secondly, there were concerns related to whether overtime had been paid for appropriately. Those have been checked out by the employment standards branch. Thirdly, there were concerns about the amount of overtime, the reasons for the same, and the lack of a constructive, positive relationship in that particular situation.

Initiatives of two types have been taken: as I mentioned, the employment standards branch initiatives; and secondly, initiatives of a preventive mediation nature which have produced a number of meetings between the union and Suncor and, I believe, some considerable improvement in that relationship. There was to have been a meeting yesterday which, my understanding was, should have produced some evidence of progress between the parties. The meeting did not occur, and I'm unable to give the hon. member more detail at the present time.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question. Is the Minister of Labour able to outline to the Assembly what approach was used by the employment standards branch with respect to investigating the specific complaint of seven days at 12 hours per shift, as opposed to seven days

at 10 hours per shift that the minister alluded to on May 21, as I recall, mentioning the importance of safety? What course of action was followed by the employment standards branch in investigating that complaint?

MR. YOUNG: First of all, Mr. Speaker, on the specific course of action. I have not considered it my personal responsibility to question exactly how the officers proceeded in their work. Now, if that's a question which has unique importance, I may pursue it if the hon. member . . . And the hon. member might wish to join me in that pursuit.

In respect of an earlier reference to *Hansard*, then another reference to hours apparently worked, I would not wish the hon. member to find himself in a predicament, as occurred as recently as last week with what I think — but I'm not sure, since I don't have the *Hansard* in front of me — to be a difference in reference to time frames. I just alert the hon. member that I think we're now venturing into that risky area.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In light of his inability to answer the question as to what process the department followed, is the minister prepared to look at some totally impartial method of investigating the complaints, where both union and management can state their cases? I refer specifically to the question of the overtime.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I must rise and defend the staff of the Department of Labour who, it seems to me, have had the allegation put to them just now — or put to this Assembly — that the staff is not objective. On behalf of that staff and the rest of the staff of the government, I must indicate to the hon. member that I find that allusion objectionable.

With respect to the process followed, officers of the department were in Fort McMurray on at least two occasions. There have been innumerable conversations, meetings with at least the assistant deputy minister and the president of the union local, plus I have met with the president of the union local. Unless the hon. member wishes to be specific, I'm just not sure what he has in mind in his question.

MR. NOTLEY: A further supplementary question to the Minister of Labour. What studies, if any, have been undertaken by either the Department of Labour or the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation with respect to the impact of Section 28 of The Employment Standards Act? This is the section which allows 24 days out of 28 days consecutive work. Last May 21, the minister alluded to the impact of safety on the number of hours worked. Has any study been commissioned by either the minister's department or his colleague's department on the impact on safety of Section 28?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I think the question and the legislation should be kept in the appropriate context. The one piece of legislation, The Employment Standards Act, relates to the minimum conditions which must be observed, if you will. There is a great deal of flexibility in those conditions. That is independent of, but certainly controlled by, the requirements for safe working conditions, which are administered by my colleague the minister responsible for occupational health and safety. There shouldn't be confusion that because the one piece of legis-

lation says these are minimum conditions, another piece of legislation and the regulations that flow from it may very well not allow the full extent of the minimum conditions in the one piece of legislation to operate in a given situation. That's as it should be.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation. Given the answer of the Minister of Labour, what assessment has been made, study commissioned, or review undertaken, of the impact of Section 28 of The Employment Standards Act as it relates to safety? For the information of the minister, this is the section which allows up to 24 days' work without any holiday, then a period of four days. What specific review has been made of that section by the minister's department from a safety perspective?

MR. SPEAKER: Might I ask the hon. member if he is able to distinguish this question from its predecessor?

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I asked the hon. Minister of Labour the question. In response, the hon. Minister of Labour indicated that it may well be that regulations under The Occupational Health and Safety Act have precedence. If that's the case, I would ask the minister in charge of that department what studies, from a safety point of view, have been done. Employment standards are the responsibility of the Minister of Labour; safety is the responsibility of the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, because of the lengthy question, and rather than be accused of misleading the House, I would like to take that as notice and respond later.

Constitution

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Premier. I find it necessary to bring back the subject of the constitution for some clarification and recognition of position. My first question is to inquire of the hon. Premier as to his position with regard to the current proposed amendment to the constitution by the NDP in the House of Commons, to provide special compensation to Quebec only, with respect to a situation where Quebec would choose to opt out of a particular program.

MR. LOUGHEED: I may have misunderstood the amendment being discussed or debated now in the House of Commons. The position is that it affects the accord signed by the nine provinces, including Alberta. Last Friday, a communication was transmitted on behalf of the nine provinces to the Prime Minister, to the effect that there should not be any further substantive amendments made and that we should proceed with the accord as we have it, the resolution in its present form; and that if there are to be subsequent changes, they occur pursuant to Section 36.

I presume the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood is referring to amendments being debated that would change the nature of the amending formula, to the effect that if a province opted out of a constitutional amendment, it would receive compensation. My understanding of the situation is that subsequent to our meeting on November 5, the federal government, through the Prime

Minister, proposed that that be altered and that compensation be provided in the areas of education and culture only. There now has been an amendment by the Progressive Conservative opposition in Parliament that the accord be altered and that compensation be provided generally for all matters of opting out, which would put it in accordance with the agreement entered into by the Quebec government last April 16.

If the hon. member is referring to the amendment . . . And I must have the amendment wrong. I can't believe that the NDP has proposed an amendment that would provide compensation only to the province of Quebec. I must have that wrong; I'm sure that couldn't be the case.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, I hope that is wrong as well. I hope that is not in fact what is being proposed.

My supplementary question is further on the constitution and proposed amendments. Could the hon. Premier indicate whether any further amendments are being contemplated to give further special conditions and recognition for the Metis, subsequent to the directive issued by the Premier and the earlier advised information provided to the House?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the situation as it exists today is that there would not be further changes to the section that has been brought in — renumbered as Section 35, I believe — to provide for a recognition of the existing aboriginal and treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada, defined as the Indian, Metis, and Inuit. My understanding of the current situation is that that's the way it will stand as the resolution is taken to final vote in the House of Commons, then the federal Senate and, if approved, on to the United Kingdom Parliament. However, there is the Section 36(2) which I've mentioned before in the Legislature, which provides over the course of the next year for some identification of the rights referred to in the previous section.

MRS. CHICHAK: One additional supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Requests have been made in a number of other areas for further amendments. I wonder if the hon. Premier could simply advise whether, on behalf of this province, he would consider and agree to any other amendments in any other area.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the situation is that the nine provincial governments that signed the accord on November 5 have taken a position, as a result of a telephone conference last Friday, to the effect that there should be no further substantive amendments and that the matter should proceed as it is now, and as the resolution exists today before the federal House of Commons. If there is to be consideration of further changes, that will be undertaken through the process of what is Section 36.

Rental Accommodations

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works. Does the minister have up-to-date information on the vacancy rate in rental accommodations in the province of Alberta?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, the vacancy rate determinations we have are obtained, in the cases of Calgary and Edmonton, from the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. These surveys are done every April and October. For the rest of Alberta, the Department of

Housing and Public Works, using summer students, surveys and therefore determines the vacancy rate on a once-a-year basis, then makes adjustments during the year. I don't have them at my fingertips, but I could probably provide the latest vacancy rate information the department has in any municipality the hon. member wishes.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister's department have any projection on the planned construction of rental accommodations for the province in 1982, and if it will meet the increases in population?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, that question is very subjective and depends on whom one talks to. In discussions I've had with the industry, I've had estimates of as high as between 5,000 and 10,000 units of housing that might have been built under the MURB program, had that been allowed to remain. One developer indicated to me that he had planned and had land for 1,000 MURB units in Calgary and another 1,000 in Edmonton. That was just one developer. So if one looked at that forecast of upwards of 10,000, if that may be the case, then the cancellation of the MURB has a very serious effect.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question with regard to the cancellation of the MURB program operated by the federal government. Some of the municipalities have made concessions now to speed up so they can get the foundations in, since they've extended the MURB program until January 1. Has the minister been considering home mortgage changing its regulations so it can approve mortgages on a rapid basis? Or it could approve the mortgages after they get the foundations in, so they could use some of the home mortgage money to put up these accommodations in the province.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure I totally follow the question. I'd be happy to respond further if I'm not answering what the hon. member is asking. Of course, we were talking about rental accommodation. In terms of home ownership, I think the mortgage corporation has approved 8,350 units this year in our budget for home ownership through the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation.

I think the hon. member asked me about speed-up. It's true that we've had some delays. These have been occasioned by the fact that we've had incredible demands. Our budget of \$1.7 billion this year represents 24,655 units of both rental and ownership housing. Therefore, that's put a terrific strain on the people in the Home Mortgage Corporation. I think they've responded very well. There have been delays at times, and they've coped with that. We're minimizing those delays, and I expect they'll be even less in the future.

MR. MANDEVILLE: One further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it the minister's intent to meet with officials in Ottawa or with the department of housing with regard to continuation of the MURB program, especially in the province of Alberta? Is the minister making any representation to see that Alberta gets its fair share of the 15,000 rental units that are going to be spread across Canada?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, the federal minister of housing met with me here in Edmonton last week — I think on Wednesday — and indicated that they were prepared to allocate 2,000 of the 15,000 units to Alberta. I would draw to the member's attention that if one looks at the minimum estimate we had for construction under the MURB program — it was 5,000, and builders I've talked to tell me that more likely 10,000 would have been constructed — that puts that 2,000 in perspective.

I urged the federal minister in the strongest way I could to look very hard at attempting to re-establish the MURB. In my view, the MURB, along with soft costs, write-offs, and so forth, was not a loophole; it was an encouragement to investment by private and small investors. In the last decade, it resulted in a vast amount of residential construction, not only in Alberta but all across Canada. I think it's of great importance that the federal government reconsider that decision and reinstitute the MURB.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question. Are there any funds left in the accounts of the two programs we have in the province, CHIP and MAP, to construct apartment buildings at this time?

MR. CHAMBERS: Sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear the last part of the question.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Have the funds run out as far as CHIP and MAP are concerned, or are there still funds available to build rental accommodations in the province?

MR. CHAMBERS: We added \$200 million to the program on October 1, as members will recall. There is still money left. The funds are expended for the CHIP, but there still is funding available for the modest apartment program. We have an allocation for the Calgary area of some 600 or 700 units remaining, I think. I expect these will be taken up. I think the \$200 million should suffice through the end of our current fiscal year.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might supplement my colleague's answer, which probably would be of interest to the member who has posed the question with respect to apartment unit starts. For example, in Calgary in the period January 1 to October 1981, the increase in apartment starts permits in actual units was 150 per cent over the equivalent period in the previous year. In Edmonton the increase was 33 per cent over the equivalent . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. My understanding of the question was that it concerned whether money was left in certain funds. I think we've gone a long way from that.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I wasn't adding the information on the final supplementary; it was on a previous supplementary.

VIA Rail Services

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. Minister of Tourism and Small Business flows from my concern about the impact on the city of Edmonton as a result of the federal VIA Rail abandonment from Edmonton to Jasper to Vancouver. Is the hon. minister continuing to pursue, perhaps in activity with other inter-

est groups, putting together some further program and pressure on the federal government to reconsider that abandonment program?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member, two things have happened. We are continuing to support the community of Jasper in its appeal process to the decision handed down in Alberta sometime in the month of November. We have and will continue to seek additional meetings.

One area where we will be discussing the abandonment of the VIA Rail service through the northern region from Winnipeg to Edmonton, and particularly Edmonton to Vancouver, will be at the tourism ministers' conference in mid-December in Ottawa. We will have representation made at that time.

MRS. CHICHAK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. minister could advise whether he is currently having a statistical review carried out on the impact on tourism, the number of people now having to seek other more expensive modes of transportation to travel between Edmonton, Jasper, and Vancouver. Are some statistics being compiled to reinforce the position being taken in the west?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, we're attempting to do just that.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower would like to deal further with a topic from a previous question period.

Nursing Shortage

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, in regard to the questions raised yesterday with respect to refresher nursing courses, I wish to advise that six public colleges are offering those courses at the present time. The average cost is \$796 per student. The hospitals plan to offer their own programs to about 200 students, at an average cost of \$562. The Department of Advanced Education and Manpower is funding both college and hospital refresher programs at a total cost of \$380,447. In addition to that, the tuition fee for a hospital refresher course is \$150 for students in both colleges and hospital-based programs.

The other question related to extension courses on an outreach basis. Funding has been provided to Grant MacEwan College to develop a program to provide nursing refresher courses by distance education. Athabasca University's role in outreach education, which I mentioned yesterday, is restricted to a collaborative effort with the University of Alberta for training at the baccalaureate level.

Psychiatrist Shortage

MR. HORSMAN: Finally, with respect to training psychiatrists, no funds have been designated for psychiatry within the profession faculty enhancement grants I mentioned. The major factor in determining the number of graduates in any medical specialty is the number of residency positions, which are determined and funded by the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care. There are 23 psychiatry resident positions at the University of Alberta and 14 at the University of Calgary. In the past, the problem has not been the number of residency positions but the number of recruits available to fill them. Fortun-

ately, this year all positions at the University of Alberta are filled, and 12 of the 14 positions at the University of Calgary are filled.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health wishes to deal further with some information that was previously sought.

Programs for the Disabled

MR. BOGLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday, in response to a question from the Leader of the Opposition, I made reference to a piece of correspondence which I indicated went out on November 13. The correct date for that information was actually November 19. I would like *Hansard* to record the same.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Government Services.

Provincial Buildings — Specifications

MR. McCRAE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Several days ago, the Member for Grande Prairie asked a series of questions which amounted to a representation for the use of an Alberta product in our Government Services purchasing requirements.

MR. SPEAKER: If they did, the Speaker shouldn't have allowed the question.

MR. McCRAE: Since you did, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might be permitted to conclude with the information. I wanted to assure the member in the House that his representations on this matter, on that and previous occasions, have been very effective. Although we do not buy a large dollar product of lumber, to the extent that we do buy it 95 per cent of it is Alberta-based.

Government Documents

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago I raised a question with the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration and the Minister of Transportation with regard to a search within the departments — defined in other terms in this Legislature — for persons who may have placed documents in the hands of the opposition. Could the two ministers report as to what they've found in their investigation?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I don't have anything to report. We're not doing anything.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, with respect to Motion 149, there had been a debate, but I note that the person speaking at the time is not in the House. I move that Motion 147 stand and retain its place.

[Motion carried]

147. Mr. Notley moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing copies of all studies prepared by the

Native Secretariat of the department of Native Affairs of the government of Alberta since October 1, 1980, dealing with the question of the effect anticipated or previously proposed constitutional changes might have on the status and rights of various aboriginal peoples in Alberta, and specifically including the document titled Aboriginal Rights Amendment Discussion Paper.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I move Motion for a Return No. 147, standing in its place on the Order Paper.

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, with respect to Motion for a Return No. 147, it is not the policy of the government to table internal departmental documents prepared for the information and background of staff and employees of the department. Such documents may or may not have opinions and recommendations of the writer and, as such, are private and confidential. However, when all the information has been assembled and studied and a decision reached, that decision should be made public and the minister prepared to give reasons for making such a decision.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, participating briefly in the debate on Motion for a Return No. 147, I would just like to point out to you, sir, and to other members of the House that this motion for a return has now been on the Order Paper for quite a number of days. It certainly took a good deal of time for the government to come up with this answer.

If members will read the motion for a return, I note that we're talking about copies of "all studies prepared by the Native Secretariat in the department of Native Affairs". We're not talking about internal memos from a government official to the minister. We're talking of:

all studies prepared by the Native Secretariat of the department of Native Affairs of the government of Alberta since October 1, 1980 . . .

Mr. Speaker, members of this House are well aware of the importance of the question of aboriginal rights, particularly as it relates to the debate over Section 34 of the Act before the House of Commons, which ultimately will be sent to London. I welcome the fact that at least we have gone some way with the words "existing rights", but the kind of information contained in the documents and studies I requested would be helpful to members of the House in assessing just what merits there are. And I argue very strongly that there are overwhelming merits in not only the existing wording before the House of Commons but in the initial wording of Section 34.

Unfortunately, it would appear we're not going to get that information, notwithstanding the fact that Motion for a Return 147 is properly before the House. I say to the hon. minister that it is not good enough to argue that copies of studies should not be made available and that the announcement will be made in due course. The public has a right to know, a right to have the chance to scrutinize studies which have been paid for by the public. We're not talking about the kind of confidential information the minister may get from the director of the Native Secretariat; we're talking about commissioned studies that have been paid for by the public.

I simply say to members of the House that Motion for

a Return 147 is not only in order, but it would clearly be in order for this government to comply with its terms.

[Motion lost]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the first hour this afternoon has been designated for government business. In the terms of the designation, Committee of Supply was referred to. In fact, I had planned on dealing with Bills 99 and 66 in committee. If the House agrees, I would like to do it that way, and come to Committee of Supply on Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation after that if there's time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there unanimous agreement to in effect change the designation from Committee of Supply to dealing with Bills in Committee [of the Whole]?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[On motion, the Assembly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole]

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**
(Committee of the Whole)

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the committee please come to order.

Bill 99
Legislative Assembly
Amendment Act, 1981 (No. 2)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill 99 was recommitted to this committee yesterday for an amendment. The amendment has been circulated. Are there any questions or comments regarding the amendment?

[Motion on amendment carried]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding the Bill as amended?

Title and preamble were approved previously.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 99 be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

Bill 66
Senior Citizens Housing
Amendment Act, 1981

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding the sections of this Bill?

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister to enlarge a bit more on the financial breakdown of how we're going to be looking at senior citizens' housing construction and maintenance support. Yesterday we were discussing housing, public housing, and senior citizens' housing. With the amount of rental accommodation that seems to be drying up, there is a concern we're going to require more and more senior citizens' housing. I'd like to know if the minister can give us some idea of what the

minister or the department is looking at for long-term financing. Are any of the foundations having financial problems? What does the minister's department propose to do as far as the funding of senior citizens' housing in the province is concerned?

MR. CHAMBERS: As members will recall, Mr. Chairman, last year, after consultation with the Senior Citizens' Homes Association, in fact a task force that involved that association, and after considerable study over a period of a couple of years, I think, we came up with recommendations that the government adopted. This had to do with a formularized rental rate, which allowed for appropriate increases and which we felt was well within the affordability of the clientele of lodges — because this is hotel-type accommodation which, as the hon. member knows, provides meals, accommodation, linen, and so forth — in addition, a change in the assistance with the foundation deficits. These were approved in a significant way. At a recent meeting with the Senior Citizens' Homes Association — I guess it was their annual convention — they expressed to me the view that the new formula was appropriate and working well. I heard no complaints with regard to lodge financing. So I think that's in good order.

With regard to numbers, we have 2,000 units of self-contained apartments and 600 lodge bed units in our budget this year. Over recent years, the self-contained apartment has increased in popularity compared to lodge bed units, as the hon. member knows. That doesn't mean that both aren't required. I think they are. They both serve a very useful purpose. Self-contained has been extremely useful from the standpoint that it's economically possible to build as few as four units, say, in a small community. Because of the base requirement for staff, kitchen, and so forth, members know that there has to be an economic model for lodges, generally somewhere between 44 and 65 beds, although we are experimenting with a couple of smaller ones.

