

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Monday, April 5, 1982 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to other members of the Assembly, 25 grade 6 students from Greenview elementary school in the constituency of Edmonton Mill Woods. They're here with their teacher Ada Moyles to view the building and the legislative process in operation. They're seated in the members gallery, and I ask them to rise and receive the traditional welcome of the Assembly.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you and to other members of the Assembly a group of grade 10 students from Edwin Parr high school in Athabasca. With them in the members gallery are their teachers Mrs. Rita Sequeira and Mr. Marvyn Rogers, and their bus driver Mr. Sherm Rounville. I ask them now to stand and be welcomed to the Assembly.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Hon. Mary LeMessurier, MLA for Edmonton Centre, I wish to introduce two classes. First of all, seated in the public gallery with their leader R. Godel are some 50 grade 6 students from Grandin elementary. The second group of some 17 students is from the Alberta Vocational Centre. Accompanied by their leader Elke Siebels, they are seated in the members gallery. I ask that the students and their leaders rise and receive the welcome of this Assembly.

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

**Public Lands and Wildlife**

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to announce National Wildlife Week, which begins today and concludes April 11.

Alberta, the other Canadian provinces, and the Northwest Territories, in co-operation with the Canadian Wildlife Federation, are sponsoring this important week. During Wildlife Week, I am announcing the formation of a new order: the Order of the Big Horn.

This new order will recognize those citizens and organizations who have made a significant contribution to the conservation of the fish and wildlife resources of the province. There will be several categories to the award, and nominations for the award will be solicited from the general public.

Wildlife Week is held annually to promote an increased awareness of our wildlife resources. Our fish and wildlife officers will be visiting schools throughout Alberta, explaining Alberta's wildlife management programs. Stu-

dents are being urged to enter a national poster contest being sponsored by the Canadian Wildlife Federation. In this contest, there will be provincial winners as well as national winners. As well, Wildlife Week educational information kits have been distributed to all Alberta schools, libraries, media representatives, and MLAs.

We have wildlife displays in the local malls, and they are being prepared by many fish and wildlife districts. In Edmonton, there will be displays in the West Edmonton mall and the Bonnie Doon mall, as well as in the foyer of the Bramalea Building on 108th Street.

Our wildlife resources are important to those of us who are campers, naturalists, hikers, artists, musicians, fishermen, and hunters, and to those Albertans who rely on wildlife resources as the source of their income.

To provide more of Alberta better public service with respect to our fish and wildlife resources, five new fish and wildlife offices are to be opened in the following locations: Fort Vermilion, Leduc, Vulcan, Hanna, and Coronation. As well, existing offices will be given more support staff. With our regional offices, there is now more capability for the fish and wildlife division to make resource decisions outside of Edmonton, often by people living and working in the area affected.

The theme chosen for Wildlife Week 1982 is How People Live with Wildlife. Here in Alberta, the fish and wildlife division is preparing to meet the future needs of both wildlife and people. Mr. Speaker, I foresee a bright future for Alberta's wildlife resources.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

**Municipal Financing**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, with regard to the new restrictions on municipal financing. Could the minister indicate whether a meeting has been established with the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association to discuss this plan that was sort of unilaterally announced in this Legislature?

MR. MOORE: First of all, Mr. Speaker, there are no restrictions whatever on municipal financing. In fact, contrary to the comments of the hon. member opposite, the Provincial Treasurer and I announced last week that with the exception of some criteria of the Local Authorities Board and the ability of the Municipal Financing Corporation to borrow, there would be no limits on municipal borrowing from that corporation during the next year.

If we had not announced a new program of very extensive interest subsidies to municipalities in this province last week, we would have reverted to the situation that exists elsewhere across Canada: 16.5 per cent interest. The situation is 11 per cent interest, so from the hon. member's question, I'm unable to tell what he's getting at. He may want to expand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister is rather defensive about a bad move. My question is: when is he going to meet with the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association to discuss this program which limits the number of years of assistance from this government?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, from time to time I meet with the Association of MDs and Counties and the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association to discuss these and

other matters. I don't know when I'll be meeting with them next, but certainly it will be within the next few weeks. At that time, if the Urban Municipalities Association has some representations to make, I'm sure they'll make them.