Indications are that we are now catching up to demand. Every summer, we do demand surveys throughout the province. Indications are that we are catching up to the demand for all types of senior citizens' accommodation. Of course there will be an ongoing need, but I think we are over the largest hump insofar as annual quantity.

MR. NOTLEY: I'd just like to make several comments, and then deal in a little more detailed way with several questions I posed in second reading. One move the department has undertaken that I think is quite useful is the concept of self-contained units and a lodge together. I know the North Peace Foundation is talking about a possible project in Peace River and is looking at the option of one at Fairview as well, where you have the self-contained units adjacent to or part of the lodge. I think that's an excellent idea, Mr. Chairman. That sort of move is one of the best things we can encourage, because people can then move from their self-contained units to the lodge and stay in the same environment, the same atmosphere, with the same friends. I think it goes some distance to taking away much of the fear of being uprooted and dislocated that concerns a lot of senior citizens.

It seems to me that one thing we might discuss with the Senior Citizens' Homes Association would be to look at the siting not just of new projects that combine this concept, but as we expand our nursing home capacity in the province, instead of looking at what is most convenient from a nursing home vantage point, which is adja-

cent to a hospital, look at the role of nursing and auxiliary homes in the same context so you take away the fear when people go from one level of accommodation to another, eventually through the nursing home to the auxiliary hospital. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that there might be some real merit in the minister and his colleague the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care looking at how that type of concept can be explored. I know perfectly well that for practical reasons it's not possible to do it in every case, nor is it possible for practical reasons to have self-contained units and a lodge in every case. But it seems to me that where it is possible, it is one of those initiatives that frankly makes those last years a little less frightening for people. I certainly support it.

With respect to the power the minister will be receiving in this Act, as I recall second reading the minister indicated that somebody has to be able to do this; that is, empower somebody to say to municipality X, Y, or Z, you must be part of the foundation, and that the initiative would come from the Senior Citizens' Homes Association. That's my recollection. Perhaps the minister could be a little more specific. Is the amendment we're dealing with a consequence of the homes association, or is it a response by the government to their concern, without a specific recommendation from the homes association?

I'd also like to know from the minister how many municipalities we're looking at as a result of this particular amendment. Is there a large number of municipalities where there is no agreement to be in the foundation, or is it a relatively small number?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, there are 317 municipalities in the province, including cities, towns, villages, counties, municipal districts, improvement districts, and special areas. Of this number, some 30 municipalities do not support any senior citizens' lodge foundation, yet people from those areas are in lodges. As I mentioned in second reading, three lodges — in Evansburg, Andrew, and Sylvan Lake — are unsupported at this point in time. I have had representation from the Senior Citizens' Homes Association, representing all the foundations, that to be fair we should make this equitable and should amend the legislation to ensure participation by everyone in a fair and equitable way.

After observing this for some considerable time and trying to rationalize it in some other way, we decided to accept the advice of the Senior Citizens' Homes Association and proceed with this legislation. I haven't really received any objections to it. It's been some time since second reading, and no objections have reached my office. We're talking about an equalized assessment basis, and I think it's going to be well received. I think it's a case of municipalities even welcoming it, saying: why should I jump up and down and volunteer to participate in this; but if you say I have to participate in a fair and equitable way the same as everybody else in the province, fine, we'll do it. I don't really anticipate any serious objections.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, getting back to the construction of self-contained senior citizens' units, I ask this question without any malice, because we have a little thing going in Josephburg that we're extending. Is there economy in, say, building four units as opposed to eight? Right now I believe they have eight, and they wish to add eight more. But the department, in its wisdom, feels they only want to go to four. Knowing the little I know about construction, it seems that you can build eight for very

little more than it would cost to build four. This is the case the people in the area, the foundation, is trying to make to the minister's department. I'd like to know the minister's views. Is there any economy in going to double the size, an addition of eight instead of four? What are the economics? Is there such a thing as an economical size to build in an addition?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, there isn't generally that much saving. In other words, if you build eight it will cost close to twice what it would cost to build four. If one figured in the land base, there could be some, depending on the area of land. The criterion would certainly be that the demand be there and they be filled. In other words, if we were to build eight and two were to remain vacant for some period of time, that would destroy the economics. You have to keep them full. They're very expensive; very heavy subsidies are involved.

By the way, in response to an earlier remark by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I agree that there are advantages in having self-contained if the land is available adjacent to the lodge. We try to do that. Of course, with a lot of the older lodges, the land just isn't available. Furthermore, we're putting self-contained with as few as four units in smaller communities where there isn't a lodge. But if the land is available, I think it is a good idea to have the self-contained on the same area as the lodge. Furthermore, my colleague the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care and I have been considering for the some time the advantages of multilevel care. We've been looking at that aspect.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question to the minister, if I may, Mr. Chairman. In the discussions the people in my area have had with the minister's department, I would like to know where the greatest amount of input comes from. Is it from the local foundation, or is it from the people working in the minister's department? I'm sure someone — and that's always the minister's responsibility — has to say, we go with eight or we go with four. Knowing the local people, they always figure if we need six, it's better to have eight than four. I'm sure the minister appreciates what I'm saying. That's just the way human beings think. Basically, the question I'm asking is: where does the ultimate decision-making process lie? Do the local foundations have that much input, or is the ultimate decision made by the bureaucracy?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, if we're talking about lodges, the foundations have significant input. Through the Housing Corporation, we dialogue with them in an ongoing way. As you know, in most cases the self-contained aren't operated by the foundations. Every summer we have summer students do surveys, need and demand studies, which include interviews of people: would you want to move into self-contained accommodation if it were there? There's some kind of formula basis for assessing that, because a lot of people think they might and then by the time it's built, they decide they want to stay in the old place for another couple of years. So you have to assess that. It's done on the basis of these annual surveys, where we have summer students interviewing people across the province, attempting to assess the demand in the best way possible.

DR. BUCK: This is the last supplementary question I'd like to ask the minister. Right now, do we have 100 per

cent occupancy of the self-contained units in the province?

MR. CHAMBERS: I'm sure we don't, Mr. Chairman. Obviously, we're building a lot of them, and there are the newly completed that are in the process of being filled. Other than that, the occupancy would be very high, and I don't have an exact statistic. To my knowledge, there aren't very many vacancies, again excluding the post-construction period. It does take a while to get people moved in and settled.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I guess it was just by chance that prior to coming here this afternoon, I got a telephone call from one of my constituents, a Mr. Oliver, who is 70 years old. He appeared to be quite well informed on this matter. As well, I got the impression that he was watching us on television, because he also referred to the Bill we just gave approval to a few minutes ago, the Legislative Assembly Amendment Act. He drew a comparison between that and what we are doing in regard to senior citizens' housing.

His problem was that he was living in a rented apartment where he was paying \$315 a month, and on January 1 the rent is going up to \$450. He originally got into the apartment five years ago and was then paying \$90 a month. Obviously, such quantum increases in rent are creating quite a lot of problems for him, and he's having difficulty handling them. He doesn't want to go into a nursing home or senior citizens' home. He'd like to be able to live on his own. His concern was what the government was doing about this, and his particular representation was in regard to rent controls. I know the reasoning for putting on rent controls and for taking them off, and I explained those to him. He wasn't very satisfied with that. He would like to have seen more input from senior citizens. We've been talking about input from the foundations, and the minister indicated that there were significant contributions or input from foundations. But the point this gentleman tried to make was that there should be more input from those people directly affected, and that is the senior citizens.

In Calgary Buffalo, there are four large senior citizens' groups. One is a senior citizens' lodge, Jacques Lodge, which is quite large; and a nursing home, Cedars Villa. As a matter of fact, once when I visited Cedars Villa I met the grandfather of the Minister of Education. I told him I was in the Legislature, and he said, oh, you're a politician, are you? I said, yes. He said, well, what you have to do is get down and talk to the people. Prior to his retirement, he was a minister in the church, and he knew that when you talk to people you can't talk at them. You can't stand up in the pulpit; you have to get down and talk to them. Those were good words of advice, and I've tried to heed them as much as I can. The grandfather of the Minister of Education was in his late 90s. And although he obviously doesn't have the physical capability he had when he was younger, he certainly has the mental acumen one can only acquire with experience. That's been reinforced in my mind over and over again throughout as I visited these centres in the last three years.

I indicated that there were two, Jacques Lodge and Cedars Villa. As well, there are two other gathering places for senior citizens in Calgary Buffalo. One is the Golden Age Club and the other is the Kerby Centre. I think there are about 5,600 members in the Kerby Centre, senior citizens from all over Calgary. Their guiding motto

is "seniors serving seniors". They want to be able to help themselves and do things for themselves. In my opinion, if they had more resources they could certainly do that. It's the same sentiment echoed by Mr. Oliver when he phoned me this afternoon. He said, I don't want assistance; I don't want to go into these places; I want to look after myself. He felt there were extraordinary circumstances in regard to rental accommodation in Calgary. In essence, he was just advocating the return of some sort of rent control, perhaps not the type we had before but maybe a review board. Using his words, a review board

...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair is having considerable difficulty relating the remarks of the hon. member to the provisions of this particular Bill. We're studying the sections of the Act. If there are any questions or comments regarding those sections, I believe those should be identified.

MR. SINDLINGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to make two points. One is in regard to input in the decision-making, which we were discussing prior to my getting up. It was pointed out that the foundations provide a great deal of input in the decision-making. The point I would like to make is that I think it would also be beneficial to have input from those who would be directly affected, the senior citizens. I don't know if an advisory committee to the minister, which would allow senior citizens to participate in the decision-making, is set up right now.

From my interpretation, that's the essence of this Bill. It deals with decision-making and provides for more transfer of authority to the minister. I was seeking some assurance that the decision-making by the minister wasn't done independently or in isolation. We got partial assurance that that was not the case, because there is input in the decision-making from the foundations. I just submit that there ought to be a very direct attempt to ensure that the senior citizens who are affected also participate in that decision-making. I think they would be the ones in the best position to offer the best advice.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

The second point I want to make in regard to this amendment Act is the question of cost. From the Bill, circumstances could obviously arise whereby municipalities would be required to contribute more to carrying the costs. The question that arises is the ability of the municipalities to pay those increased costs. The municipalities are faced with increased costs, just like everyone else. But I submit that in Alberta they're facing a greater problem than in other cases. Whereas the province is benefiting from natural resource development, the benefits are all going in one direction. They're not being distributed to those centres or locations where major costs are being incurred for those developments. Mr. Chairman, that raises the question for municipalities, if they're going to be required to carry increased costs, of what offsetting factor will enable them to get additional revenue to meet those costs.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, on the contrary, with the changes we made in the formula this past year, the deficits of municipalities are being reduced in a very substantial way. In fact, with good operation the deficits should be negligible. We've gone to an equalized assess-

ment basis for the purpose of equity. For deficits under one mill, for example, the municipality receives a grant to cover 25 per cent of the deficit to a maximum of 30 per cent of total expenditures. For foundations whose deficits are greater than one mill, again based on equalized assessment, the province finances roughly 50 per cent of the deficit, again limited to 30 per cent of total expenditures. That's a control factor to ensure efficiency of operation. At their annual convention recently, the Senior Citizens' Homes Association expressed to me that they felt this new formula was fair and equitable, and they could operate very well under it. It also allowed for a rental adjustment on a five-year formula basis.

Insofar as input, of course we have a large number of non-profit groups across the province operating senior citizens' accommodations, self-contained and so forth. We have an advisory committee, and we talk to these people on a regular basis. We do get a lot of good input and advice. It's a good two-way dialogue, which is extremely helpful.

In addition to the self-contained apartments and lodges, for example, in our budget this year alone we have 6,350 CHIP units, under the core housing incentive program. Half those are at cost rental; that's part of the deal. Many of these units are occupied by senior citizens who are able to obtain favorable rent in these projects as well.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary please, Mr. Chairman. Has there been an assessment of the impact this amendment would have on the city of Calgary?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't expect any massive impact on any particular municipality, certainly not on a large one. You're talking about the change in this Bill, I presume, not the change we made in the formula last year, which will be of significant benefit to every municipality and foundation in Alberta. As far as this Act goes, of the 317 municipalities I mentioned, only 30 weren't participating. In terms of the whole pot, if you like, it's not going to affect anybody drastically. It will provide equity and a fairness that don't exist now because of the 30 who have seniors in lodges but don't contribute. It will result in fairness and equitable distribution, and shouldn't impact adversely on anyone.

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Chairman, it was mentioned earlier that the department is moving toward lodges, self-contained units, and nursing homes and hospital combinations. I think this is a good move. You only have to look at the village of Hythe, where this is happening. I think there are about 300 people in the village of Hythe, and 150 of them are senior citizens. It's almost a senior citizens town. I think it's a good move.

Are all lodges in the province running into deficits, or only some? Are those lodges that are running into deficits not running at capacity, which could very easily cause their cost to be considerably higher? Another question I would like to ask the minister is, what are the highest deficits lodges are running into? Are these lodges in the north, south, or scattered throughout the province?

MR. CHAMBERS: I'm quoting from memory here, which isn't perfect by any means; I'd be happy to dig out the details for the Member for Grande Prairie. The highest deficit I recollect seeing was something in the order of \$40,000. Again, I may have to come back and say I'm wrong on this. That was prior to amending this formula.

I haven't seen the recent deficits as a result. Well, it's too soon to say because we just changed this last year. But with the significant changes that were made, and talking with the people from the Senior Citizens' Homes Association, they feel that with good operation and management the deficit should be very small. There has been the occasional case of lodges where the vacancy rates were fairly high. Of course, it's difficult to operate without a deficit when you have a high vacancy rate. These have been corrected quite rapidly, so we don't have significant vacancy rates that I'm aware of in very many places.

The Member for Grande Prairie asked me about control before, and I mentioned that we have that guideline of a maximum of 30 per cent of total expenditures as a check to encourage good operation. With good management, I think the majority of lodges will operate without deficit. There is a motivator in there to encourage sound management.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree with the minister's concept of decentralizing and putting up these small, self-contained units. I think they're excellent and well accepted by our older people in this province. In my constituency, it's well appreciated.

During our session we had the minister down there to open some in Brooks, and a senior citizens' lodge in Bassano. I think decentralization is a very good step in the right direction; for example, the one the minister opened in Bassano. We kept adding to the lodge in Brooks. We were moving people from Bassano and other areas into the Brooks area. Now that one is built in Bassano, they can leave the people close to that area and accommodate them in that lodge. The decentralization plan is accepted very well in the province.

I think the self-contained units for our senior citizens is an excellent program. They are going over very well. I have many of them in my constituency. They're almost to capacity all the time. We have no occupancy rate in our senior citizen self-contained suites, especially in the centres where we're putting in four, six, and eight units. They're always full.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister: who picks up the deficit when some of the self-contained units aren't to capacity, and they have a deficit and not enough money to operate them on their own through the local church or whoever is sponsoring the self-contained suites? I was wondering what effect decentralization has on the cost of senior citizens' lodges. The hon. Member for Grande Prairie asked where the largest deficits were. Are they in the smaller centres, or are they in high-rise senior citizens' lodges?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, I guess the highest deficits have occurred in those few lodges where there have been significant vacancy rates. The last numbers I saw indicated that vacancy rates in lodges had been reduced substantially, so that should help. As to whether they're greater in one municipality or another, I don't know that I could answer that. I think, though, that the way we have the new formula structured, after considerable thought from the task force, should result in an equitable treatment of deficits for large or small municipalities.

With regard to the self-contained, the rental is on a 25 per cent of income basis. The deficits are picked up generally by the Housing Corporation and, in most cases, are cost shared with Canada Mortgage and Housing

Corporation on a fifty-fifty basis. Some are not; the deficits in those cases are picked up by government.

MR. SINDLINGER: I'd like to ask a supplementary, please, to the question asked by the Member for Grande Prairie. It's in regard to the highest deficits. I don't think the Member for Grande Prairie got a geographical breakdown as he requested. I see he's shaking his head, so he didn't. Perhaps the minister doesn't have that information with him. But it was indicated by the minister that the highest deficit, as best he could recall, was somewhere in the vicinity of \$40,000. Just using that number, could the minister please translate that into per occupant terms?

For example, if the deficit is \$40,000 and there are only 10 people in the unit, that would be a \$4,000 loss per occupant which, to me, would be quite a huge deficit. On the other hand, if there were — just to use an extreme example — 40,000 occupants and the deficit was \$40,000, the deficit per occupant would be only \$1. That wouldn't be significant at all. I'm asking the minister if he could give us an indication of the per occupant deficit, so we could judge whether or not this \$40,000 is significant.

Secondly, perhaps the minister might respond a bit further as to where the major deficits occur. Perhaps he might have missed the question in regard to a geographical breakdown of the deficit.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, again I was recollecting, looking at a list of deficits a year ago, before we changed the formula. I recollect seeing something in the deficits in the order of \$40,000 for a given lodge. There may be some that are higher, but that's the highest I recollect.

The whole purpose of changing the formula last year — and of the task force work over two years — and restructuring the formula in a major way was to cure those deficits. The information I have from the Senior Citizens' Homes Association is that it's working. It would be a significant academic exercise to go back over the past years and say, okay, this lodge had a given vacancy rate at this time and it incurred this deficit. That deficit may have been due in part to the vacancy rate and in part to the fact that maybe that lodge wasn't managed quite as well as another. Since we have totally restructured the formula, I don't know that that exercise would really be of any significant value, other than perhaps historical interest.

Again, I can only repeat that in talking to the Senior Citizens' Homes Association at their annual meeting only two or three weeks ago, they assured me — and I never had any dissent to it — that the new formula was proper, working, and they didn't expect any deficits that couldn't be handled.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, could I just follow that up on a supplementary basis for a moment. The details of the new formula escape me, and it does relate to Section 13.1(1) of the amendment Act. To what extent will there be provision in the new formula for local requisition? Perhaps the minister could just describe the new formula as it applies to the normal, local responsibility for these lodges. Will it be a set amount and everything over that assumed by the department? Is it going to be a global budgeting basis, somewhat like the hospital system? Are we just hoping there won't be deficits? How is the new formula specifically going to address the problem of these various deficits that in the past would be picked up by local requisition, and the local authorities would just be

asked to pay more to the foundation? Presumably, there is still going to be some local participation. But to what extent is whatever overlap that is still there going to be paid: exclusively by the department, or will there be some latitude for local requisition increases over what would normally be paid?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, of course the major part of the cost is paid by rent, as it should be. The five-year formula, which I'm sure the member is familiar with, provides for fair phased increases over five years, up to a constant formula level. Again, foundations with deficits under one mill, based on equalized assessment, will get a grant to cover 25 per cent of the deficit as long as that doesn't exceed 30 per cent of total expenditures. That's the cost control to motivate good management. That's the lid, if you like.

MR. NOTLEY: Twenty-five per cent of the . . .

MR. CHAMBERS: If the deficit is under one mill, based on equalized assessment, they receive a grant to cover 25 per cent of the deficit. For foundations where the deficits are greater than one mill, based on equalized assessment, the province finances about 50 per cent of the deficit, but with a 30 per cent total limit.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, did the hon. members wish to continue on that subject? I had a different subject.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: They didn't indicate to me.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mine is a supplementary, Mr. Chairman, and it's just a quick one. If I were a manager, I think I would budget so I would incur a deficit so that I would get that make-up, if you want to call it — 25 per cent of the deficit to 30 per cent of the maximum expenditure. So I would look at it in different terms. I'd think of it not as a deficit but as a subsidy to be received from the province and, in that sense, a benefit. Obviously, it is a benefit for these people to get that money.

The minister has been able to recollect that the largest deficit he could recall over the last years was \$40,000. Could the minister give us a ballpark estimate of the total deficit in that last year? In my way of thinking, that would be a way of estimating the benefits under the new formula. I would then be able to say that if, for example, the total deficit in that year was \$4 million, it amounts to a beneficial program in the amount of \$4 million, which is a better way of looking at it than calling it a deficit.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, I don't have that number at hand, and I don't think it really relates to the legislation we're dealing with. We're in the first year of the new formula, so obviously we don't have the results from the first year in terms of deficits. All I can go on is the assurance from the homes association that they feel the formula is fair and equitable; and with good operating management, which they encourage, the deficits will be minimal.

Frankly, I have never yet talked to one who approached it in a devious way. They try to achieve no deficits, and do a pretty darned good job. They have

assured me that they think the new formula will work very well indeed, that the deficits will be small and manageable, and that the approach is fair and equitable. There were hundreds of people at this annual meeting — I think every foundation across Alberta was represented — and I never had one representative tell me they didn't think this was the right approach or that there was any serious problem with the formula structure.

MR. SINDLINGER: For clarification on that point, Mr. Chairman, I didn't mean to imply that the business managers would be devious in trying to get more money. But inherent in a formula like this is the same thing we had with inflation controls in Canada several years ago, when the government said that the maximum wage increases would be 11 per cent. What happened then was that 11 per cent became the norm. Rather than trying to get something below that, everyone shot for the 11 per cent, and that was the actual number people got. This is the same type of formula. It says, here's the maximum amount of money one can get under the formula. Therefore, that's what people in fact shoot for.

I'm not saying there's anything wrong with it. I think the prudent manager who would have a great deal of demand from the operations he's running, or whatever, would plan so that he could maximize the satisfaction of the demand by budgeting to get that amount of money. It's a good formula in that sense. I'm just saying that rather than call it deficits or anything of that nature, just call it benefits and identify it for the good program it is.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, I perhaps haven't made this really clear. For the municipalities that have deficits greater than one mill, the province will pay 50 per cent of the deficit, with the 30 per cent control factor of total expenditures. The province won't pay more than 30 per cent of the total expenditures. I can't see any motivation for a municipality to say, okay, just because the province will pay 50 per cent of that deficit, I should aim to have a \$10,000 deficit so I can collect \$5,000 from the province. That's still a net loss of \$5,000. The real motivation is for them to have zero deficit, and that's what they're targeting for. In the event they get into a deficit situation, this formula assists them in a significant way.

MR. NOTLEY: Just a supplementary, if I may. The minister indicated that the formula is that under one mill, the grant is 25 per cent of the deficit, and if it's greater than one mill, 50 per cent of the deficit. Do we have any statistics on what the range is in the province? There would be some foundations where there would actually be no deficit at all. What is the highest? Does it get as high as three or four mills? Do we have any figures on that?

The second question I would put to the minister, Mr. Chairman, relates very specifically to the requisitioning power that the minister is asking in Bill 66. What is the arrangement with respect to capital improvements? For example, let's take some of these older lodges. Many of them were built between '59 and '63, when building standards were different. As we bring in a new building code, improvements have to be made. Also, buildings that are 20 years old just have a higher maintenance factor. How is that calculated in terms of funds from the department, or how would it related specifically to 13.1(1)? Suppose a municipality has not been ... I'm not familiar with the exact situation. I think the minister mentioned Evansburg and Andrew. Let's take the case of

Andrew. They haven't been in the foundation. Perhaps the lodges there require capital improvements to some significant degree. To what extent will a community which now finds that it may be in the foundation as a result of the minister's action, and properly so ... Somehow we have to pay this; I'm not arguing [that]. How will they be affected? Are the capital improvements covered by the normal operating formula, or would it be covered separate and apart through Alberta Housing?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, routine maintenance — lightbulbs and so forth — is done by the foundation. Through the Housing Corporation, the province has what we call a major lodge upgrading program. When lodges achieve a certain degree of wear and antiquity, they are prioritized every year. The Housing Corporation goes through and does so many in a major renovating sense. From that significant capital standpoint, that's carried by the Housing Corporation.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, 100 per cent of the major upgrading is carried?

MR. CHAMBERS: Yes. In other words, through the major upgrading program, the Housing Corporation goes in and does it. We're talking here about significant renovations to older ... I think that answers the question the Member for Spirit River-Fairview raised. When the older lodges reach a certain stage and need renovation, they can benefit from that program.

I think the hon. member asked me something else, and I can't quite recollect what it is.

MR. NOTLEY: The other question I asked was what range we have in terms of information on the mill rates. Up to one mill, we have 25 per cent of the cost borne under this provision. Over one mill, it's 50 per cent. Do we have any statistics on the most recent information as to the range of mill rates for lodges in the province?

MR. CHAMBERS: Before we changed it, the formula didn't assist the major centres whatsoever. Four or five major metropolitan areas didn't benefit. Then, too, the formula applied to over two mills. That really helped the smaller municipalities but not the major ones. The new formula assists every municipality. Again, under one mill the major metropolitan ones qualify 25 per cent. We further reduced the two mills to one mill for all other municipalities, on the 50 per cent basis.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, in terms of the self-contained units — the 'six-plexes' and the 'eight-plexes', and the guidelines established in locating these various units of accommodation — I'd like to say to the minister that the people in my constituency appreciate them very much. We've opened some in this last year, and they want to acknowledge the good work of the minister in that area. We regretted that you weren't able to be at some of them, but other members of the government party were able to be present. They appreciated that as well. So we do appreciate what is being done.

As I observe the pattern of events that's occurring, somewhere along the line we're going to reach a saturation point. I wonder how the minister sees that at the present time. What size of town will qualify for these kinds of units? Is it still based on the number of senior citizens who would sign a petition? Are other require-

merits coming into effect that the minister is putting in place? I'd appreciate being brought up to date on that.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, when we saw some time ago that the self-contained were really popular, we embarked on a policy of being able to provide them in smaller communities. So we don't have any special guidelines. If the demand is there and there's a requirement for four units, we can go in and put in four units. That's one of the beauties of the self-contained program, unlike the lodge program where you have the basic fixed cost of kitchen and so forth. You can go down to small modules and achieve some sort of reasonable economics. The thinking has been well borne out, and I'm sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition would agree with me that there are a lot of advantages in people being able to live and stay in the community where they have spent most of their working lives. That's one of the beauties of the program. Therefore, if the demand is there, and we do it through annual surveys with students in the summer, we budget for those units.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 66 be reported.

[Motion carried]

MR. PURDY: I draw to the attention of members that the time for committee has now lapsed. Would the Minister of Agriculture, who is Deputy Government House Leader, make the necessary motion that we rise and report?

MR. SCHMIDT: I move that the committee rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has under consideration and reports Bill 66, and Bill 99 with some amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

218. Moved by Mr. Notley:

Be it resolved that this Assembly urge the government to proceed to establish by way of statute and regulation, and under the jurisdiction of a single government department, a comprehensive policy governing the generation, use, transportation, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials in the province of Alberta.

[Adjourned debate May 28: Mrs. Embury]

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to continue my remarks on this motion that was presented to the Legislature in the spring. At that time, I had already

started my comments in response to this motion.

The purpose of this motion is to debate an extremely important topic that is always on the minds of most Albertans. It has been debated, of course, on many other occasions in this Legislature. One has to assume that this motion is before us once again as an indication that the Member for Spirit River-Fairview believes not enough is being done through present legislation to protect the environment of Alberta from the impact of hazardous materials. There is also an assumption that there is no comprehensive policy or effective departmental action.

As I stated, everyone certainly agrees that this is an important, complex issue. If one considers supporting this motion, it would require a merging of no less than 18 government departments. Let's look at what departments of this government are involved in hazardous wastes: Advanced Education and Manpower, Agriculture, the Attorney General, Disaster Services, Economic Development, Education, Energy and Natural Resources, Environment, Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, Hospitals and Medical Care, Housing and Public Works, Labour, Municipal Affairs, Social Services and Community Health, the Solicitor General, Transportation, Utilities and Telephones, and Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation. Further to the complexity within Alberta, the federal government is also involved in this important issue through the Department of Transport.

While the Member for Spirit River-Fairview recited many examples of weaknesses in laws and regulations and what is happening in the province of Alberta, there were no suggestions from the member as to how this could be changed. The government already has in place a body of environmental and protective legislation dealing with hazardous wastes. So members are aware of exactly what we have: The Department of the Environment Act, The Clean Water Act, The Clean Air Act, The Hazardous Chemicals Act, The Agricultural Chemicals Act, The Planning Act, The Oil and Gas Conservation Act, The Public Health Act, The Disaster Services Act, and the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Control Act.

I would like to review very briefly what has happened in this province, so there will be no doubt in the mind of any member of this Legislature as to what has been happening over the years since the Progressive Conservatives formed the government. In January 1972, through the Department of Environment, the government set up a study which would deal with the problem of the disposal of toxic industrial and institutional wastes. In March 1972, a report called Multiple Waste Treatment and Disposal was submitted to the Minister of Environment. In November 1972, another report, entitled Action Plan for Treatment and Disposal of Toxic and Hazardous Wastes in the Province of Alberta, was submitted to Alberta Environment. This detailed the development of a treatment plant program. Also on the Canadian scene, the Canadian Council of Resource & Environment Ministers met in April 1978 and in June 1979 to address the problem of hazardous waste management in Canada.

More recently in Alberta we have a hazardous waste management report, which was submitted in January 1980 by the Hazardous Waste Management Committee. There were three keynote recommendations and 20 specific recommendations. I would like to refer briefly to the three specific recommendations, which were that there was an obligation on Albertans today to bring about immediate conversion of industrial and other special wastes to non-objectionable forms; secondly, that an integrated waste treatment system, consisting of the best

available technology, should be established in the province of Alberta to manage industrial and other special wastes being generated; lastly, that the Alberta government should play a leadership role in the management of industrial waste, through development of comprehensive legislation and in the establishment and operation, if necessary, of waste management facilities.

One of the pieces of legislation before us today for consideration is Bill 80, the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Control Act. This was given first reading in the Legislature on Tuesday, November 3, and second reading on November 13. During the discussion of this piece of legislation, the hon. minister said that it was the intention of the government that the Bill would be held at committee stage through the fall session, and possibly be returned in the spring session. This would allow Albertans to have input to this piece of legislation. The minister stated in his remarks on introduction of legislation to the Assembly that this Bill paralleled the federal Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act.

One important provision of the Bill is that it would prevail over any other Alberta legislation which might deal with the transportation of dangerous goods. This would allow municipalities to pass by-laws designating routes and time of movement, or prohibit carriage on designated highways in the municipality. The Bill would also provide for the use of one code of regulations which would be in effect across Canada.

I commend the Member for Spirit River-Fairview for bringing this motion before the Legislature once again so that more of us have opportunity to speak to this issue which, as I stated before, is of great concern to many Albertans. There is no doubt that not only the provincial but the federal government will play a very important role in this issue. I would like to add a note of caution, however, because I strongly believe in the private sector in our province. While some members of the Assembly may have trouble with regard to the contribution industry would make regarding this topic, I feel that many parts of our industry in this province are responsible in their own way for the transportation of hazardous wastes. I certainly hope that with some caution, we would remember that laws and regulations are not always going to be as effective as we would like them to be and that, hopefully, many of the problems that are occurring could be solved by mutual co-operation of government with industry.

I urge members of this Assembly not to vote for this motion.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, as I read this motion, I interpret the intent of the Member for Spirit River-Fairview is that he would bring all departments of government into one super agency to take care of our hazardous material in Alberta. It's sort of like bringing it under an umbrella, but this umbrella certainly has enough holes in it. As the Member for Calgary North West indicated, I believe there are some 16 different government services. Going over *Hansard*, the lengthy debate last spring and the very many well-intended suggestions, I would like to point out that I cannot see one department of government handling all the complicated problems of transportation. Environment is the natural one to handle it. But when it comes to transportation, just who in Environment has the expertise to deal with problems of axle weight, load limit, highway scales, realignment, safety, curves, and especially to pick routes through our cities.

I think Bill 80, introduced by the Minister of Municipal

Affairs, and whoever is now responsible for the signing within Edmonton and Calgary, have done an exceptional job; no question about it. As I come into the city, I see very large red signs pointing out dangerous [goods] routes. There must be a lot of co-ordination in the planning of those routes, and who better than Transportation.

Mr. Speaker, I went through the RITE directory, and nowhere in the many subdepartments of the Department of Environment do I see anything related to transportation. For instance, I see land reclamation, land assembly, environment assessment division, reclamation council, and water resources management — a very large group; their expertise of course is making water run uphill. What expertise could they lend to the movement of these goods? They certainly have the expertise in the disposal of them.

Mr. Speaker, the ECA hearings that took place throughout the province this year and last certainly alerted Albertans to the problem of and solutions to the disposal of hazardous wastes. They held a well-attended meeting in my constituency of Camrose. In the Bruce-Viking area to the east of me, in another constituency, there is quite a bit of opposition by landowners to the county's invitation to Environment to run some test holes. I can't comment on it, because it's in another area. But I think I would rather have a hazardous waste plant across the road from where I live than a municipal waste disposal site. At least I wouldn't have papers blowing all over, garbage falling off trucks, a highway littered with boards and nails, and you name it.

I would like to make one suggestion. When I was reading through *Hansard* on what took place in debate, the remarks of the Member for Calgary Buffalo were of considerable interest when he described the derailment of sulphur and propane through the Crowsnest Pass and how the local people used dynamite to release the propane tank. It sounded good in theory. They set a charge on the tank, ran behind a berm, and let it blow. It released the propane all right. But as the Member for Calgary Buffalo described it, the tank car took off for three-quarters of a mile down the track at an altitude of about 200 feet.

The problem of railroads and labelled dangerous goods, especially through Blairmore, the Crowsnest Pass, Calgary, and Fort Saskatchewan — I believe our Department of Transportation, in co-operation with the federal government, has considerable funding to reroute railroads around major towns and cities in Alberta. I believe Red Deer and Lethbridge are entertaining the idea of rerouting their track completely out of the cities. I realize that in the Crowsnest Pass, it would be considerably cheaper to reroute the towns out of the way of the track. Perhaps I have said enough, Mr. Speaker.

I'll keep on talking. The Member for Lethbridge West was supposed to follow me. Maybe I'd better see what they said in *Hansard*.

MR. NOTLEY: We could have a vote, Gordon. [interjections]

MR. STROMBERG: We'll make sure they're not near an ecological reserve.

I was at a meeting last night, with the Farmers' Advocate, of the east-central Alberta land protective society. This is the Dodds-Round Hill group. Representation was made by a farmer from the Viking-Bruce area that is now proposed as a waste disposal site. He made

quite a passionate plea for the co-operation and understanding of the ratepayers of the county of Beaver. As I understand it, a number of municipalities within the province are currently entertaining the idea of perhaps asking the Department of Environment to come into their municipality and do the necessary coring and drilling for the feasibility of these sites meeting the requirements for a waste disposal site. A couple of counties have indicated they believe that with the amount of material that's out, they would not have too many problems convincing their ratepayers that that assessment and industry would be a sort of economic boon to their area.

I would like to ask Mr. Speaker if he could send out a note to the Member for Lethbridge West and tell him he's wanted back in the House. [laughter]

[Mr. Gogo entered the Chamber]

In closing, Mr. Speaker, of all the motions that have come before the Legislature this sitting, this motion has probably created some of the most interest. There certainly has been a lot of debate. I have to congratulate the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, even if his umbrella is full of holes.

Thank you.

MR. OMAN: Now that the hon. Member for Camrose has relaxed, I should inform him that I'm next on the list and have been sitting here all the time. The only problem is that I don't know what to say either.

MRS. CRIPPS: Why don't you talk about my Bill. It's more interesting anyway.

MR. OMAN: Nevertheless, not just as a matter of filling time, my remarks will not be long. I have a few concerns related primarily, I suppose, to my own city and constituency. As has already been mentioned, the topic is obviously timely because of certain incidents that have taken place in our own country and the United States, particularly along the rail lines and major freight ways of our nations.

The motion has merit. There's an old saying to the effect that everybody's business is nobody's business. In our organizational aspects, whether in business or politics, I think all of us recognize that you have to assign duties, specific responsibilities to specific areas, if they're to get done and if someone is to check. So I think the idea of co-ordination is important.

As far as the general principle here, I'm not sure if the Member for Spirit River-Fairview had in mind that we'd set up a new department. I don't think that would be necessary, simply because I don't think we need another department to look after other departments' areas. It seems to me that right now we have, in Environment, a natural department that would and should be responsible for the matter of hazardous wastes, whether transportation, sewage treatment, or whatever. So I cannot agree with the idea of simply setting up another bureaucratic aspect in which we would spend more money and hire more people. It may well be that we now have the machinery in place. Perhaps it needs to be oiled a little better, expanded, or whatever.

There's no question, however, that we need to be aware of this. I think the problem is one of balance. That's always true in life. You tend to go from one extreme to the other. When nothing has happened for a while, you become lax. Then all of a sudden an accident like Missis-

sauga comes along, and you have the possibility of over-kill. So you have restrictions that are so restrictive and slowing of the economic process that people can't operate. It's hard to find the proper balance. If we were to take into account all the fears of life and everything that could happen to us every day, none of us would get up in the morning. At the same time, we take our chances. We consider the odds, and take this street instead of that because it's less dangerous, and we go on living.

The city of Calgary has been concerned, as has been mentioned by a number of members of city council, because we have the east-west main line of the CPR going through the city. We also have connections going north and south. Naturally, when things like Mississauga happen, the consciousness of that sort of thing repeating itself in our own city is something we are all aware of. It wasn't very long ago that one of our zealous aldermen succeeded in having a propane distribution plant in Midnapore shut down. In fact, the whole planning process was shut down so nothing could move in that area for several months because you had a propane distribution plant there. The result is that that plant has had to move. I can't comment on whether that was good or bad, except that at the time of the Mississauga incident it was recognized that this was a possible hazard.

I think we need something that has foresight rather than hindsight, which would limit placing such distribution centres in places where they could be destructive. Therefore, if the cities can't handle it, the Department of Environment would prevent such a tie-up as happened with, I suppose, the loss of millions of dollars because of delays in development, roads, and so on, not only to the company and the distributor but also people who wanted to proceed. A church where a good friend of mine was pastor had a licence from the planning department to build an adjacent church, but had to delay for a period of six months. So the matter of delays and costs was taking place simply because there wasn't proper planning, foresight, or co-ordination between various levels of government. So the idea certainly has merit.