Throughout the course of the last several weeks, I have received a lot of comments from municipalities about the previous program, encouraging us to continue with some kind of interest rebates. Indeed, since our announcement last week, I've received a lot of very favorable comments from municipalities across this province, expressing the view that they were pleased that the government had seen fit to continue with an interest subsidy program down to 11 per cent when, in the rest of society, many are paying 19 per cent and 20 per cent.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Because of this Conservative government.

Mr. Speaker, could the hon. minister indicate what discussions took place with the rural and urban municipalities of this province, before this announcement was made in the Legislature?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to. First of all, the hon. member should understand that the introduction of this program for the current fiscal year was undertaken in consultation with the cabinet and the Provincial Treasurer. It's expenditure of government funds, and doesn't allow me to discuss in detail with others the exact level of that. The hon. Leader of the Opposition knows full well that that has always been the situation. [interjections]

Mr. Speaker, I can say that I invited, and received, extensive comments from municipalities and from both associations with respect to our interest stabilization program. It's been well received in the past, and it's been well received that we continued it.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate the reason for limiting the interest stabilization to five years?

MR. MOORE: The hon. member is mixed up again. We didn't limit anything. We had a program that expired on March 31, 1982; we introduced a new one that same day. The new one is for the 1982-83 fiscal year. It provides substantial benefits for municipalities across this province, in subsidizing the interest rates on money borrowed from the Municipal Financing Corporation. I see nothing limiting about that at all.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. On page 2 of his announcement, the hon. minister says:

... subsidies will be paid by Municipal Affairs for five years from the date of a debenture being issued by the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation, with the regular [AMFC] rate being paid after five years.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. minister: what does that mean, if it doesn't mean the term is not limited?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, as I said at the beginning of this conversation, if last week we had not introduced a new program for interest subsidies during the current fiscal year, municipalities would have reverted to the situation they were in for 25 years prior to 1974, in that they would have been paying whatever market interest rate the

Municipal Financing Corporation was able to provide. So I don't see anything limiting about it at all.

We assessed all the requirements for the Department of Municipal Affairs, and for assistance to municipal governments across this province, and decided we should continue with an 11 per cent interest rate, by way of our subsidy. It's the lowest interest rate any major borrowers are getting anywhere in this country. By suggesting that that would be paid for the first five years of the debenture, I suppose we were able to come to some agreement, if you like, between either paying the full 20 years and raising the interest rate to something higher or doing what we did. From most municipalities I've had favorable reactions to keeping the interest rate at 11 per cent and paying it for the first five years of the debenture, rather than for the life of the debenture, whatever it might be. Bear in mind that some of those debentures run only five years, some run 10. On average, they run about 20.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the hon. minister going to take the initiative to establish a meeting with the rural and urban municipalities of this province to hear their input on this policy, which could still be changed during this Legislature?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. Leader of the Opposition doesn't follow me. On Tuesday afternoon, I announced this program in the Legislature. That evening in Calgary, I met with the executive of the Association of MDs and Counties. I met with the entire delegate body at their annual meeting the following day. The day previous to announcing this program in the Legislative Assembly, I talked by telephone with the president of the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association and discussed this very matter with him. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has to know all those details before he can suggest that there hasn't been consultation, or that I'm not willing to meet with either association or any of their members. I do that on a continual basis.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, that isn't the feedback I get.

A further supplementary question. Could the hon. minister indicate what effect this change in policy could have with regard to tax implications, in terms of property tax or other kinds of taxes on municipalities across this province?

MR. MOORE: It will have a very beneficial effect in allowing municipalities to maintain reasonable increases in property taxes. If, effective this fiscal year, we had not introduced a new program subsidizing interest rates to 11 per cent for the first five years of a debenture, this year there would have been an average increase in municipal property taxes of about 10 per cent, at least for major urban centres. The introduction of this program, in the way I outlined it last week, has meant that at least over the first five years of any debenture borrowing they do, the interest cost to municipalities will not be increased over past years. In 1983, for Edmonton and Calgary that will result in about a 10 per cent reduction in what might be the case if those two cities were located in any other province in Canada.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The minister indicated that he received representation and, as I recollect his answer, that the day before the announcement was made he talked to the president of the

Alberta Urban Municipalities Association. During the course of either the representation from or the discussion with the president of the Urban Municipalities Association, did the minister outline the option which would include the five-year limit? And, if so, what response did he receive from the organizations in question?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, during the question period I'm not at liberty to outline private conversations with the president of the Urban Municipalities Association or anyone else.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question. Then in terms of the representation the government received prior to the announcement, can the minister advise the Assembly whether, in discussions with officials of either of the two municipal organizations, any discussion was initiated by the minister outlining the options, one of those options being the five-year limit?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, in conversations I had with urban as well as rural municipalities, a number of options were considered. The most talked-about option was the province increasing the interest rate by way of fixing a limit on the maximum subsidy we would pay below this current 16.5 per cent. In my view, there was wide expectation throughout the province that there would be an increase in the effective interest rate to beyond 11 per cent. There was not a great deal of discussion about providing the subsidy for the first five years of a debenture. However, a number of representations were made with respect to maintaining at previous levels the subsidy on loans which have been taken out over the past years.

There is some confusion, particularly in the media, about what we are doing with respect to debentures approved prior to April 1, 1982. The situation will not change from what existed previously; that is, we will be paying the interest subsidy on loans right through to their maturity, whether [that] be 15, 20, or 25 years. Mr. Speaker, that means that there are many municipalities that have borrowed funds in the area of 8 per cent to 11 per cent, and the interest subsidy will be paid by this government for the full life of the debenture, which may run for another 18 or 19 years.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a supplementary question to the minister. What will happen when the interest rates go down to 6 per cent and 7 per cent again? Will municipalities be locked in at the higher rate over the long haul?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is making a prediction we hope comes true rather quickly. But that question would be better directed to the Provincial Treasurer, who is the minister responsible for the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I believe the interest would continue as per the original contract.

#### Grain Transportation

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my second question is to the Minister of Agriculture, with regard to the shortfall of boxcars to ship grain out of Alberta to the coast. I wonder if the minister could indicate what assessment has been done. Have any meetings been held with CPR,

CNR, or the Canadian Wheat Board since the beginning of 1982, with regard to this problem?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, since the start of 1982, the availability of rolling stock has been limited only on very short terms. On the overall basis, for the last three months sufficient rolling stock has been available in the way of hopper cars for the movement of grain from Alberta, west and east.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question with regard to the shortfall being about 50 per cent, in terms of the actual number of cars being taken to the coast. Has the minister made any representation to the Canadian Wheat Board, with regard to that problem?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, we had the opportunity to discuss on the short term with the Canadian Wheat Board the movement of most grain which moves west on behalf of Alberta producers, and have looked at the area of rolling stock compared to the availability of space on track. In other words, at times the availability of rolling stock for the movement of grain far exceeds the capacity to move, in some cases. We had initial meetings on that basis and, in many cases, it works out to be a problem for a short period of time. Depending upon the type of grain and the sale negotiated, the shortfall then seems to lend itself to a closer tie to a number of cars that could move barley, say, if it happened to be either of the malt variety or feed.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In his recent assessment, could the hon. minister indicate whether any demurrage charges are being incurred at the west coast at present, because the boxcars are not taking the grain to the west coast when it's needed?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, no more than the average, that I'm aware of. I would be pleased to look into the matter if there were some particular cases, but the information I have is that it's about normal for Vancouver.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister take on a commitment to review the matter with the Alberta Wheat Pool, the Canadian Wheat Board, and the two railroads, within the next week or two, to bring us in this Legislature up to date on the matter and, as well, place a little pressure on the system?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, there's always pressure, on behalf of producers in this province, to keep the rolling stock going, whether it happens to be through the port facilities or rolling stock itself. The negotiations are ongoing, and I would be pleased to bring back the most current report.