I live very close to the CPR main line. I like the railway tracks. One went across our farm back in Manitoba, and I've loved the railway ever since I was a kid. I don't mind living relatively close to the tracks. I hope I live both on the right side of the tracks and not on the wrong side of the facts. When I see the freights slipping through, sometimes very quickly, it occurs to me: what if they jumped the tracks with some of those chemical cars? It is a factor that concerns those of us who live relatively close to a main line.

I understand the federal government has already initiated action whereby trains cannot travel above certain speeds in residential areas. I think that regulation has to be brought in. I certainly commend our Minister of Municipal Affairs for sponsoring Bill 80; it's already been mentioned. I understand there is a sincere attempt in this Bill to work things out with the various levels of government, to bring the federal, provincial, and municipal organizations into a kind of co-ordinated unit as far as inspections for trucks, perhaps railways, and airways are concerned in the future.

In this sense we need co-ordination, and I would support the [motion]. However, I would not support the creation of a new agency. We have enough of them around already; we can't even keep track of them. Let it be under the Department of Environment, and let us make sure it is done.

One final word before I allow my seat mate to carry

on. I reiterate the fact that in the city of Calgary — because I'm not from Edmonton, I'm not sure whether the situation applies. I realize that because Edmonton tends to be a centre of greater heavy industry, the problem of hazardous wastes is probably greater here than in Calgary. As far as the areas of — I don't know if you'd call these hazardous wastes, but they're certainly damaging wastes: sewage treatment and so on. Whether or not you're from Calgary, I expect you've seen that those people downriver from our city, in the area of Brooks and so on, are complaining because the tertiary treatment systems we have in the city of Calgary are not taking care of the problem. So pollution is flowing down our rivers. Of course, being a city that is rapidly growing, increasing in both industry and population, Calgary is hard pressed to take care of the increasing load of sewage treatment. They have appealed to the province to give aid, and the province has indicated an interest in co-operation.

I commend the Minister of Environment for the interest he's taken in Calgary's problems. I think we're going to have to continue to monitor these areas simply because of the fast, exploding growth of a city like Calgary. The result of that growth is putting an awful lot of pressure on the infrastructure of the city, whether in areas of transportation or whatever. Certainly the matter of sewage treatment is one. I think we have to be mindful of that, recognizing that these are our people. Even though they are in a municipal constituency, we have responsibility for them.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I have some favorable inclinations to this [motion]. When and if it comes to a vote, I don't think I would vote for it, simply because it's too wide for my own areas of interest in the sense that I don't want to see another bureaucracy set up. Let's handle the concerns, rightly and justly expressed in this Bill, through the Department of Environment.

Thank you very much.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, in the debate this afternoon on Motion 218, presented by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I would like to differ with my colleague from Calgary North West when she urged that we not be too difficult with the private sector, that we hope for co-operation to be the best tool. I went to the eastern part of the United States a little while ago and had the unpleasant occasion to visit the James River area of Virginia. Hooker Chemicals — a company which is active in Canada, by the way and has one of the most undistinguished records of disposal and transportation of wastes in the United States — had stored a lot of very toxic chemicals in steel drums in an old garage in downtown Alexandria, Virginia. Over a period of time, those steel drums rusted and the chemicals eventually seeped out onto the floor of the garage, from there into the sewage system, and from there into the James River. Today, about five years later, you can neither swim nor fish nor do anything in the James River, thanks to the Hooker Chemical Company, which, I might also add, was very active in the Love Canal experience and in the Niagara Falls area, where a lot of concern has been raised about poisons and chemicals being dumped into the Niagara River and affecting the drinking water of millions of people. I don't think it's enough to simply hope the private sector will behave responsibly.

It's a very serious and pressing concern. This is one of the most important questions we're debating in this session. In my constituency, Edmonton Glengarry, we have

four separate dangerous goods routes. Four different roads are designated in an area of about three square miles. I think my constituents live under a very clear and present danger. In addition to that, we have the main line of the CNR and the Calder yards, where a lot of dangerous goods in tank cars are shunted and moved around as they assemble trains. Last year, we had a very serious incident that affected quite a few residents in the Calder area.

People in Edmonton and across the province are becoming concerned about and aware of this issue. With the designation of dangerous goods routes now in the province, it's fair to say we've moved to contain the danger. That's desirable, because until then truck traffic could move anywhere throughout the city and people weren't aware of the dangers. We've contained it, identified certain routes, and I gather the city administration has picked out areas that are probably the safest for trucks to travel.

Alberta is becoming increasingly industrialized, and the population is growing as well. In tandem with that growth, some very serious problems are growing and compounding. While the problems are intensifying, as the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill pointed out, you can't just stay in bed and hope the problem will go away. We have to manage it. [interjections] Some hon. members are referring to my marital status, I think, about staying in bed.

MR. ISLEY: What status?

MR. COOK: Lack of.

The motion doesn't suggest we simply legislate the problem away. I don't think that's suggested at all. It is clearly an attempt to make the government think about being more aggressive in the management of wastes and hazardous materials, the storage and transportation of those goods. It's important that we recognize it as a serious problem, but perhaps the Member for Spirit River-Fairview has overstated the case. The suggestion is implicit that the government isn't doing much, or anything at all, and I don't think that's the case at all.

Mr. Speaker, last year the Americans closed the border to the transportation of PCBs to storage facilities on the United States' side. I think that has been useful for us, because it's put the responsibility to handle our own wastes squarely on our shoulders. I take the point of view that this society has to assume its share of the burden. I think we have to recognize that we have to create disposal facilities in our own province. The Minister of Environment is quite clearly moving in that direction. We have to move to be aggressive in managing the transportation of these wastes and chemicals. The dangerous goods routes that have been set up in the city of Edmonton, Calgary, and other communities are good examples of that. That's happening, but I don't think we should be self-congratulatory or complacent. The Hooker Chemical experience on the James River took place in a state which had, as I understand it, some fairly advanced regulations a few years ago. There was an example of a company that just ignored them.

Let me give you a couple of other examples of some difficult situations in the eastern United States. Chemical wastes are very expensive to dispose of. Rather than pay a responsible company to pick up those wastes in storage and dispose of them in a reasonable way, either by incineration or in a well-managed dump, some companies would simply hire a chemical truck to pick them up. In

the dead of night, going down the highways of Virginia, the spigot on the truck would be opened and the truck would simply drive a couple of hundred miles during the evening, slowly releasing the wastes all along the highway. It was a number of years before the state of Virginia realized what the heck was happening. Then they had a very expensive problem of cleaning up a lot of soil along the highways and trying to dispose of it, the alternative being having carcinogens getting into the water system and people drinking chemicals that would hurt them or generations yet unborn.

I don't think we can be complacent. We have to address the problem squarely and assume our share of the responsibility. We have a social responsibility, Mr. Speaker. Alberta is becoming more industrialized, and the population is growing. Responsibility is growing, and the problems are growing. As I mentioned, I think the government is moving, but we still have a lack of awareness. I thought it was absurd that the Edmonton Public School Board would use paraquat, one of the most lethal chemical herbicides, to mark out the lines on football fields in high schools. It immediately kills the grass, and the lines are very visible. But what can kill the grass very effectively . . . It's a great application, Mr. Speaker. One application will work for one or two years; it's just great stuff. But in a schoolyard with kids perhaps 6, 7, 8 years old running around and playing on the field, one has to wonder if somehow they consume a little bit of that — it is a carcinogen, very lethal. We're just not aware, and I'm not sure what we can do to make people more responsible in their use of chemicals as well.

This problem is not just a storage problem, not just a waste management treatment problem; it's also a problem trying to make people generally aware that chemicals are — in a play on words in a publication tabled this afternoon by the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation, chemicals was spelled chema-kills. It's a very lethal area, and children today or children yet to be born can have some horrifying experiences. There's a case in Boston of an innocent dump in a small town placed, believe it or not, over an aquifer which supplied the drinking water for that town. Very recently they discovered that an inordinate number of children were coming down with cases of leukemia, statistically far out of proportion to what might be expected in a normal population. In the space of a three-square-block area, in the period of one year, no fewer than six kids were diagnosed as having leukemia. That's devastating, both to them and to their families.

MR. LYSONS: Were they all from the same family?

MR. COOK: No, they were from three different families.

So we need to be concerned, and we need to move. The government of Alberta is moving. We have improved our urban transportation by designating hazardous goods routes. I understand the occupational health department is trying to make workers more aware of hazardous goods. I understand that so far, some 4,500 chemicals have been identified as dangerous products. Workers need to take more care, and companies need to be responsible in their management systems as well. The railway transportation accident in Mississauga made us all aware, and I know the CNR is concerned about how it might reduce the dangers. Freight trains are now moving at a maximum speed of 25 miles an hour in the city of Edmonton, precisely so the impact of an accident will be lessened.

Mr. Speaker, we need to consider, for example, rerouting railway tracks outside major urban areas where hazardous goods are in transit. I understand that's being done in Lethbridge, where major track relocation is under way for a number of reasons. But I would think the Calder yards might be better placed somewhere other than in the heart of an area where 100,000 people live within about 2 miles of those yards. The shunting of dangerous goods in transit would perhaps best be done in the Clover Bar constituency. I'm being facetious, but somebody has to recognize that the hazards should be placed in areas of low population density.

A waste facility plant has to be built, Mr. Speaker, and some community is going to be charged with zoning for that facility. Handled properly, there shouldn't be a great deal of danger. I think that's the move the Minister of Environment is moving in. In this case, the way to go is a well-designed, well-managed facility, not subject to the profit motives of any particular company, but handled by the community as a social responsibility.

We also have a very aggressive dangerous goods team working with the Disaster Services department of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I've had a couple of chats with the people on that team, and I'm relieved to know that the government of Alberta is so active. They've reassured me about a number of cases in the Calder yards, just as an example.

Mr. Speaker, the motion provided by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview does raise the question. In that sense, it's timely. I think it's also fair to say, though, that the question has been a subject of concern for some considerable time in this government and also in the general public. I think the general population in Alberta is aware and concerned — perhaps not as aware and concerned, given the use of paraquat, for example, in Edmonton as a marker identification system for football fields. But the concern and awareness are growing.

I think the Member for Calgary North West was fair in her comment that the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, in his remarks in debate, did not identify a positive approach to this issue. He listed concerns; he listed problems. That's fine. I guess that's his responsibility as a member of the opposition. But I was somewhat disappointed that he didn't also identify a program or a model he would like to see the government of Alberta follow, other than simply bringing all the problems and concerns under the heading of a given department.

I'm not a management expert, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure if that's the way to go or not. I can't really comment on that. But I think the motion is somewhat deficient, in the sense that it's redundant. It simply asks us to consider something that is already under very serious consideration. Perhaps its use is in reinforcing that and reminding us that we shouldn't be complacent or self-satisfied. With such a dangerous, hazardous area of public policy, that reminder is very useful and timely. You have only to look at the experiences here in Alberta and elsewhere in North America to realize that we cannot afford to have a very serious mistake happen even once.

While I generally support the motion, I think it's deficient and could use some further work and a sense of direction. Simply to have identified the problem isn't that productive, because the problem has already been identified. With that, Mr. Speaker, I close my remarks and look forward to other hon. members providing us with words of wisdom.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the motion sponsored by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I've now heard 11 or 12 speakers. Almost all commend the member not only for his concern but the fact that he has brought this motion before the Assembly. I don't want to imply that it's like motherhood. I think the Member for Spirit River-Fairview has brought many good motions to this Assembly on the basis that he believes, in some ways, that he's the social conscience of the province of Alberta. I've looked at the motion, listened to hon. members, and read *Hansard*. And frankly, it's very difficult to argue against the intent of the motion.

Reference has already been made to the fact that today on the Order Paper we have Bill 80, sponsored by the minister responsible for Disaster Services, the Minister of Municipal Affairs. The Transportation of Dangerous Goods Control Act has spelled out many options with regard to moving these various goods. The very fact it is going to remain on the Order Paper is an indication that the government welcomes the views of various people around the province who are going to be involved with dangerous goods.

Mr. Speaker, the motion addresses "disposal of, then uses the words "hazardous materials". I would almost be tempted to call them either special materials or new materials, because many of them are certainly new. Just a week or two ago, I attended a very tragic event in my constituency. A young mother and two children passed away in what some people would accept as a normal house fire. It wasn't a normal house fire. Although it was a frame house and there had been evidence of fire — they had smoke alarms in the house, but it wasn't the smoke that got them — they died from fumes from some type of upholstered furniture that generates a certain type of fume when it burns. Unfortunately that got to them, and the smoke alarms did no good. I simply use that example to point out that there are so many new things today that were unheard of to me as a young person in Canada. I recall that in my youth, rivers were clean. In eastern Canada — I come from eastern Canada — it's not a phrase out of the bible; they actually walk on water. There's no question that many of those rivers have become so polluted that you don't have to be an anointed one to walk on that water; you simply have to want to take a short cut. That's how polluted they've become; there's no argument.

Members are well aware of what happened in England in terms of cleaning up the Thames. You can actually walk along the Thames now without retching. They've done remarkable things. That indicates that either the social conscience point of view or the emphasis that the tourism industry is prepared to spend to make a dollar, pays off in many ways, because they've cleaned up the Thames to the point where not only can fish swim in it but you can actually eat the fish you catch.

In researching this, Mr. Speaker, I'm indebted to my colleague the Member for Calgary Forest Lawn who, as we all know, has taken a very deep interest in these new types of wastes and how they impact on his constituency, certainly in the Bow River, and perhaps everything else that's associated with Calgary. In looking over these, frankly I'm somewhat surprised when I see the number. There are acids, alkalis, and contaminated soil. Canadian Industries Limited operated a plant for 50 years in Calgary. As times and balance sheets changed, they opted to do away with a lot of the former plants and equipment used in putting chemicals together in terms of everyday uses that we don't even seem to associate with chemicals;

namely, paints.

They've since decided to use much of that urban land within the city of Calgary for urban development. I was interested to learn that because of the amount of contamination, they had to dig down 13 to 17 feet and excavate I don't know how many acres. It's interesting to note that that was all trucked into the state of Oregon. Surely, that's in recognition of the fact that the standards as they presently exist in Alberta are so high that that was not allowed to be dumped in the province. It may not say much for Oregon; I don't know. But knowing municipal and state governments, obviously they were paid to allow that to be dumped in their state, wherever it's dumped. I simply use that as an illustration and example that I think standards are very high with regard to Alberta environment regarding chemicals and chemical uses generally.

Then we go on to others such as solvents, oils, and pesticides. Well, you don't have to talk about pesticides when you're dealing with 37 rural members. They know the dangers of pesticides better than anybody. I recall the debate yesterday regarding worker compensation in the rural area. At that point, I didn't hear anybody talk about pesticides. We all tend to think in terms of industrial accidents. Pathological wastes out of our hospitals, heavy metal solutions which we use in electroplating and a variety of things, the photographing process, and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, I only use that to illustrate that there's no question as to the number of new things that exist today that did not exist yesterday. It's very important for us in the Assembly, who seem prone to pass Bill after Bill after Bill. It's interesting to note we've now passed 100 Bills, and we're only dealing in a province of 2 million people. We wonder why we get this continual static by small business men and others in Alberta about more red tape, more laws, and then not having adequate people to enforce those very same laws.

The Member for Spirit River-Fairview talks by way of statute and regulation. That should be enough to frighten a lot of people. When you begin to look at just the numbers — 29 members of cabinet in this House, which almost implies we must have 29 departments. We find that the departments involved would be Advanced Education and Manpower, certainly Agriculture, the Attorney General, Disaster Services, Economic Development, Education, Energy and Natural Resources, and of course the mother of them all, Environment, Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, Hospitals and Medical Care, Housing and Public Works, Labour, Municipal Affairs, Social Services and Community Health — particularly from the public health point of view — the law enforcement area, the Solicitor General, Transportation, Utilities and Telephones and, of course, the one that's perhaps been getting much of the attention and rightly so, the emphasis we put on Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, it affects many departments of government, which undoubtedly is the motivation for the member saying we should put it under a single department. I really don't have much quarrel with that, except I don't know how it could be done. Reading through *Hansard*, I really don't think the sponsor of the motion tells us how it can be done.

Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago reference was made by the Member for Edmonton Glengarry to the railway relocation project in the constituency of Lethbridge West. I don't think we should be naive to think that you eliminate that problem by simply moving a railway, because it ended up in the constituency of Macleod. I suppose the

only advantage is that the density of population is remarkably changed. Maybe that's what the member was referring to. But one shouldn't believe for one moment that simply because you move it from an urban to a rural constituency, you've solved the problem. I don't think that was the intent of the member's comment.

MR. COOK: That's why I suggested the Edmonton line go to Clover Bar.

MR. GOGO: Recently, Mr. Speaker, in moving a warehouse company that had been in the constituency of Lethbridge for 60 years, it had a fire. They put out the fire, but in doing so discovered there were many, many drums of various chemicals stored in the basement of that place. To this day, they haven't been able to identify some of those chemicals. Maybe if we'd arranged for the person who stored it to have paid his bill, they wouldn't have held it and would have got rid of it years ago, and it wouldn't have happened. I don't know. But again it points out the fact that, frankly, there are many new chemicals and people just do not know how they would affect the health of others.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether that has been particularly helpful. I'd like to sum up on the basis of the following. The Member for Spirit River-Fairview has again shown his social conscience by sponsoring the motion. In fairness, I've only been here six years, but this type of thing has been on the Order Paper many times and debated by very competent and eloquent people. If we listen to the various comments of the Minister of Environment and his predecessors, we find there's been a tremendous amount of criticism of the growth of the civil service in Alberta. Oddly enough, it's been the type of growth related to this very type of problem. Frankly, as somebody in this House who is well respected has said on so many occasions, you can't have it both ways. You cannot have the economic activity, the petrochemical industry, and a lot of the manufacturing sector that we have through diversification in Alberta, without some problems.

So I'm confident on the one hand that through its Minister of Environment, the government is directing its attention to that. The evidence of Bill 80 on the Order Paper is one indication. In fairness to the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, he has proposed an excellent idea to the House. The only way I would oppose it would be on the basis of its implementation. Agreeing with the Member for Calgary North Hill, I would be opposed to increasing any degree of bureaucracy to try to form a new department dealing simply with the transportation, storage, and disposal of these so-called new materials.

Thank you very much.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure this afternoon to say a few words about the motion put forward by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview. I listened with considerable interest to the comments. I haven't had time to review what preceded the afternoon's discussion; that is, when it came up prior to this date. But I assume the dialogue that went on at that time would be every bit as interesting.

The origin of the resolution probably came as a result of hearings not too long ago by the Environment Council of Alberta. One recommendation it made was that we give some consideration to some arm's length group that would administer in general the environmental problems in the province. Perhaps they visualized a superministry,

for lack of a better term, that would have this all-encompassing power to rule on practically every issue within the province that had an environmental nature.

I must say that at first blush, the concept could be attractive. I could imagine a minister having that total, all-encompassing power which would give him the authority to reject practically every proposal put before the Legislature of Alberta that deals with environmental matters. It would be appealing to some, but I don't think our government visualizes that kind of all-encompassing power within one department. Essentially what I'm saying is that while the concept has some appeal in terms of our own position, it would not be a very practical recommendation.

Members may know that a number of departments are involved in environmental matters. Not too long ago, in discussions with the Public Advisory Committee of the Environment Council of Alberta, I proposed that for their own benefit and for the opportunity to have a greater knowledge of how a government works, they should invite other ministers to appear before the public advisory committees, and in areas of environmental problems that they have the opportunity to dialogue with these members and indicate their areas of jurisdiction. As a result, the Environment Council has proceeded in that manner. I know a number of ministers who have appeared before the advisory group. It's been a good experience for them as well as the public advisory committees and members of this total group who are represented by some 75 to 100 different organizations in the province. I don't think they realized the complexities of government. It gives one a better insight into how complex the operation really is. It's certainly one of the largest corporations in this province.

While I'm mentioning that point, it's interesting to note that over the years, it has been traditional for different departments to take on different roles. I think the Member for Calgary North West, and others, alluded to the role of the Department of Municipal Affairs, which will be dealing with transportation of dangerous goods through the Disaster Services people, which comes under Municipal Affairs. That's an area where they can help with regard to environmental matters that occur insofar as transportation of these materials along the roads.

There are other branches of the government. The Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife is heavily involved with the supervision of Crown lands throughout the province, and you know we have very substantial Crown lands. His responsibility deals with the problems of wildlife, the handling of reclamation procedures on Crown lands, and in that particular area.

I've got a message from a doctor, but as you know it's very difficult to read a doctor's writing. A medical doctor, that is; I want to clarify that.

There are other departments. The Minister of Recreation and Parks is very heavily involved insofar as development of Kananaskis park, and has to deal with reclamation, pipeline, industry, indirectly with water and sewer, and so on, in development of that large provincial park. The Minister of Agriculture has department people who are involved in various ways with environmental matters. While our own department has both The Agricultural Chemicals Act and The Hazardous Chemicals Act under my jurisdiction, none the less there is still a relationship between the two departments. The minister is heavily involved with concerns about the invasion of good agricultural land by industry, and problems of that nature that deal with erosion, the use of fertilizers, and

that sort of thing.

The Minister of Energy and Natural Resources is responsible for the Energy Resources Conservation Board, in which hearings are held with regard to industry throughout the province. That particular responsibility is quite great. As you know, the ERCB holds public hearings, makes recommendations — has responsibility, by the way, for the pipelines throughout the province — deals with wells that are creating an environmental problem by leakage, and is involved particularly with sour gas plants and the emissions involved there.

Going back to Public Lands and Wildlife, the Eastern Slopes are involved. The forestry service comes under that large, joint department. Most recently, the discussions on the problem of the Odyssey project in a sense comes under the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife.

I'm just citing a few departments that are pretty closely related to the responsibilities of Environment. In our turn, handling 13 different pieces of legislation, we attempt to co-ordinate all this. One has to remember that in many cases, we have interdepartmental committees. For example, I was just looking at the mail this afternoon. I have a report by a committee that deals with recommendations on issuing permits for work by industry on Crown lands. In that respect, about five or six different departments — Energy and Natural Resources, Public Lands and Wildlife, Recreation and Parks, Agriculture, along with others I may have missed — and our department are represented on recommendations that flow from requests for development.

So while the member has put forth an excellent topic for discussion and no doubt developed that from recommendations of the Environment Council, there is an interrelationship between the departments. It probably takes a genius, which I'm not, to try to co-ordinate all this. But we do our best to attempt to minimize the sort of conflict on environmental matters that can occur between departments.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of other points I'd like to make. But in view of the time, I wish to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, this evening the business of the House will be third reading of Government Bills, followed by Committee of the Whole on certain Bills and, if time permits, Committee of Supply.

[The House recessed at 5:28 p.m. and resumed at 8 p.m.]

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**
(Third Reading)

Bill 92
Electric Energy Marketing Act

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 92, the Electric Energy Marketing Act.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in rising to address a few comments on Bill 92, I regret I was not able to be here for

second reading, nor for the discussion at committee stage except for the last few minutes yesterday afternoon. In dealing with Bill 92 before the Legislature, first of all, I certainly agree with the objective contained in the Bill, which is as much as possible an attempt if not to equalize power rates in the province to provide more equity in them. It's important to realize, as the minister explained in outlining the Bill, that we will not have equal rates; there will still be some difference. But as I understand the second reading debate, approximately 80 per cent of that difference will be accommodated as a result of the passage of Bill 92.

As a member in this House who has continually raised the issue of the disparity in the rate structure, I welcome any move which would overcome that disparity. In my view, there is no doubt that differences in power costs can be an impediment to proper growth in those areas where power costs are higher. During second reading debate and also committee stage, I know that some hon. members minimized the impact of power costs. But when one looks at the cost of power and adds to that the other factors — higher transportation costs because of distance, higher energy costs — what you see by having unequal power rates is just another burden, if one can describe it that way, which people in the rural areas, especially the northern areas of the province, have to face. There is no doubt when one looks carefully at rate comparisons that people in the rural areas, especially smaller communities in the north, have been paying significantly more for their power than their confreres in the urban districts or southern regions of this province. So there is no question that northerners as a whole, regardless of party position, would urge the government to move on the question of more equitable power rates.

Mr. Speaker, may I just be permitted the comment to the minister that with the passage of Bill 92, I hope the government would address some other disparities in prices. When we deal with Bill 92, let's go one step further and perhaps look at the wholesale price of gasoline which varies rather significantly in the province.

I want to make it clear that I certainly stand in my place fully in support of the principle of more equitable power rates in this province. One can advance many additional arguments for the marketing agency that will be established as a result of this Bill. Clearly, if we're going to enter into some form of power grid with Manitoba and Saskatchewan, there has to be one purchasing agency. I don't think there's any doubt about that. Where I would differ with the government is not in the objective the minister set out in his comments on second reading a week ago, nor the discussion that took place yesterday on the objective, but rather whether it would not have been a more prudent course to go the next step and acquire the two investor-owned utilities and achieve the same goal through public power.

I read *Hansard* and noted that members on both sides of the House rose to heave a sigh of relief that the minister did not come in and promote public power. Within the confines of that caucus that I look at, across and over to my left, I cannot help but think a number of members in their heart of hearts would not have preferred that the government had moved toward public ownership of power. It's hardly a radical suggestion, Mr. Speaker. It was a Conservative government in Ontario that established Ontario Hydro before 1920. It was a Conservative government in Manitoba that promoted and expanded hydro in that province under public ownership, although it was not brought in by a Conservative government. It

was a Social Credit government in 1960 that decided to take over B.C. electric and bring that province's electrical distribution and production system under public ownership. We had the Liberal government in Quebec doing that in 1962 and, as I recollect, a provincial election was fought on that score. Indeed, when one surveys the rest of the country, Alberta is unique in being the last corner, if you like, for private ownership of public utilities, at least on the scale of both TransAlta and Alberta Power.

It is interesting to note as well that the support for public power elsewhere in the country has crossed party lines. We have Conservatives, Liberals, Social Creditors, and New Democrats who support it. The one constant in other parts of the country seems to be the recognition that where you have a public utility where there can't be competition, it is better that that public utility be publicly owned.

As I reviewed *Hansard*, I found it rather intriguing that several members had offered the Legislature the wisdom that it's better to have private ownership because of the competition. With great respect to those hon. members, I say, what competition? Are we going to have TransAlta and Alberta Power competing to distribute power from one town to another? Are we going to have two power lines going down the road competing to see whether Farmer Brown will take his power from TransAlta or Alberta Power? Of course not. Areas have been set aside for the two companies, and they operate exclusive monopolies within those areas. I just say to hon. members that if you have a situation where there is a total monopoly, where there cannot be the constraint of the market place, where competition is not even a theoretical possibility, then why balk at the logical step of moving, as other parts of the country have, and acquiring investor-owned utilities?

Mr. Speaker, it's worth noting that not just a small number of people advocate this particular position. Unifarm, our largest farm organization, has traditionally supported public ownership of power. The Rural Electrification Association virtually every year, in my recollection of that organization's history — and I recall conventions over some 25 years — more often than not has supported public ownership of power. The Alberta Federation of Labour supported public ownership of power. So you have broad support among organizations in this province that represent significant numbers of Albertans.

I note that opposition members in the Legislature suggested that the matter might be held over. Well, I'm not sure how prudent that is. But let me say to the minister that, with all the discussion that has taken place, the last time this matter was put to the people of Alberta, in 1948 — and I believe it was the hon. Member for Drayton Valley who mentioned the discussions surrounding 1948. As a result of my review of *Hansard*, I don't recall whether she mentioned in her contribution the plebiscite that took place in 1948. In 1948 there was a plebiscite on the question of ownership of power. Should it be privately owned? Should it be publicly owned? Mr. Speaker, I happen to think that the government of the day was quite correct in putting that matter to the people of Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't wish to interrupt the member. There are a number of conversations going on in the Assembly. There's nothing particularly terrible about that, but I have the impression of a rather constant humming, and I would respectfully suggest to hon.

members that the hon. member who is speaking is entitled to be heard in relative silence.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in 1948, along with the general election, there was a plebiscite on this question of whether there should be public or private power. By the very smallest of margins, out of more than 200,000 people who cast ballots in that campaign — something over 300,000, as my memory serves me — just several hundred votes separated the proponents of public versus private power. So even in 1948, more than 30 years ago, some might say this province was divided fifty-fifty.

I'm under no illusions that fifty-fifty would be an accurate reflection of the view on the issue within this Legislature this evening. But, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Minister of Utilities and Telephones were to put this issue to the people of Alberta in another plebiscite, frankly I would be rather surprised if it did not pass, quite apart from the politics that presently dominate the Assembly itself. In travelling around the province, running into people who are supporters of this government on many other things, it has always amazed me when they come up and say, I don't agree with you on this and I don't agree with you on that, but I certainly think you're right on public power, and it's high time we moved towards public power in this province. I know perfectly well that this was one option the government reviewed, because the minister made that clear to a meeting of the REAs I was at a little over a year ago. Mr. Speaker, I say to the minister — and I'd be less than honest if I didn't bluntly say it — while the objectives of equalizing power rates are strongly supported, certainly by myself as a member of this Assembly, I submit that we would achieve that objective much more efficiently if we had a system of public ownership of power.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say one other thing. I find it rather intriguing that members of the present government would be so upset at the possibility of public power. I look in the quarterly report of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Certainly public power is not something so tainted that it offends the members of this government, otherwise we would not have invested \$50 million at 11.25 per cent in the New Brunswick Electric Power Commission. We have Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, \$75 million and \$75 million; and the granddaddy of all is Hydro-Quebec, totally public owned, \$200 million at 11 per cent. So when members in this House say they're glad, they're relieved, and they're mopping their brows, we haven't got public ownership of power in Alberta, yet we have hundreds of millions of dollars invested in public ownership of other provinces' power.

Mr. Speaker, in addressing this question, it seems to me one has to ask if we can loan money to other provinces — and I note Hydro-Quebec: \$200 million at 11 per cent. Members of this Assembly are well aware of the way the Public Utilities Board operates. The owners of an investor-owned utility are permitted a guaranteed rate of return of 15 per cent on their investment. What we're doing, without overly simplifying the issue, is saying to Albertans, you will pay the investor-owned power companies 15 per cent on what they own. The latest figures I have, Mr. Speaker: in the case of Alberta Power, as of December 31, 1980, that was \$311 million; Calgary Power, \$1.09 billion, for a total equity ownership of \$1.4 billion. We as Alberta consumers are paying 15 per cent. On the other hand, we're loaning money to other provinces for their power facilities, including the government of the province of Quebec, through Hydro-Quebec, at 11

per cent. I really wonder if it makes a good deal of sense to carry on with private ownership regardless of the merits.

I read with care the minister's observations about why public ownership was rejected. I just couldn't see any explanation as to why the government had chosen this route, except perhaps the minister wasn't able to get the most prudent course through caucus, even though I know in my heart of hearts that there are a number of members in that caucus who basically do — maybe quietly, maybe in the closet — support public power.

Mr. Speaker, I raise the difference between the 15 per cent guaranteed rate of return and the investments we've made in other provinces because one observation raised by opposition members when this issue took place that I thought was particularly valid was the amount of money that is going to have to come forward to cushion this program. Apparently we're going to come forward with \$100 million next year. We have no idea how that \$100 million is going to be allocated, nor do we have any idea what the remaining amount of money will be over the five-year phase-in period. One doesn't really know whether it will be \$500 million, something less, or something more.

Mr. Speaker, I say very frankly to the minister that moving toward public ownership of power and shifting some of the money we have at the moment — particularly money in bonds that are not earning a very high return — would in fact allow us to go some considerable distance in cushioning that \$100 million, without calling on additional public funds that the minister is going to have to call upon as a result of this marketing board. The difference between our heritage trust fund earnings and the 15 per cent guaranteed rate of return, according to my arithmetic — and third reading is not the place to go through a detailed recitation of statistics — would be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$81 million a year. So we would go very far down the road to the \$100 million the first year by moving from an investor-owned at 15 per cent to using some of our heritage trust fund money to acquire the investor-owned utilities of this province.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I weigh the evidence, no person supports a more equitable rate structure more ardently or strongly than I, but I would say that at this stage the route of a marketing agency in preference to public ownership is really not the most feasible alternative. The most feasible alternative is for this province to seize the courage to get in step with the rest of the country, not doing something terribly radical or even controversial, but doing as the Tories did more than 60 years ago in Ontario, the Social Creditors more than 20 years ago in British Columbia, and the Liberals almost 20 years ago in Quebec: acquiring ownership of our power facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks on third reading of Bill 92 by saying that notwithstanding the fact that it is my strongest submission that we go the route of public ownership, because I think there is some commitment here to equity in power rates — even though I think this is not as efficient a route to proceed, I intend to support Bill 92 on third reading. But we would be far better off to go the route of public power.

Let me just draw my remarks to a close by saying to the minister and to the members of this government that if after analysing it one is still worried about its implications, let the people of Alberta decide. It didn't destroy this province that the people of Alberta had a chance to vote on it in 1948. There are certain issues in a democratic society where there's nothing wrong with letting the

people have a vote, letting the people make that decision. Mr. Manning was right in 1948 when he let the people of Alberta decide. By the narrowest of margins, they decided in favor of private power. I respect that decision, Mr. Speaker, but I would say that if we're talking about going the next step forward . . . Certainly the implications of Bill 92 indeed involve going the next step forward, when we look at some of the major investments required in electrical generation and when we talk about a power grid that's perhaps going to link us with two other publicly owned utilities. And who knows what negotiations will be taking place with British Columbia, which is another publicly owned utility. If this government is concerned about its internal politics, put it to the people of Alberta. Let the people of Alberta make the decision.

MR. MILLER: They did.

MR. NOTLEY: They made a decision back in 1948, 33 years ago. We've made big decisions in other areas since then. [interjections] I would say to the members of the House, let the voters judge. Notwithstanding the snickering in the House, I would very surprised if the people did not give this government the go-ahead, in a very emphatic way, to acquire ownership of the power utilities and to put this province in step with the other parts of Canada.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I believe I saw the hon. Member for Vegreville first.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, I must rise to support Bill 92. I can see the significance of this Bill and what it will mean to the people I represent. Recently, the Leader of the Opposition strongly suggested that this be put off until the spring session; maybe the elected members would have a chance to find out the feelings and desires of their people. It's surprising, because the other side is always saying: why are you delaying things; the now government should be doing it now. I can see a real reason that it be done now. At a meeting on Sunday, I had an opportunity to meet with approximately 60 people from all areas of my constituency. This was one of the issues I brought up, and they wholeheartedly supported it.

In the Vegreville constituency, two companies provide power to the people: in the franchise area, Calgary Power; and in the northern half of the constituency, Alberta Power. There is already a difference in rates. Those served by Calgary Power pay slightly less than those served by Alberta Power. But those people living right on the boundary of the franchise area always mention, why are we forced to take from this when we can take from Calgary Power just across the road and have it cheaper? At present, it's not too bad. But five, six, or 10 years down the road, if nothing is done I believe the users in the northern part of my constituency will pay almost double for power over those in the south. I think it is a necessity to have this.

Another thing that may be said about the cost of electricity and so forth: I think back 32 years to when I just installed electricity. True enough, it was considerably cheaper. I think I paid about \$25 to \$27 every three months for electricity. But what did I use at that time? I had a bulb in each room of the house, and little more was used. When I wanted to start my car on a cold day, I had to put a pan of ashes under the oil pan to heat it up.

Today both cars are plugged in once the first frost comes around. The electric stove, the furnace, the dryer, the heat bulbs for the animals, and other things have been added. That is the difference. True, I pay approximately five times as much as I did in 1949, but I'm sure I use at least five and more times as much electricity as I did. Actually, it is a lot of money. But in proportion, I don't think I have been penalized that badly. Furthermore, one thing I can say regardless is that the costs have gone up but the service has been as good as it was some 30 years ago. I really appreciate the fine service we're getting, and sometimes I wonder whether we'd have such service if the power were publicly owned.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview mentioned the other provinces, whether Ontario, Manitoba, or British Columbia with public power. True, but the population in this province is increasing by 5,000-plus every month. Maybe it's good where there's public power and other public things, but the people are running away. This is one of the reasons power is so costly in Alberta. If we wanted it to stay at the cost it is, we'd probably have to put a fence around Alberta to keep those other people out, then we wouldn't have to generate more and more power at inflated rates as the years go by. The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview should be well reminded that when Saskatchewan took power in 1947, Canadian Utilities, which was supplying them, because of its loss in base created this problem and much of the problems we have faced in Alberta for many years.

I wouldn't object so much if we were without electric power in Alberta. Maybe public power would be all right. But why invest \$1 billion in something we have? We have a fine example in the federal government taking over PetroCan, investing so much of the people's money that it didn't have. It's going to tax us to pay for something that already existed. If there's anything we are going in the right direction with, it's the expenditures of this province to provide the things we do not have, whether in any area.

I can't see hon. members standing and talking about public power and so forth. This Bill is well accepted in the area of the province I represent. I support it strongly. That is my opinion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I want to make these comments. For the 10 years I've been a member of this Legislative Assembly, many of us have searched for ways to improve the situation with regard to the fairness of electric power rates paid by people in many parts of Alberta, northern Alberta in particular. In my view the proposal contained in Bill 92, the Electric Energy Marketing Act, as presented by the hon. Minister of Utilities and Telephones, is without question the best by far of the alternatives available. Simply put, it does the job and does it well. Mr. Speaker, the problem with the alternative presented by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview is simply that it is supported by only one Member of the Legislative Assembly. At best, it is a socialist dream, and socialist dreams really don't help the power consumers of northern Alberta.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make two comments about this Bill. First of all, I'd like to say that I speak against the Bill. It's not that I don't feel it has merit or value, because I think it does. The principle, the equalization of rates across the province, is good.

I have two reservations. The first is in regard to Calgary. I understand that the Calgary city council has

made representations to the minister, asking for more information. As it is right now, I understand that the city of Calgary feels the implementation of this plan will result in a cost increase to the city of 13.5 per cent. However, on the other hand, in his calculations the minister feels there would be a cost increase of only 8.5 per cent, which is a discrepancy of 5 per cent.