#### Constitution — Aboriginal Rights

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. It deals with our constitution — or at least the Canada Act, to be back on the 17th — and Section 37, which is the section dealing with a conference on aboriginal rights. Is the minister in a position to confirm plans for a federal/provincial ministers' meeting

in Fredericton on May 3 and 4, to discuss treaty Indian matters and, amongst these concerns, plans for the constitutional conference on aboriginal rights, as outlined in Section 37 of the constitutional resolution?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, there is in fact a meeting of ministers responsible for native affairs, to be convened in New Brunswick on those dates. However, the agenda is not quite as the member suggests. It deals more with local matters: the concerns of economic growth, land claims, and items of that order. It is not suggested that that meeting will deal with constitutional preambles or a constitutional meeting, which is spelled out in the Constitution Act.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is either the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs or the hon. Minister responsible for Native Affairs in a position to advise the House why there has not been formal consultation with both the Indian Association of Alberta and the Metis Association of Alberta concerning this meeting in Fredericton? The reason I ask is that both the governments of Quebec and New Brunswick have gone through that consultative process.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I can't speak for the Minister responsible for Native Affairs. I can say that as recently as today I had a conversation with the president of the Indian Association of Alberta, setting forth the Alberta position with respect to representations at inter-provincial meetings of this type, and we had a chance to discuss the agenda and this issue.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either hon. minister. In addition to the conversation the minister alluded to, will there be any opportunity for formal representation by the chiefs or formally, through the Indian Association of Alberta and the Metis Association of Alberta, before the Fredericton meeting? Perhaps I could put this question directly to the Minister responsible for Native Affairs.

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the meeting in Fredericton, basically three items are on the agenda. Land claims is one, Indian government is the second, and the third is economic assistance to the native bands. There has been no consideration of the constitution. Over the last year, I think there's been a great deal of discussion, as far as the native people are concerned in the constitution, and that will be coming up again at the first ministers' conference within a year of the return of the constitution to Canada. So it's not on the agenda of the provincial ministers.

With regard to native representation, it's left up to the individual provinces whether they have any native representation on their delegation.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Bearing in mind that answer, will there be native representation on the Alberta delegation?

DR. McCRIMMON: We haven't had any discussion with the Indian Association of Alberta or the Metis Association of Alberta on that subject. We'll discuss it with them in due course.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has any date been set for discussions with both organiza-

tions? Can we be given the assurance that prior to the Fredericton meeting, there will in fact be a formal meeting between either hon. gentleman, or both, and the two organizations, to discuss this very question?

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, the date was just set a few days ago, for early June, and it's being chaired by the Premier of New Brunswick. We haven't had an opportunity, not knowing the exact timing. But in due course, we'll be in touch with the Indian Association of Alberta and the Metis Association of Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Can the Premier advise the Assembly whether the government of Alberta has developed any position yet with respect to representation from the aboriginal people at the first ministers' conference to discuss Section 37? Has the government decided whether aboriginal people should be there as observers or participants?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, as yet we've made no decision, or even had an opportunity to have an assessment, with regard to that matter.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the Premier indicate what initiatives the government has in mind, in terms of meeting with the Indian and Metis people of Alberta to develop a position? Bearing in mind the importance of this issue and the Premier's comments on November 9, when may we expect a position by the government of Alberta on this important matter?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe we have any timetable or any useful information I could give the hon. member on that matter. I do recall that we provided financing, as we committed to do, to the Metis Association and the [Federation of] Metis Settlements to do some research work they wanted to do, which they thought would be quite extensive.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs in a position to give the House some indication as to when the first ministers' meeting to deal with Section 37 will be, and what preliminary meetings are planned by the respective provincial ministers prior to that?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, as I answered in the House — I believe within the last two weeks — we have no firm timetable with respect to the requirement to have a first ministers' conference under Section 37 of the Constitution Act. One of my officials was in Ottawa this past week and could not confirm any date. In fact, the priority of the federal government at this point is to get the constitution home. Once that has been accomplished, they would then set to work to put together the arrangements for the first ministers' conference. I can't hazard any guess as to when that might be.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question to the minister. It is my understanding that a representative from the federal Privy Council office travelled across the country to meet provincial governments and gauge views on Section 37. What position did the government of Alberta indicate when that meeting took place?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that the meeting with the Privy Council has taken place in, the province of Alberta at this point.