That indicates to me that there has not been sufficient and adequate consultation between the minister's department and the city of Calgary to reconcile the differences in the calculations. If there's going to be consensus or agreement on things like this, the different parties affected have to come to a common understanding and have a common data base. In this instance, both parties obviously do not have a common data base, otherwise one would not be saying the cost increase is 13.5 per cent and the other 8.5 per cent.

I understand that the city of Calgary has calculated that the cost to the city would be \$1.3 billion over the next 25 years. That calculation does not include a factor for inflation. Just taking a rough ballpark estimate, in terms of households in Calgary, that would be a cost of somewhere around \$10,000 per household. That's a very substantial and significant sum of money in terms of an additional cost to the ratepayers in Calgary. That increase would be in addition to the normal rate increases that will occur over those years. But the point here is that obviously there is a discrepancy between the two calculations. It indicates to me that there has not been sufficient time for the two parties to get together and reconcile the difference so there is a common understanding.

It's my understanding that the city of Calgary has asked the minister to hold this over for another three months, until the spring session, so there would be time for the minister to get together with them and discuss this further. I suggest that would be a very good idea, in view of the fact that the two parties cannot reach agreement on the numbers. Obviously, there has to be something wrong.

The situation is not too dissimilar to the energy negotiations over the last year, when the parties were dealing from different data bases. It took the two getting together and at least identifying where the differences were. In this case as well, it would be beneficial for the parties to get together and, if they couldn't reconcile the differences, at least identify where the differences lie.

The second reason I speak against the Bill is in regard to the subsidy. The minister has indicated that the subsidy in the first year would be \$100 million, but we haven't been able to determine precisely where the benefits of that would occur. Yesterday in Committee of the Whole we talked about the different consumer groups — industrial, commercial, and residential — and the minister pointed out how difficult it was to determine or at least to project demands through each one of those sectors into the future. I agree that that is a difficult thing to do, but it's not impossible to get an order of magnitude estimation for each one of them.

In terms of the \$100 million subsidy, I would reiterate the question I posed yesterday and ask specifically where that subsidy would land or who would benefit from it, in terms of the ultimate consumer such as residential, industrial, and commercial, but also the farm sector, and in addition to the ultimate consumer, the geographical breakdown.

I've made reference to the Energy Resources Conservation Board report that the minister referred to the other day as well, the annual statistics, 1980, for the Alberta

electric industry. It shows the sectoral consumption of electricity by consumers in the province for 1980. The farm sector consumed only about 6 per cent of the total consumption. If the total subsidy is \$100 million in the first year, I would presume that the benefit to the farm sector would be only \$6 million. The statistics also show that the residential sector of the province consumed only about 20 per cent of the electricity consumed in 1980. Residential consumers and farmers together would receive only about 25 per cent of the \$100 million subsidy. That leaves 75 per cent of the benefits going to the commercial and industrial sector.

I'm not sure if the principle function or purpose of this Bill is to benefit residential consumers or to aid in industrial development and at least make neutral the consideration of power factors when it comes to the locational decision-making. If 75 per cent of the subsidy is going to industrial and commercial consumers, that would appear to be the principle import of the Bill; that is, to neutralize the power factor in industrial location decision-making.

But what disturbs me even more about who receives the benefit — that is, the subsidy — and where it lands geographically in the province is the lack of information on the total subsidy. The minister has indicated that in the first year the subsidy will be \$100 million. However, yesterday in Committee of the Whole in response to questions in regard to the subsidy over the initial five-year phase-in period, the minister would not indicate what the amount of the subsidy would be. I think that's important; it's an important thing for the members of the Legislature to know exactly what the total cost of the program is. Yesterday the minister indicated that a projection for the first five years had been done for the Provincial Treasurer, and that there was some idea what the total estimate would be over the first five years for that subsidy. That's all that was asked for: some sort of definition or ballpark definition of what the total cost of the program would be.

I think it's incumbent upon the minister to reveal to the Legislative Assembly exactly what the cost of the program would be over the first five years. If we have \$100 million in the first year, and if the subsidy is going to decrease each year thereafter into the fifth year, the maximum the subsidy could ever be in the five years is \$500 million. But apparently it would be less than that.

If one looks at the number of households in the province, taking a population of something over 2 million and assuming occupancy per household of about four, we come up with something like 500,000 homes in the province. If one wanted to do a very, very rough, back-of-the-envelope calculation, it wouldn't be hard to see that the subsidy on a residential basis, presuming that was 100 per cent of the consumption, would amount to somewhere around \$200. In the example given yesterday by the minister, in regard to the impact on a Calgary household, the average cost per year to a typical household in Calgary would be about \$270, for an average consumption per year of 6,300 kilowatt hours. If in the fifth year that subsidy is suddenly taken off, it's not difficult to see that there would be a quantum increase on a per-household basis of almost 80 per cent. It's not hard to imagine that any government at the time would not allow such an increase to take place in one year. Therefore, it follows that the subsidy would have to be extended beyond the fifth year — and who knows how much further? I recall it was the minister's major concern last night that, in not revealing what the subsidy would be on an annual basis past the first year, he did not want to

commit any government in the years past the fifth year.

I would submit to the minister and to the members of the Legislative Assembly that by endorsing this Bill tonight we are making a commitment certainly beyond the first year, and beyond the fifth year as well. We're not going to come back here and change this tomorrow, because it's taken us a long time to get to this point in the power development in our province.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm standing to speak against this Bill tonight as a member of the Legislative Assembly for Calgary, because the elected officials of Calgary have demonstrated to my satisfaction that they have not had ample time to consider or perhaps endorse this proposal at this point in time, because they don't know precisely what it would cost them. Their estimates are that over 25 years it would cost them \$1.3 billion, not counting inflation, which is a considerable sum. If city council has those fears, I think the government should take every step possible to allay those fears and demonstrate to them that that in fact will not be the cost.

The major point of reconciliation has to be the difference in the increase; on the one hand, where the minister says an 8.5 per cent increase and, on the other hand, where city council says 13.5 per cent. Despite the fact that other Calgary MLAs have said that most Calgarians would support this, I'm not too sure they would. I think it would be difficult to go to a Calgarian and say, listen, your costs are going to increase 8.5 per cent or 13.5 per cent over the next five years, they're going to increase \$1.3 billion over the next 25 years, and that's going to mean a \$10,000 cost increase for each of your households, not even counting inflation. I don't think they would accept that. That's why I think it's very important that the government slow down and take their time to demonstrate, especially to city council, that in fact this step is in the best interests of Calgarians in the long run, because at this point in time they don't believe it is. Unless they can be convinced, the implementation and administration of the program is going to mean nothing but difficulty between council and government in the years to come.

The second reason I am speaking against the Bill is that unless the minister has had a change of heart since Committee of the Whole, the minister has not told the Legislative Assembly what this program will cost. What is especially irksome about that is that the minister has said there is an estimate of that cost for the next five years. If there is a place to reveal that cost, I can't think of any better place than right here in the Legislative Assembly where we are all going to be asked to commit to that program and that cost.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I certainly would be remiss in my responsibilities if I didn't add something to this debate. I think one of the points that has not been made to this point in time . . . The discussion up to this point has been on rationalization of power rates, and the principle of the Bill is to bring equity in rates across the province. But when we pass this Bill in third reading, there's another principle we're accepting in this Legislature that should cause us an equal amount of concern, because we're not only responsible for the \$100 million in the coming year but in the years after that. This evening when we pass this Bill, we are accepting the concept of subsidizing and shielding power rates in the province of Alberta. That concept is different concept from what we have had up to this point in time. We have had a user-pay concept, where the user of the service of the electrical energy in the province pays for the electrical energy.

There hasn't been to my knowledge . . . If there is some information I haven't got, possibly someone could point out where the electrical energy and its supply has been subsidized in some manner.

Over the last number of years, we have had the Public Utilities Board involved in the process. The Public Utilities Board established what the wholesale rate should be, what the profit of the various utility companies should be, and then a rate was established for the various categories of industrial, commercial, or residential customers. The rate was established. But at this point in time and with introduction of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, we are accepting a concept of subsidization. We can try to fool ourselves all we want in this Legislature. We can say it will be \$100 million this coming year. We can say there will be no subsidization at the end of five years, no reaching into the coffers of this province. But we're fooling ourselves. We're totally fooling ourselves with that kind of understanding, because as long as I've been around this Legislature, once you introduce public funding into a program, you don't withdraw it. I can't recall any kind of institution that became subsidized by government and, after a number of years, that subsidy was taken away. I think that's a principle we must realize in this Legislature. Do we want to go in that direction?

I've looked at some of the concerns raised with regard to that. The people today say, do we use power efficiently; are we wasting power? Not too long ago, 93 economists led by Richard Lipsey of Queen's University called for the removal of subsidies to the electrical sector of Ontario. They were concerned in their debate about the effect of subsidization of electrical energy to the people across this province. They made a couple of points that I think are interesting and we should look at. First of all, they indicated that "the price of electricity should be boosted substantially to prevent uneconomical uses" of power in the province. Secondly, they said:

From the perspective of the 93 protesting economists, the electricity subsidy transmits the wrong price signals to the marketplace. It encourages society to demand more electricity even when investments in conservation or natural gas . . .

MR. MILLER: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. leader resume his seat for a moment while we hear about the point of order.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is he quoting in regard to Alberta or Ontario when he's quoting from Queen's University and the fact of power equalization in the province?

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the hon. minister, I wouldn't conceive that as a point of order. It's an enquiry which the speaker who has the floor of course may accept or not at his discretion.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, the point is that there should be some concern with regard to the principle we're establishing at this point in time. As legislators, we should go into subsidization with our heads up. There should be even greater responsibility for members of government, and specifically the minister, to be able to stand up and say, for the next five years I know we will be committed to this number of dollars in subsidization. The minister has not had the courage to do that in this Legislature. The minister has said, I'm committing \$100

million; after that we may have a different government; I may be in a different portfolio. Fine, but the people of Alberta represented in this Legislature have to have better information, because it's a new concept. We are going to subsidize power rates in this province. That's a fact of life.

We must know that we are not only changing it from a program of subsidization; we're moving it into the political arena, where the government can play with the strings of the power costs in this province. Before an election, the government can inject dollars into the system. We're doing it right now. One hundred million dollars is going to be injected into this system this coming year. The minister shakes his head. Well, if we're not, stand up and tell us you as a government are not committing \$100 million. Can the minister do that?

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Utilities and Telephones has said a number of times in this House that he is committing the government to \$100 million. The Provincial Treasurer already has approved it for the year 1982-83 before we even get it into the Legislature. That's the regular format with this government. Who cares about the Legislature? As long as the Provincial Treasurer and the minister agree, it's a fact of life. Well, that really isn't the way government should be handled. There should be more responsibility than that in this Legislature. All the members on the back bench think, we're doing a great thing; we'll go back and tell our constituents in the rural areas that we're going to have lower power. It's just like them, walking into the trap. They get them into the trap and then in a couple of years the power rates go up. That's what's going to happen, and Albertans don't know it.

The government's going to say, we're getting closer to an election; we're going to pump in another \$100 million — like giving \$1 billion to the municipalities to keep the tax rates down at the municipal level. That certainly didn't do much, Mr. Speaker. The municipalities are waiting for another election so they can get another \$1 billion. That's the way this whole system with the agency is going to go. We come close to an election and this government plays with the people, deceives the people. They're going to say, we're going to keep the power rates down for all of you; here's another \$100 million. You tell me if that isn't going to happen.

So why have they really put this agency into place? One, they can play politics with the people of Alberta; they can play with the prices of power rates. [interjections] That's really the wrong reason. They won't even tell Albertans how much they're going to take out of their pockets before they put it back into the power rates. They don't even tell Albertans that, so they can play politics with them.

Mr. Speaker, I think that's a most irresponsible thing, along with a number of others we hear in this Legislature. [interjections] It isn't the only one. I was going to say it was the most, but many, many others are equal. How in the world can we . . . [interjection]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the hon. leader just take a moment's pause while we hear — is this going to be a point of privilege, a point of order, or just a point?

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, it's probably just going to be a point. I'm wondering how the member can be so noble. I'm just amazed at how noble he is.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm not sure that flattery is a justification for interrupting a speaking member.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, you've got to have attendance in this House, and one way to have it is to get your name in *Hansard*. There we are again.

AN HON. MEMBER: Speak for yourself.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I hear all these people saying, I'm trying to get my name in *Hansard*. [interjections] But all I want to do is hold this government accountable.

The Minister responsible for Native Affairs — I've been waiting all session to hear about how the natives in this province can be handled, how it relates to an agency such as ...

MR. SPEAKER: May I respectfully draw the hon. leader's attention to how easy it is to get one's name in *Hansard* and elsewhere.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my points are very clear. One, we talk about equitable rates across the province; maybe that has some merit to it. The point I made the other evening in Committee of the Whole was that Albertans haven't even had a chance to discuss that concept. I think that's a shortcoming of the way the minister has handled this at this point. If the project is good, it doesn't have to be pushed on Albertans. You can talk to Albertans. If the program is good, they'll come back and support it stronger than ever. I think that's a fault in the process the minister is using. I only reiterate the words I used the other evening: the government will come out to sell the people a program and say, this is what you have to take once we pass the legislation. It will not be a participatory type of program.

MR. NOTLEY: Create a demand.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Right, they will go out and create a demand. All of a sudden the Minister of Government Services will come out with a pamphlet.

MR. NOTLEY: For high schools.

MR. R. SPEAKER: It'll be put into the schools across the province. They'll all know that soon they will need public power. I'm sure that's what it's going to say. It'll infer that kind of thing. The Minister of Government Services smiles. I'm sure he doesn't know what's going on in his department. But that's most likely in the works. A committee is working on it, and all of a sudden he'll find it on his desk and think it's a great idea.

Mr. Speaker, the point I want to make is that the people of Alberta haven't really heard of the program yet and are not aware of this thing that is going to be pushed on them in a few moments. It's a violation of participatory democracy, the open government this government believes in. And the Premier today says public business must be done in public. He believes in it.

All of a sudden, here we are, in just 15 days pushing a new concept of not only rationalization but subsidization on the people of Alberta. Subsidization means that the people of Alberta, through their tax money, must in turn subsidize this program. We're just fortunate in this province that we have royalty revenue from which we can draw \$100 million next year, \$100 million two years from

now, and \$100 million three years from now. This government says, what's a million; what's a hundred million. Maybe they'll have it and maybe they won't. Who knows what kinds of commitments they've made for us.

The last point: I refer to the minister's news release. I only reiterate the minister's discussion about an objective of balanced economic growth. The Minister of Economic Development was in his seat a few moments ago, and I'd like to have had him respond to this matter and point out to us exactly how this program will bring about balanced economic growth in the province. Utility rates, as a factor in determining where an industry goes in the province, is way down the list. It's itemized as numbers 15 to 18 on the list. Mr. Speaker, this government is selling that as one of the number one reasons for the program being implemented in this province. I think they have to do better. The Minister of Economic Development should have been in the House this evening, and if this is such a great thing that's going to bring about economic diversification in this province, we should have heard about it. But what does he do? He hardly speaks now. I haven't heard him this session. I think maybe he said something in the spring, but I can't recall that. But here it is, the great thing about the program, and nobody has really spoken on the subject. But I guess Albertans will accept it. They have a big majority. Everything's great in good old Alberta. It's good enough. Well, it isn't. I think you can do better.

Mr. Speaker, it's incumbent upon the minister to admit, one, this program of subsidization; two, there hasn't been public discussion; and three, how is it going to affect economic growth as projected in this news release?

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. minister conclude the debate?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, again it has been a fascinating and interesting experience to hear the comments of the hon. members, particularly those who sit in opposition. I've listened very, very carefully to their comments, and I've had a difficult time trying to find out where they stand on the issue. That's probably been the most difficult thing in listening to the debate.

I outlined earlier the objectives of the legislation, and probably it would be useful to do it again, Mr. Speaker. There are a number of objectives. The first objective, referred to by a number of members, was to reduce the rate differentials experienced by citizens in the province. We're not eliminating rate differentials, and there's a reason for that.

It would be useful and important for me to comment on the remarks by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, where he advocates a different sort of solution to achieve a similar objective. But he has neglected to advise the members of the Assembly that in order to achieve a single Crown-owned utility it would be probably be necessary — and I suppose he would support expropriating Edmonton Power from the citizens of Edmonton or, in addition, expropriating Medicine Hat Power from the citizens of Medicine Hat in order to achieve a grand socialist objective. The government offers an innovative alternative that doesn't require paying a premium, that doesn't require trampling over the ownership rights of the citizens of Edmonton and Medicine Hat or those small investors who happen to own shares in the investor-owned utilities. He hasn't mentioned that that would be one of the repercussions of the course of action he would choose

and the premium that would be paid. Presently rates are based on the depreciated plant and the investment or equity that is in that plant. I would like to correct the hon. member on the rate of return. It's 14.75 and not 15.

So I really had difficulty in determining where the member stood in terms of the objectives of Bill 92. On one hand he said, yes, it's a good idea, but on the other hand, you should trample all over the ownership rights of the citizens of Edmonton, Medicine Hat, and others in order to pay a premium and acquire the utility for some other purpose, when the benefits from those purposes can be achieved through Bill 92 without massive government intervention. Fascinating comments by the Leader of the Opposition. I guess that can be expected when his research doesn't come from his constituents but from 93 economists in Ontario. [interjections]

DR. PAPROSKI: Eastern information.

MR. SHABEN: That's the source that was quoted, Mr. Speaker, and I listened very carefully. I think the members of the government caucus listen to other than professional economists in Ontario.

We've carefully examined the objectives and purposes of this legislation. I'll complete my outline of the purposes: first of all, to reduce rate differential in the province; secondly, to provide an opportunity to move toward economic dispatch of electricity in the province. The Leader of the Opposition referred to conservation. That's part of economic dispatch. You use the least-cost sources of energy on a one-system basis. This marketing Act will lead to that over a period of years. That's one of the reasons for the five-year phase-in, to allow a reasonable period of time for the utilities, in co-operation with the agency, to attain economic dispatch. I thought I had made it clear during earlier debate that this was an important objective in this particular piece of legislation.

Other objectives are to make it possible for us to integrate power purchased extraprovincially. Should an agreement be concluded with Manitoba and Saskatchewan, there's an opportunity to move that power into the interconnected system, not through a single utility but through the agency and, ultimately, to the consumers. Export of surplus quantities of electric energy. The member alluded to Hydro-Quebec, Manitoba Hydro, and Ontario Hydro, who subsidize their citizens through export of surplus quantities of electric energy. There isn't a capacity in Alberta now to achieve that, but with the marketing agency that can be achieved, Mr. Speaker. Those sales and the pooling process will provide benefits not just to the utility that makes the sale but to all Albertans who are consumers. That's an important aspect.

Another, and I touched on it earlier, is the potential for the development of hydro and how we integrate that hydro into our system. All of us here believe that a worth-while objective of the province is to encourage the development of renewable sources of energy. How do we integrate that into the system? While on the point of hydro, I'd like to correct the hon. Leader of the Opposition, in that there have been subsidies in the past. Government funds were placed in the Brazeau project, by the government the hon. leader was a member of, in order to make it possible to develop the hydro potential on the Brazeau. The hon. member is well aware of it. So it's inaccurate to say there haven't been contributions by government.

MRS. CRIPPS: No interest for 20 years.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, there were a number of other comments by members, and I think it's important that we understand the purpose of the legislation and the method the government has chosen to resolve a long-standing problem. This concern we have about balanced growth, opportunities for economic development in all regions of the province, has been raised in the House many times.

This leads me to the comments by the Member for Calgary Buffalo. I have real difficulty in understanding where the member is, because yesterday he was in favor of it and today he isn't. He must have talked to one of his advisors, who may or may not be an economist. The point at issue is that we have thoroughly discussed this matter. The objective of the subsidy is to achieve a gradual phase-in over a five-year period as we move toward economic dispatch. The figure quoted, the request of \$100 million that will come from me to the Provincial Treasurer, is not a figure that has been drawn from the air. It's to reflect those numbers provided to the hon. members in committee yesterday, so there isn't a negative impact on the Calgary consumers as we phase in those consumers who presently enjoy the lowest rates.

The comments about the relative amounts of electricity used by particular groups: the agricultural community uses approximately 4 per cent, not 6 per cent, of the electricity generated in the province. Industry uses a large amount, commercial as well, and residential somewhat less. If the member will recall, when we discussed this matter earlier, I advised the members of the manner in which revenue requirements are determined by a utility and rates are set. I'll review that again for the hon. member.

The investor-owned utilities make their application to the Public Utilities Board for the amount of revenue a utility requires to meet various costs of operation, fuel, capital, and return on equity. The Public Utilities Board carefully examines those requests and the material presented to them and responds by either approving or not approving a certain revenue flow to the utility. Then the utility sets rates for various classes of customers based on that revenue requirement. Historically, in Alberta industries are charged a higher rate in terms of the cost per kilowatt hour than are residential consumers. That's a practice that occurs here, and it occurs in other jurisdictions. It's an accepted practice where residential customers receive a more favorable rate than industrial customers. So there is a process of cross-subsidization between customers within the utilities right now. The member is fully aware of that.

That process will continue; there won't be any interference with it. In order to provide hon. members with a projection that will stand up for five years, it would have to be fixed on the basis of what sort of share each class of customer would pay toward that revenue requirement. That changes from year to year and from time to time. When we deal with revenue requirements, we can deal with those. But rate classifications are set from year to year, based on what is acceptable to the consumer, the Public Utilities Board, and the utilities that serve the customers.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that the government is prepared to bring forward this innovative legislation addressing very important issues raised with the members of the Legislature over a number of years. It will assist us in providing electric utilities to our consumers in the best

possible way, on terms and in a manner that meet the needs of Albertans. Mr. Speaker, I would urge all members to support this legislation on third reading.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 31, I ask to be excused.

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Speaker, I would also ask to be excused.

[Mr. Purdy and Mr. Little left the Chamber]

[Motion carried; Bill 92 read a third time]

[On motion, the Assembly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole]

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**
(Committee of the Whole)

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the committee please come to order.

Bill 81
Alberta Income Tax
Amendment Act, 1981

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are some amendments, which I believe have been circulated. Are there any questions or comments regarding the amendments?

[Motion on amendments carried]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Bill be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

Bill 94
Government Land Purchases
Amendment Act, 1981

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding this Act?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. I raised this in second reading as a question. It's with regard to the allocation of moneys for the Minister of Housing and Public Works to acquire land in the annexed area. The minister indicated to me that this Act made that possible. Would the minister see very many situations such as that happening over the period of a year, where really unbudgeted money is allocated to a minister to make an expenditure that in a sense is unauthorized by the Legislature? I wonder if the minister could comment on that. What would be the incidence of that kind of use of this legislation?

MR. HYNDMAN: It's hard to predict, Mr. Chairman. The present Act has been in effect with a ceiling of \$100 million since 1976. Essentially, the Act is for the purpose of increasing the ceiling and allowing the restricted development areas to be purchased. The hon. Leader of the

Opposition is correct in the sense that in the past when there has been land banking for purposes which have been carried on and initiated by the Minister of Housing and Public Works — I think for valid public purposes — it has been done through the vehicle of this Act.

So this Act, the amendments, in no way affect what the existing powers have been. It is a matter of government policy, I guess, as to the rate and extent of land banking which would take place. Of course it is constrained by the amount of money available. So each year various moneys would be made available, as found in the back of the estimates. But subject to what the Minister of Housing and Public Works may want to add in terms of comments, I wouldn't think the pace would change much from what it has been over the last five years.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, just on that matter. We're striking out \$100 million and substituting \$450 million, which is a substantial increase. As I recall, listening to the minister a moment ago, he indicated that he does not see any particular change. Yet we are taking a figure of \$100 million, passed in 1976, to \$450 million, an increase of four and a half. I put to the minister: on what basis did the government arrive at the figure of \$450 million? There must have been some basis for moving from \$100 million to \$450 million, as opposed to \$200 million or \$300 million. What yardstick was used for that increase?

MR. HYNDMAN: One major reason has been the significant increase in the price of land over the past year. For example, one of the main departments involved here is Transportation, which purchases land for rights of way for highways. The cost of that land has increased materially, and we are bumping close to the ceiling of the existing \$100 million. It is anticipated and hoped that this \$450 million will last for four to six years, as the previous one did, before having to come back. The departments of Environment and Housing and Public Works are two other major claimants on the fund for land, for such entities as provincial buildings.

One main purpose for the passage of the Act is to purchase lands for the utility and transportation corridors within the RDAs around Edmonton and Calgary. As members all know, because they've been going forward over the past couple of years in terms of special warrants, those amounts are very, very significant because they are very close to the boundaries of the two major centres. So it's essentially a function of the increasing land prices, and that's the purpose of the increased figure.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. In terms of the total amount of \$450 million, would you consider it a revolving fund in terms of when there are repayments or the land acquired is sold for some reason or another? Does that amount of money, the selling price, go back into this fund again and the Provincial Treasurer can draw on it for other purposes? Is that the concept behind the fund? Is it revolving in that sense?

MR. HYNDMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it's a revolving fund, like other revolving funds which the Legislature has endorsed. Therefore, any department which in a subsequent year wishes to purchase land from the fund has to reimburse the fund for land being purchased. In the spring when the estimates are being considered, information could be provided on request as to what the Minister of Transportation roughly feels he'll be buying in the area

of rights of way for the ensuing year, therefore giving an indication of the amounts of money he would see being needed to buy moneys from the revolving fund. Similarly with the departments of Housing and Public Works and Environment.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Bill be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 100
Chartered Accountants Amendment Act, 1981

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are some amendments. Are there any questions or comments regarding the amendments?

[Motion on amendments carried]

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, this is not on the Bill as such. But I understand there is a Bill somewhere in the works, whereby there is a better definition of chartered accountants, registered accountants and, I believe, industrial accountants. Is that Bill somewhere in the works, and will this Bill be extended to take in the requests of that association?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would say it's premature to suggest there is any Bill in the works. This Bill before the committee does not deal in any way with definition of the field of practice.

The hon. member is correct that a number of groups in the accounting area have asked for and made various requests with respect to the way there should be definitions of the field of practice and the extent to which that should or should not occur. It has been the chartered accountants, the registered industrial accountants, the certified general accountants, the accredited public accountants, and two or three other groups.

I indicated to those groups some months ago that I thought it would be useful if they could get together and work out some agreed-upon approach. Two of the groups agreed on an approach, but not one of the third groups, the certified public accountants. So at the moment, the matter is before the government caucus. We hope, though, that the various groups, of which there are at least six, could get together and try to work out some form of accounting occupations and professions Act, one whole Act encompassing and defining the field of practice, which as members know is a matter being debated right across Canada. There has been a royal commission in Ontario. There has been suggested legislation in British Columbia and Manitoba. So there's nothing imminent, and we're now looking for input and, hopefully, some agreement that can be initiated in and between the groups before we would want to proceed with a piece of legislation.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the minister in reference to his last comment. Do I hear the minister saying that if there is success between these various groups who would like to see their names on the statute books, like the certified general accountants, perhaps in the future we would rescind The Chartered

Accountants Act of Alberta and replace it with another Act?

MR. HYNDMAN: That might be the way to proceed, Mr. Chairman. At the moment, of course, the Chartered Accountants Amendment Act, 1981, is the only public Bill. There is a private Bill with respect to the registered industrial accountants, and some of the other groups are formed under The Societies Act. So down the road I think everybody would like to see some form of rationalization of all this, but in such a way that it's fair to all those within the accounting areas who have taken perhaps different routes to the kind of expertise they have. It's a question of working that out in such a way that it's fair to all the groups. We're trying to do that now.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 100 be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration and reports Bill 94, and reports Bills 81 and 100 with some amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY**

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

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

head: ALBERTA HERITAGE SAVING STRUST FUND
CAPITAL PROJECTS DIVISION
1982-83 ESTIMATES OF
PROPOSED INVESTMENTS

Executive Council

Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation

1 — Occupational Health and Safety Research and Education

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. One discussion that took place last night was with regard to the \$45,000 to be invested in research in the area of agriculture. I find that a very interesting subject in terms of workers' health and compensation, in that I can recall a number of years ago when a professor from Brandon University in Manitoba came out to the farm. My father had the opportunity of talking to him.

The professor was doing studies on the reason small towns were deteriorating. The professor had a nice paper, 28 pages. He presented it to my father and said, this is a

great document. It has all this information: it tells you why the stores closed, why the corner garage isn't there any more, why people can't buy certain kinds of machinery in the little town any more. After paging through it my father said, I knew that; if you'd just spent five minutes with me, I could have told you that quite easily. That was just common sense as far as my dad was concerned. I'll always remember that about some of the research done on farmers. Here we're spending \$45,000, as I understand it, to find out why farmers have accidents. I think they know why they have accidents.

In the committee last night, and it wasn't clear in *Hansard*, I wasn't sure of the real terms of reference for that research that was going on. I'd appreciate very much if the minister could outline the kinds of criteria that will be used. Who will be researched? What kind of travelling will be done? Will the researcher meet with farmers in various facets of agriculture?

Farmers do a number of things today. They have processing plants. Farmers are producers in terms of grain, cattle, and other kinds of livestock. Farmers are businessmen. They run businesses connected with agriculture and not connected with agriculture. What is the minister intending to do? Have those terms of reference been defined yet? I think the farmers of Alberta would be very interested in that.

MR. DIACHUK: Following last night's discussions, I want to say that I welcome all the interest. I reviewed *Hansard*, and I guess we all got involved in the discussion of the farmers' participation in workers' compensation. If I led some of the discussion in that direction, it wasn't my intention. None of those projects that have been approved are designated to try to coerce, study, find out why farmers are not participating in workers' compensation.

The Gale commission, which we reflected on last night and that was struck and reported in 1975, studying industrial health and safety in this province, emphasized in its report the need for research and development. I want to place this on the record again, even though I may be repeating myself from last night. They also stated that the function is one that is particularly susceptible to financial constraints, and sufficient long-term funding to ensure its operation should be assured. During the past four years — this year would be five years — the occupational health and safety division has appropriated annually about \$100,000 for grants to stimulate research by non-government bodies. This is because we have been doing it carefully, developing it when it was under the ministry of Labour and then under my portfolio, rather than going out and expending a lot of money and having everybody going in all directions on the study of health and safety in the work place. Experience has shown the response to be rather unco-ordinated. In our opinion, and in my opinion, the main reason for this is twofold: firstly, there is no focus for such research in the universities and colleges here in Alberta; and secondly, there is no formal educational training in this field in Alberta. Other than the occupational health nursing certificate program at Grant MacEwan and the extension I had indicated as one of the programs being carried out through Grant MacEwan, that is the present limit in educational programs. It should be noted that if the foundation funds are made available — and this was the intent — some of the grants we traditionally handed out through that \$100,000 annual appropriation will be diverted to other research and education.

Because of the way the discussion took place last night, with the hope that we would look at the overall approach we have taken and with the hope that maybe the answers would be sufficient to approve these estimates tonight, it has become eminently clear that there is a limit to what government programs can do in the prevention of accidents and illness in the work place. Disregarding what the hon. Leader of the Opposition just stated — well, I know what the farmers need for a safe place — I don't believe he does know. I don't think even the people who have been involved over the past five or six years really have a handle on what causes accidents, other than some theories. We can learn from an organization in another province. Ontario has a very fine, organized agricultural safety association, and they have some. But in this Assembly, we always say that farming in Ontario is much different from farming here in western Canada, particularly in Alberta.

The stage for the action is the work place, and the persons involved are workers. We want to work with representatives of the employers. It is clear that the promotion by the government alone, and the attempt to enforce legislation, will not result in significant decreases in the rates of injury and illness, Mr. Chairman, even though some of the members alluded to that in the discussion yesterday. This \$45,000 and other funds, and even the \$1 million appropriated this year and the estimates we're working on for next year, will not produce the safety we want to see in the work place. We are convinced that greater awareness, motivation, and knowledge by employers and workers will be the key to significant progress.

How will this be accomplished? In spite of encouraging trends such as a reduction in the fatality rate in some areas of the work force, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the traditional methods of preventing occupational accidents and ill health, such as the enforcement of the Act and its regulations, are inadequate. This inadequacy stems from two major sources. One is the lack of information regarding technological and human aspects of occupational health and safety; and two, the lack of adequate education and training. Again, I refer to the Gale commission, which concluded that no occupational health and safety program would be complete without a comprehensive education program and research capability. While the division under my responsibility has been trying to implement the Gale commission recommendations, it is clear that greater involvement of other organizations is needed.

So often we are concerned about and even accused of government interference in too many sectors. This is what we're trying to accomplish. To date, the involvement of the postsecondary and technical institutions in occupational health and safety training and education is still at the exploratory stages, as I indicated. Although a variety of educational and training programs are being offered by industry, government, educational institutions, and private organizations, they focus on specific issues and at times tend to be unco-ordinated and fragmented.

Mr. Chairman, a major area of concern in Alberta is the acute shortage of trained occupational health and safety personnel. I repeat again that except for the health nurse training at Grant MacEwan college, there is no facility in this province where professional or technical qualifications related to occupational health and safety technologies can be obtained. That is why I welcomed the resolution moved by the hon. Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park and debated on one occasion in this

Assembly this fall. It was to bring about a recognition of some of these people in this speciality, to show some recognition for the training they have taken.

Here in Alberta, although there has been considerable discussion and committee interaction with the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower, very little progress has been made toward the establishment of formal training programs of any kind. Some of this funding is being directed to more of this type of program — and we hope there will be more — to see what is the best way of providing research, education, and training. Again, I want to remind hon. members of the committee that we aren't out there soliciting or arranging studies. I repeat from last night that individuals and institutions come forward with proposals that the steering committee reviews to consider whether they are areas that fall under the requirements we want to see some of the money expended. It is basically to see if some of the technology is being used properly, and some of the educational programs can be implemented in some of our postsecondary institutions.

The success achieved only in this one example of the occupational health nursing course at Grant MacEwan college is surely a pointer to what can be achieved in other occupational health and safety related technologies. It is believed that both industry and labor unions are ready and willing to participate in the development of these much-needed programs. I indicated yesterday that there is interest, but it is only the first year. The criticism already is: well, I know what has to be done for the farmers. I would like to hear, because that is exactly what Dr. Harrell is going to do. I don't want to repeat the whole presentation, but he will be working with the organizations that have the information, plus interviewing people who have had these accidents, to see if it is a pattern, a trend, a time of the year; to see the reasons for these accidents occurring.

I also want to touch on the research section we presently have. This section of the occupational health and safety division provides many necessary internal services. Its resources and capabilities are not geared to address the many varied research needs that remain outstanding. For example, several important areas of research relevant to Alberta have not been examined. This is what is hoped. When we know we presently haven't got the manpower or the resources, we welcome the outside organization, individual, or agency to come forward with a proposal to get involved. Technological areas in which alternative, safe procedures are explored and developed, the application of engineering to eliminate hazards from equipment and processes, is something they do now with the staff they have.

We're presently involved to a good extent in the human aspect of work-related accidents and disease, through our hygiene section. However, very little is known about why individuals become involved in unsafe situations. Methodologies are needed to make individuals aware of hazards and to promote safe work habits. I look forward to some submissions.

It is fine to say, as was alluded to last night, why don't you just fund it through the existing organizations? I indicated that I welcomed the resolution the hon. Member for Calgary North West introduced here. It received good debate and good input from the outside sources. There is evidence that we're getting an interest now. Because we are working and approving them slowly, and because we have only approved approximately a quarter of the funds that have been allocated for the grants, the

indications are that we're not falling head over heels and rushing into these programs. Because there is little or no focus on occupational health and safety in the present research section, with the universities or other educational establishments, I hope there will be more after we receive some input from outside sources that come forward with a good proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to touch on these, because I didn't get an opportunity to reflect on some of the discussions last night when we adjourned. I want to say of the example the hon. Leader of the Opposition used: I know why small towns are dying; the people have moved out. But I'm sure that he or anyone else hasn't the answer to the best way to prevent accidents on the farm. We know, as we have often seen, that that is an industry of pressure — the pressure of the time of day, of the season, and even of the big, sophisticated equipment there.

But some of the research that has been carried out and the work involved — we have produced good material, good liaison with the farm community. I referred to one of my staff members who is well travelled in this province and known by all members of this Assembly, particularly in rural Alberta. The co-operation between Alberta Agriculture and my officials and with the 4-H clubs, Unifarm, the Western Stock Growers, and many other farm organizations has been excellent. They are all interested in seeing what is the best way to improve safety on the farm.

Mr. Chairman, the same thing applies to other sectors, because only two of those grants were directed towards agriculture, to farm safety. The others are in related industries. I hope that collectively the hon. members see the value in these programs and support this appropriation.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, in response to what the minister has said with regard to accidents on the farm, and the proposal he made to us this evening. If we went to the farm and made some of the generalizations that were made, and started talking to some of the farm groups about lack of education and training, needing a comprehensive education program and a research capability, being just at the exploratory stages — I missed the other sentence. It was something about technology being needed so that we can eliminate the accidents. More input is required. These are nice generalizations that sound great when you're idealizing. But farmers in the province are practical.

I can recall one of the best things back in 1955. I went to a short course here in Edmonton on farm safety. They had two or three demonstrations set up for these young people from the farm. It was farm young people's week. One demonstration was to demonstrate how, when you're with your two-wheel tractor, you're pulling some type of implement, a cable or a chain, if you jerked the clutch a certain way, the tractor could rear up and come over backwards. They had roll bars and various things there to stop the tractor when it got to a certain height. As a young fellow at that point in time, I remember that that was a good demonstration and lesson. I was always cautious because of the very fact that it was a good demonstration, and I learned something.

Mr. Chairman, when we come into this Legislature, we talk about hiring someone for \$45,000. I quickly review *Hansard* and I find no qualifications of that person. If this person has put together idealistic types of generalizations about finding a farm safety program, that's all we're going to have when the report comes back from the Department of Sociology. I don't know this fellow, and

certainly shouldn't make any inferences about him, but I ask if he has ever lived on a farm, if he has ever been on a farm community. What are the frames of reference for the study that's going to be done? Who will he talk to? Those are basic, but there are other questions as well. There are suggestions of things that could be happening at the present time.