#### **Wildlife Programs**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife comes from his ministerial statement. I guess I am the only person in this Assembly who they ever named a program after: Buck for Wildlife. I'm sure the government thought of that when they named it. [interjections]

The Buck for Wildlife program is to enhance the amount of habitat available to our game birds and game animals. Can the minister indicate if that program is proving effective? Some hunters I've spoken to don't seem to see any impact. From the minister's studies, is there any indication that that program is proving effective?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, it's proving very effective, not only in the money being spent but also in the public relations aspect. People are aware of the need to protect the habitat, be they private land owners or people utilizing the resources. The money is being well spent. I think it's a very good program, because of the impact it has on wildlife itself and on public awareness of the importance of wildlife to our society.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister indicate if the department's Buck for Wildlife program is encouraging farmers to allow some of their land to grow into a wild state, so it has cover for wild animals and birds?

MR. MILLER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. You are probably aware that in conjunction with the county of Red Deer we have a project around the municipality of Red Deer. Not only have we had farmers participating and a payment schedule for them, but we also have a large sign that they put up in their gateways, saying they are participating in the program. It's a very worth-while program we hope to expand to the rest of the province.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a follow-up to a question I asked the minister earlier in the session. Does the minister have an assessment of what effect the late spring and the heavy snows are having on our wild animals? Many of them are calving at this time of year.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, there are certain areas of the province, particularly west of Edmonton, where we have a concern about the deep snow and the effect it is having on the animals. To this point in time, we haven't had any dramatic deaths because of starvation or other features, but it's a concern we are watching very closely.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. I see in the news release that five additional wildlife offices will be opened. Can the minister indicate if in the wildlife offices there is going to be an emphasis on enforcement, or are they information offices or a combination of both?

MR. MILLER: Basically speaking, Mr. Speaker, they're a combination of both. We hope our wildlife officers are spending 80 per cent of their time in awareness programs, where they are conducting public relations in the schools and with people in general, to let them know about the

importance of wildlife to the people of Alberta, and 20 per cent of their time on enforcement procedures.

#### **Business Corporations Legislation**

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Under the new Alberta corporations Act, all companies have to register with the companies branch. In order to register, can a company file these necessary forms itself, or does it have to hire an outside firm to file for it?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, in response to earlier questions on that and during the course of my review of the estimates, I believe I indicated that the continuance under the new Alberta Business Corporations Act would be without a fee payable to the corporate registry section of the department for a year, commencing February 1 this year. The documents need not be prepared by outside assistance. The needed information should be available on the body of the forms, which would assist the individual director in the preparation of the documentation.

#### **Oil and Gas Industry Assistance**

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, my question today is to the hon. Premier. Has the Premier made any recent representation to the federal government to change the destructive energy and interest rate policies that are destroying the oil industry in this province?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources responded in the House, with regard to the energy issue. But with regard to the question of interest rates, I'm not sure what the hon. member refers to as "recent". I believe he is aware — as are most Albertans — that we took the lead on that subject at the economic conference of first ministers, and have started a pretty strong debate in this country that there is a choice. We do not need automatically to follow the United States' interest rate policies. There is a choice for Canada, and we believe the choice should be made.

It is my intention to follow up on that in a number of different ways. I had hoped to have gone into that at the conference of western premiers at the end of April. But as the hon. member is aware, that meeting has been postponed as a result of other events. This spring, it is my intention to continue the effort we have made to communicate to Canadians and to build up pressure to have a different monetary policy in Canada, so we do not have a continuation of these interest rates that are unnecessarily high and so difficult for our farmers and small business people.

MR. KESLER: A supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Is the government considering any specific — and I reiterate "specific" — programs that would give new life to the energy industry, so the economic life line of this province is not totally severed?

MR. LEITCH: As I've said earlier in the Assembly on a number of occasions, Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes.

MR. KESLER: A supplementary. Could the hon. minister indicate what specific programs he has in mind?

MR. LEITCH: No I can't at this time, Mr. Speaker. We are having discussions, both with the associations representing various segments of the industry and with a number of individuals in the industry. They are making suggestions and recommendations to us. We are closely examining all their suggestions and recommendations.

MR. KESLER: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. minister give us a time frame when these specifics will be implemented?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I don't know that I can give a specified date. Certainly we have been giving very careful consideration to a number of recommendations and suggestions. We would like to make those decisions as speedily as possible, because we recognize the importance of doing it soon. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, we have to recognize the importance of doing it right. Ensuring that it will be done right takes some time. Certainly if I had to express a time, I would suggest that it would be a matter of weeks.

MR. KESLER: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. While the federal government's national energy program is crushing the oil industry in the province, would the provincial government undertake a policy of not granting further exploration and lease rights to the federal government's oil company, PetroCan, or to any other federal corporation?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, that's not something we have under active consideration.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

9. Moved by Mr. Crawford:

Be it resolved that when the House adjourns on Wednesday, April 7, 1982, it shall stand adjourned until Thursday, April 15, 1982.

[Motion carried]

### head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

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

#### Department of the Environment

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring up a few matters related to the area of southeast Edmonton. One relates to the transportation of hazardous materials from Refinery Row. Right now, many of the large trucks are using the 50th Street corridor, and many residents wonder whether such traffic can be diverted another way. This of course relates to the ring road idea. I would like to find out from the minister what progress there is with regard to acquiring land for a ring road, and what developments there are in the southeast quadrant, in relation to the ring road. I know that the ring road is a massive undertaking. But could the ring road be develop-

ed in parts, so areas such as southeast Edmonton could have the benefit of part of the diversion of this type of traffic from the southeast area?

Another concern of southeast residents affects home-owners. They have been experiencing a major problem with regard to flooding. I realize this is a civic issue; the city of Edmonton is primarily responsible. It has reached the point, though, where home-owners feel they are hostages to their situation: they fear leaving their homes during the summer, because any downpour or thunderstorm could precipitate flooded basements throughout the entire area.

The area is only about 20 to 25 years old. It affects the Ottewell and Holyrood areas and Rowland Road. It is my understanding that the problem results from combining sanitation and storm sewers; secondly, hookups from the Eastgate and Mill Woods areas have overtaxed the capacity of the trunk system. Because of this rapid growth, there is now an impact on an established area.

Many home-owners have finished their basements, and insurance companies are now unwilling to renew insurance to safeguard against such flooding in the homes. A local citizens' action committee has been formed to try to get action from the city government; however, the city has indicated that as a result of growth, their priorities are different. They can only address the question somewhere in the area of 1992, and the citizens find this unacceptable.

I would like to ask the minister: if the city of Edmonton were to approach the Minister of the Environment, is there any possibility that he could give some indication as to whether he would entertain looking at the problem? I think some financial assistance would be required, if the city government were to go ahead and try to remedy this particular problem.

Those are the two concerns I would like to relate to the minister this afternoon.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to bring up only two areas with regard to the Department of the Environment. It's my intention to ask several supplementaries on them after the minister has responded.

The first is with regard to the Scarpe Creek area in the southwestern portion of the province. Sometime last year, the minister went to the Scarpe Creek area and surveyed the damage done by the pine bark beetle, also surveyed the logging practices there. As a result of his visit to the area, the minister made recommendations to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources which I understand, through responses by the minister in the Legislative Assembly, were carried out. Could the minister elaborate on those recommendations he made to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, and report on the actions taken since that time?

The second subject is with regard to the sulphur emissions from the Shell and Gulf plants in the Pincher Creek area, and the co-ordination the department is undertaking in regard to studies being done there. It is my understanding that the Alberta government is going to sponsor or initiate a health review program, the objective of which is to identify the adverse implications of the sulphur emissions from those two gas plants on humans living in that area. It is my understanding that the study being undertaken is not as comprehensive as that recommended by the Canadian health association. I'd like to know from the minister what role his department is playing with regard to that health study.