I've stood in this Assembly and complimented the Member for Lethbridge West, who looks after the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission and sits on that committee. There is an example of a member of this Legislature taking a problem in hand. We know some facts. We know there are people abusing alcohol; we know there is a use of drugs in this province: two facts evidenced in every community across the province of Alberta. There's just no question about it. What did the hon. member do with the staff that he has before him? He took the matter in hand and put together some ads across this province that are having a significant impact and effect on the young people in many, many communities. They are good ads. Something is happening. That's a good expenditure of money. If the hon. member will ask for an increase in his budget in the spring session of the Legislature, I hope we all approve a significant increase for him. Because it's a good program. He's taken the bull by the horns and done something about it.

Let's look at the farm communities across this province. The problems are obvious ones. I have a neighbor who has lost part of his arm. Why? Because he stuck it in a baler. I have other neighbors who have lost part of a hand. Why? Because they put it in the sickle of either a swather or a combine. Those are obvious kinds of things. I know people who have back injuries because they leaped over a machine when they should have been stepping over a hitch. I could go on and list example after example after example of accidents that happen on the farm.

I recall that in that very course in 1955, a long list of farm accidents was presented to us in our study sessions. That's 25 years ago. I'm sure those lists have common elements. The information is there. What are we researching? If the minister can't come up and say, look, I know that in the farm work place these are the kinds of problems we want to investigate or we don't know anything about — I don't even know what they are. I'm sure if I sat down for half an hour I could list 80 per cent of the problems in the farm work place at the present time, just from practical experience and involvement in the farm community. But we're going to spend \$45,000, and the minister only stands up for 10 minutes and gives us generalizations about lack of education and training of the farmer. I'll tell you, if you told a farmer that, and count me in — you wouldn't last long on my farm if you came to me and said that I have a lack of training about my business. Because a farmer does know his business and spends a lot of time working and sweating to put that business into effect. A comprehensive education program and a research capability: I don't even know if the farmers across the province really know what that means. Nor has the minister told us that.

I read the Blues last night, and it is not clear. If the minister is going to come forward and ask for \$45,000 to put a research program into effect and is going to use somebody from the university, he should know what his experience is and be able to tell us in the Legislature. He should be able to say, these are the problems I'm going after. At the same time, the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation should be

able to say, here are eight out of 10 problems that, with better education through television and radio, we could do something about.

We could take a lesson from the hon. Member for Lethbridge West, who has already taken in hand an even more serious problem in this province relative to alcoholism and drug abuse. I think we could deal with the problems that are obvious in terms of the farm community the same way. Mr. Chairman, I've seen no programs — not one — the minister responsible for that type of thing in this province has come forward with. Now he wants *carte blanche* approval for \$45,000, without any type of explanation, for what he calls a program "submitted in two phases . . . That was approved at an amount of \$8,422 to Dr. Harwell. His interest as a university man I understand has been to take a look at this." He's just going to wander around and have a look. That was the biggest problem this fellow from Manitoba had. My father put the finger on him when he said, all he does is wander up and down the street; he could see all the buildings nailed up, so he knew the town had disappeared. We're going to have a look at it. That's a lot of money for that kind of thing.

"The second phase of his submission was approved on September 22 in the amount of \$37,862." What for? It doesn't even say what for. Mr. Chairman, we get so much of this in this Legislature. The ministers are paid some \$60,000 a year. Here we have a ministry with a very narrow responsibility that should know the details of what's going on. There's not very many staff to look after, because the workers' compensation group has other administrative people to look after. But here is an innovative type of program that is being talked about and the minister doesn't know the details. He's talking about it in generalizations and expects us here in this Legislature to give approval and go home. I get tired of that kind of thing. When is this specific minister going to do his homework? There are others who stand side by side with him, and as time goes on we'll get to them. But tonight I think this minister has to be answerable for that kind of thing. Maybe just a little bit of money . . .

With a whiff of the hand earlier today, we passed \$100 million for us to accept as a responsibility next year. This is maybe only \$40,000; it's not much; who cares about that? It's still a principle. A minister must be answerable for where he is spending money, held accountable.

So, Mr. Minister, through you Mr. Chairman, answer the question specifically, otherwise there's just no way we can give approval. I think we'd be totally irresponsible. Other members sit around here and think time is going by; I've got to go home; we're all going to pass it; who cares; the minister will look after it. What kind of government is that? That's what leads to government inefficiency. That's what leads to a government that may be out of power in a few years. I've had lots of experience around here, so if you fellows want to hear some of those things, I could tell you about them. [interjection] That's right. I'm not going to retire yet. [interjections] Who knows? You never know. But whether I'm going out or not, I've still got that practical experience where a little complacency puts you on the other side of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: In your rightful place.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Rightful place. That could be.

Mr. Chairman, I think it's incumbent upon the minister to tell us this. When he can tell us that completely . . . If he can't find the information after we ask a long series

of questions that I have sitting here before me in terms of other books I have here, the report I have questions on . . . I have a whole series in my binder of questions on workers' compensation. When the minister can come forward and answer all these kinds of things, we'll approve the estimates. But until that happens, I think it's time to hold somebody accountable, and we'd better stay here and do it.

MR. KOZIAK: Don't show us the questions. Ask them.

MR. KING: Why don't you ask the questions?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. Does the minister want to respond, or does the minister want other participants?

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, as I recall, the Leader of the Opposition put several questions to the minister. I think it would probably be helpful for committee members, who I know are extremely interested in this information, if the minister would respond specifically to those questions. [interjection] I'm going to give them again, because I think it's important enough that the minister have them. We're talking about the Harrell report. Mr. Chairman, we're looking here at almost \$46,000. I think the question the Leader of the Opposition put should be answered. What experience does Dr. Harrell bring to this particular project, because we're talking about \$46,000. Does he have experience in terms of knowing anything about accidents? Has he ever worked for a compensation board? He's a sociology professor. Fair enough; there's nothing wrong with sociology. It's a perfectly legitimate profession. But I'm not sure how relevant it is to the issue at hand. I say to you, Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, that it is not inappropriate when we're talking about the expenditure of \$46,000 to have some idea, as members of this supply committee, what qualifications the particular gentleman undertaking the study possesses.

The specific questions the Leader of the Opposition raised again — the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs seemed to have forgotten them. Does Dr. Harrell have any farm experience? Was he raised on a farm? Does he do any farming? What are his connections with the farm community? Or is it a case of a professor of sociology coming, making the case, and the minister says, yes, by George, we'll let you undertake this \$46,000 study.

Mr. Chairman, I was rather amused today listening to the Minister of Utilities and Telephones, who got up with great fanfare — all the government backbenchers were pounding their desks, and I think the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation was smiling — and said, we don't need all these professionals; we don't need all these professors to tell us what to do; we can make up our minds ourselves. Mr. Chairman, just a matter of half an hour after the minister sits down to a great chorus of banging on the desks from government members, we have the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation coming in and telling us we've got a \$46,000 program to a Dr. Harrell. Nobody knows at this stage what his particular expertise is, other than that he's a professor of sociology. That's nice. I'm very pleased. I know a number of professors of sociology, but I'm not entirely sure that \$46,000 of public expenditures is the way to open up a better link between the minister's office and the University of Alberta. I found it rather interesting when the minister began his discussion tonight, Mr. Chairman. Apparently there doesn't seem to

be that kind of expertise, and he mentioned the universities. I don't want to misinterpret him, and if I did I would certainly welcome his correction at whatever length is required for him to set the record straight.

I think the question has to be put again: what are the qualifications of this particular gentleman on the subject? It seems to me we are talking about a relatively theoretical in the extreme proposition. We're talking about the characteristics of those people who have accidents. I don't know what we mean by that. We've got a professor of sociology who's doing it. What are we going to be doing? Are we going to be looking at their background, their race, their age? What's the basis for this? For most of the practical information, the accident reports the minister already has would be available in any event. So I'm not sure whether we're going to do a little psychological study of every person who's got an accident, or what, for this \$46,000. Again, I don't want to denigrate the project. What I insist upon — I think opposition members and members of this committee have a right to have a clear explanation of what the qualifications are, the specific terms of reference, if we're going to commit \$46,000 to study farmers once again.

Frankly — and I offer this as a positive suggestion to the minister — we can get into these kinds of abstract discussions and studies. I believe it was 1972 when the hon. Helen Hunley stood in her place in this House and ridiculed very effectively some of the vague studies undertaken by the old Human Resources Research Council. All the members at that time pounded their desks with enthusiasm. I'm not entirely sure, Mr. Chairman, that for \$46,000 we're going to have the kind of practical information that the minister needs.

Now what could be done? Last night I suggested that one kind of study that might be useful for the government to consider funding under this particular heritage trust fund appropriation — and we're dealing with farm safety — would be to look at what other provinces are doing as a start. That's fair enough. But let's go beyond that then and examine what other parts of the world are doing. Members of the all-party committee that went to Europe — in all three countries we visited, farmers and farm workers are covered by compensation. The minister shakes his head, but that's my recollection of the trip. [interjection]

I beg your pardon? No, I believe farm workers are covered in England, and there is a program for farmers now. I believe farm workers are covered, Mr. Minister, but I could be wrong on that. If I'm wrong, I'd welcome the correction.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, let's look at a study that would examine what is occurring in these other areas, in the Federal Republic of Germany, for example. I'm going to ask the minister when he rises to give me the German pronunciation of whatever it is the farmers belong to over there. Perhaps the Member for Edmonton Glengarry can give me the appropriate German name with the correct pronunciation. I wouldn't even begin to try. But I think a study that would examine those kinds of massive agricultural compensation co-ops, if you like, would be extremely useful to the minister as well as to the agricultural community in this province. That kind of study, it seems to me, would lead us someplace, as opposed to the vague, aimless kind of study at this stage that doesn't zero in on the practical information the minister needs so he can take it to caucus and we can come in with programs that will push forward this whole business of accident prevention.

I'm sure the minister agrees we're not going to make any serious moves in this area until we take the bull by the horns — to use the analogy of the Member for Little Bow, as opposed to taking the bull by the tail — and deal with this question of compensation coverage. We're not going to get anywhere on accident prevention. We can have 100 other studies. The minister can come back next year and we can have another half a dozen university professors studying; we can have a psychology professor, a professor of psychiatry. We can do hundreds of studies. But until we deal with the question of compensation coverage for farmers, in my view we're really just playing games.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm amazed at some of the comments coming from the opposition members. We hear words like "taking the bull by the horns". What does that mean, Mr. Chairman? The hon. members of this committee surely must be surprised — at this late hour talking like that, as if that was an act to do something. Yet we haven't heard one positive, constructive suggestion from that side for the minister to take. [interjections] Already he's getting excited. He can't take it.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I want the hon. member to know that when he says we have not made a suggestion, he is not only criticizing me as Leader of the Opposition but the hon. Member for Lethbridge West, because I used his example as an excellent suggestion. Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member wishes to criticize me, remember that he's criticizing his colleague as well. I think he should be careful of his remarks.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry he's so flustered and upset about that. One constructive suggestion for the minister. We're not talking about the chairman of the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission. May I suggest that to you.

If the hon. opposition leader is merely suggesting a public relations program, maybe we should go home right now. Because he knows that; we all know that. He is carrying out a public relations program. Unless the hon. opposition members haven't been watching television recently, there are a lot of good ads on television and pamphlets distributed across this province, which is a very, very good thing. I think we'd all agree with that. That is not enough. The hon. opposition member and the Member for Spirit River-Fairview know very well it's not enough, because accidents continue to occur. If we just want statistics, then we have the almanac that was presented here today by the minister. Those statistics are there. Again, that is not enough.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition gives an example of a clutch problem. So what? We know there are clutch problems, tractors tip, arms get caught in belts, and so forth. If you go to any hospital, you know these problems occur. The important thing is that we have to know how to tackle this problem in a very constructive way over the next few years as young people in the farm industry are getting more and more involved; how to prevent the problem. I don't know why that is such a difficult thing to grasp.

If he knows all the answers, Mr. Chairman, and that's the impression I'm getting — we know the answers; all we have to do is go out there and talk to 10 farmers and 15 farm families. We know how to prevent all the accidents, and there would be no more accidents in the province of Alberta. As a matter of fact, we'd be so great, I think

we'd spread this message right across Canada. I'm trying to simply say that farm accidents, all accidents, are multifactorial. Surely, it merits an evaluation to see what important factors we should consider for a further thrust to try to prevent these kinds of problems.

Mr. Chairman, if the minister would tell us categorically that this one project for \$45,000 would give us all the answers, I would be amazed. We all know very well that that is not going to give us the answers. It's going to give us some direction, hopefully, because research doesn't give an absolute answer every time. Otherwise we'd have the answers to everything.

So Mr. Chairman, I would say that the hon. opposition members should calm down, let the evaluation be carried out, and let's get some direction. Unless the opposition have some answers right now — they should have been fed to the minister a long time ago, because I think it's a shame to keep valuable information on preventing farm accidents and say, we know the answers but we're not going to give them to the minister.

Getting back to the chairman of the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, sure he's doing a good job. But in this province we also know — and he'll be the first to stand — that we still have an alcohol problem. It's one of the biggest public health problems in Canada, let alone Alberta.

So in summary, Mr. Chairman — I know the hon. opposition members are trying to do something out there, and I'm not sure what it is. We're all getting very confused here listening to all this bull, if you wish, pulling by the horns and all that. Let's get down to the basics and let's get this study under way. If further direction is given, great. If not, maybe at least by the process of elimination we'll get some further direction.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SINDLINGER: I've always enjoyed listening to the remarks of this particular member, Mr. Chairman. I'll make every effort to ensure I remain calm and collected. I'd just like to get my two-cents worth in on this one, which is about twice as much as some of the other members' contributions.

Mr. Chairman, this study reminds me of one that was done in Washington about 10 years ago. Sociologists were commissioned to find out why people were poor. They went out and did a lot of studying, analysis, and interviewing as well. They came back three years and \$14.6 million later and said the reason people are poor is because they don't have any money. I'm afraid we might be getting into something like this as well. When the minister was describing this particular project, he said that what we're trying to do is find out what causes accidents. Rhetorically he said, is it habit, trend, or time of year. It's been a long time since I lived and worked on the farm, so I can't claim to be a current authority on this matter. But as I listen to other members speak I get the impression that this might be a matter of common sense rather than one for analysis by a sociologist. Is it habit? I think probably it's working habits. Is it due to the time of year? Well, I'm sure we can do a statistical analysis, do some seasonal adjustments, and show that, yes, it is a particular time of year. There are busy times of the year as opposed to other times of the year. Is it a trend? I suppose one could say with common sense that, yes, it is, if we look at the changes in technology, innovation, and implementation that have occurred in the rural agricultural sector since the Second World War.

But what causes me more concern about this, as we

query the minister about the qualifications of the professor who is going to undertake this particular study, is that we haven't had a definitive response to that particular question: (a) what are the qualifications of the individual undertaking the study, and (b) are they appropriate for this subject matter. I've paid particular attention to the price for the study, \$46,284. I have to ask the minister if this \$46,284 is all-inclusive. Does it also include expenses for traveling, compilation of data, analysis, evaluation, and even printing of the final report? The other question I would have to ask in regard to the all-inclusiveness of the \$46,284 is whether there would be anyone else assisting this individual in preparing the report. Will sections be subcontracted?

The reason I ask that is because I believe \$46,284 is probably right in the range of or quite probably more than the annual salary of a professor at whatever institution he's at. Presumably, if the professor is receiving a salary of that magnitude at the institution where he is instructing or whatever, that institution expects a full year's work for a full year's salary. If that individual is getting \$46,000 or thereabouts, and I think that's in the area from my experience, I wonder how that individual can do two jobs at one time. In one year he would be getting \$46,000 generally from the institution to do a year's work. In this case we're asking him to do another year's work for \$46,000. I think that is pretty difficult to do. There may be ameliorating circumstances. For example, the time frame for this study may be two, three, or four years. I don't know; I'm not too sure if we've addressed that question yet. But if we do have the time frame of just one year for this particular study, if it's coincidental with the professor's responsibilities at the university, I have to seriously question whether that individual would have ample time to satisfactorily do the job. It may be, if he has subcontracted it out, he would find the time to do it. I would appreciate a response from the minister in regard to the allocation of the \$46,284. Is it for a one-year time frame, or is it for more than one year? Does it also include his expenses and whoever may be assisting him? And how does the professor propose to do this if the professor has an annual work commitment to an institution?

MR. FJORBOTTEN: I'd just like to make a couple of remarks. I have to admire the members on the opposition side of the House. They stick to their guns whether they're loaded or not. We can talk all night about farm accidents. I'm sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition would agree that many things are the result of a farm accident. He and I are probably a good example. Our accident was that we stayed in farming until the money was gone. The way things are right now, I'm sure that's true. I'm reminded of what Eisenhower once said. He said that some people take more words than necessary to tell more than they know. Right now, when we're discussing something like checking into finding out how accidents happen, if we knew the answers we certainly wouldn't have to look for them. We can sit and debate all night and probably end up defeating it. I suppose that would be like using a guillotine to cure dandruff.

I look at the constructive suggestions that have come from over there. They talk about lack of education on the farm. I agree. If somebody comes in and tells me that I'm not educated and don't understand what happens on the farm, I don't like it either. Many times I've thought that we should have some of the engineers who design that equipment, before they could work in a factory as an

engineer, go out and run it one season. Then we'd probably have fewer farm accidents. I know that certain people — I think of the Member for Edmonton Kingsway and probably the Member for Spirit River-Fairview. The way they wave their hands, if they talked to their combines like that, they certainly would be a farm accident.

Many of us can come up with suggestions on what we might do to prevent farm accidents. I have a big grain auger. It had a shield around it. It was an excellent shield; you could put your fingers in anywhere and you couldn't touch the auger. I don't care how fast that auger was running or how it was vibrating, or how long your fingers were either, there was no way you could ever get hurt. But the grain wouldn't run through it either, and you couldn't get it in the bin. I threw it off and the auger now sits in the open. There's a good example of something that could take off a leg or do something like that. I'm humored that the Leader of the Opposition says the minister gets \$60,000 a year and isn't coming up with anything more than a study. I make a lot less than \$60,000 a year — I think the Leader of the Opposition gets the same as a minister. So when we talk about what we're discussing right now, having a study into accidents is taking a constructive approach. I agree with the Member for Little Bow when he says that the Member for Lethbridge West with the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission has just a fantastic program. That's maybe one thing that we need. But you can't lump all farmers into one kettle. Every farmer operates a little bit differently, and every farm is different when you go there. I don't think that one general approach, right across the board, will do it. I would encourage all hon. members to support it tonight.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, something occurs to me which might be only a very brief addition to what the hon. Member for Macleod has been saying about certain remarks of members of the opposition this evening. It is a reference from Mark Twain that I have in mind. He said that it's not so much the things that people don't know that cause trouble in this world; it's the things they know that ain't so.

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, as to business tomorrow, we'll be in Committee of Supply. At this point, I can't say whether it will be Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation or Hospitals and Medical Care, but it would be one of those.

[At 10:20 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]