I do understand that these two subject areas are within the purview of not only the Department of the Environment but others as well. Looking at the description of the portfolio, the Department of the Environment is

... responsible for the coordination of the policies, programmes, services, and [other] administrative procedures, departments, and agencies of the [Crown] ....

So I would expect that this department would not only be in the forefront in knowing what is going on but actually be there in initiating and recommending the initiation of these programs.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TOPOLNISKY: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the hon. Minister of the Environment. Many farmers in the northern counties and MDs have large areas of flooded agricultural land, and land that could be rehabilitated for agricultural purposes is under water. The farm water management program would certainly be very beneficial to these flooded areas. Farmers need agricultural and technical advice to be able to drain this land. What services are available through the Department of the Environment to enable farmers to add acres to their farming operations and increase agricultural productivity?

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, before the minister responds, I have a couple of short questions I'd like him to consider. Recognizing the regional landfill concept developed throughout this province, would the minister give us some indication as to whether any consideration has been given to the incineration of municipal waste as a conservation measure on agricultural land, as one other option tried out in many other jurisdictions and proven fairly successful? It also has an energy potential in some areas, where the by-product of incineration has been the generation of steam ultimately used for heating some municipal buildings in those areas. In summing up, would he give us any information he has on that issue?

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I certainly look forward to the discussion of the estimates of the hon. Minister of the Environment, and have a number of comments to make.

Before I get into discussion of the Suncor report, I want to make a few observations about the whole question of sour gas plants and, in particular, the situation in the Savanna area. Savanna is just north of Spirit River, for members who aren't too well acquainted with the Peace River country. Members are probably aware that because of the very delicate soil situation in the Peace River country, large parts of the area are particularly susceptible to fall-out from sour gas plants. In the Savanna region, we have a lot of concern over a proposal by a company to develop a sour gas plant. Hearings have been held by the ERCB. As a matter of fact, they took place about a week and a half ago. To illustrate the interest, Mr. Chairman, during the two days these hearings occurred in a little community, some 300 people attended on both days. I think that indicates the widespread concern of people in that area.

I was interested in the remarks the Member for Calgary Buffalo raised about the situation in Pincher Creek. I know the concern people there have about the health hazards — or at least the alleged health hazards — as a consequence of the Gulf and Shell plants in the Pincher Creek area. The concern in the Peace extends not only to

the health hazards but, because of the soil, to the impact this kind of plant would have on the future of agriculture in the area. As I said, it's not very often that you find a very strong public response to hearings of one kind or another, but I think members of the ERCB themselves were astounded to see that kind of turnout from people in the area. Virtually every single person in the community turned out to those hearings.

Mr. Chairman, while we have regulations, which the ERCB applies, I would argue to the minister and to members of the committees that it seems to me that we have to be somewhat more stringent in the application of those rules, as far as putting in scrubbing equipment in the Peace is concerned, because of the impact on the soil. Mr. Chairman, we make small gain by providing a few jobs through the extraction of gas if the impact is such that it lowers the capacity of a given area to produce food. Of course, that's the concern people in the community brought to the ERCB in record numbers, or at least record numbers for that part of Alberta. I don't expect the minister to comment on a particular application before the board, but I do think representation has to be made on the larger question of the soils in the Peace River country in particular. We have to be somewhat more stringent in insisting that where sour gas plants are proposed, we have installation of scrubbing equipment so emissions can be reduced.

I want to move from there to deal for a few moments with this question of the hazardous waste disposal plant in Beaver county. I know it's always difficult to find a location for a hazardous [waste] disposal plant. I don't suppose any community is going to welcome it although, by a news report over the weekend, I understand that apparently the town of Hanna has indicated some interest in having this project undertaken close to it.

It seems to me that there are a lot of reasons it shouldn't proceed in Beaver county. But whether the minister agrees with those reasons, I think one thing that should be explored in total during his estimates is what the government proposes to do in terms of the results of the plebiscite in Beaver county. I hope we can get a clear commitment from the minister this afternoon that the government will abide by the results of that plebiscite. I understand that a few people are taking around a petition supporting the project, and a much larger number have indicated their opposition to it. Mr. Chairman, the point I want to make is that whichever way the plebiscite goes, and if that plebiscite is strongly opposed to the siting of a hazardous waste disposal plant in Beaver county, I hope the minister will accept that and begin to look around for another site.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move from there to the question of the Suncor emission. In the House about a month ago, I was rather interested when the minister tabled this pollution control division Summary of Suncor Inc. Wastewater Treatment System Performance, June 1978 to Date. He advised me to read it, almost as if this were proof positive that the department had been doing its job. Mr. Chairman, I did read it, and if this is a yardstick of the department's performance, I think the minister had better take a second look at what he considers performance. When you have the company exceeding the standards set out in the Clean Water Act for all but seven of 43 months, I say to the minister that that just simply isn't good enough.

I well remember the discussion that took place in this province when the former government passed the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act. Amendments were

made when this government came into office, and there's no doubt that we have good legislation on the books. But legislation is only as good as is the department, in terms of its competence in implementing that legislation. When one looks over the report the minister himself put out on the emissions by Suncor, one really has to wonder where the department was over this period of 43 months, what it takes to constitute a violation of the Clean Water Act, and what it takes to cause the government finally to lay charges, as they did on March 19.

Mr. Chairman, a number of things genuinely concern me about what happened at Fort McMurray. The first is that the emissions were allowed to continue for such a period of time without a proper control order being issued by the government. The second thing that concerns me is that it would appear that that evidence was accumulating, and nobody notified the people downstream who were affected. We have a period of at least a month between the meeting the Suncor people had with the band at Fort McKay and the decision of the government to say, all right, we have to be serious about this, let's get busy. You had at least a month when no notification had taken place. But far beyond that limited time horizon, we had a period of 43 months. In only seven of those 43 months was the company meeting its obligations under the terms of its licence to operate under the Clean Water Act. If it exceeded the allowable, if you like, for 36 of those 43 months, where is the obligation of the company to notify people downstream and — this is even more important — the obligation of the provincial government to notify people downstream? We cannot just blithely say, well, it's up to the company; perhaps we can have the company examined; we now have this inquiry into what occurred.

Mr. Chairman, we have an inquiry into what occurred. But when I look over the terms of reference of the inquiry, it is essentially the ERCB and the department examining themselves and the company. Mr. Minister, what we should have is a totally impartial inquiry which would look at the performance of the company and of the Department of the Environment, in terms of protecting the people in the area.

I well remember when we had an oil spill on the Athabasca River in 1970, and the now Premier was Leader of the Opposition. A few members who are presently in the caucus were sitting on the opposition side. Quite properly, Mr. Chairman, the now Provincial Treasurer and the now Premier raised the roof over this oil spill. I still remember seeing the then Leader of the Opposition on television. One of the most searing indictments the now Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, made about the former government was that they had an interdepartmental inquiry into what happened on that oil spill. The now Premier, then Leader of the Opposition said, how in heaven's name can you investigate yourself; we should have some kind of independent investigation. The now Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, was correct in 1970, Mr. Minister. But I ask the members of the government: if it was correct to have an independent investigation about an oil spill on the Athabasca River in 1970, why isn't it equally right in 1982 to have a totally impartial, independent investigation not only of the company but of the role of the Department of the Environment?

Mr. Chairman, I have the release by Chief Dorothy MacDonald of the Fort McKay Band. I'd like to outline some of the concerns Chief MacDonald has raised, and ask the minister specifically what the department is going

to do to meet those proposals. Her outline of inquiry needs goes as follows — so that I am not inaccurate, I'll read them all into the record: Then the minister will have an opportunity to respond on how the government proposes to meet those requests of Chief MacDonald. I make this without apology, Mr. Chairman, because this is the band that has to face the implications of the 36 of 43 months the Department of the Environment did not follow through on its obligations.

The band has requested that the inquiry "be held under the Inquiries Act". Well, we haven't got that. I guess the question I put to the minister is, why not?

- 2) ... [there be] an independent expert on human health to sit as a member of the Board of Inquiry.
- 3) The Fort McKay Indian Band to appoint an independent expert in the field of human health to sit as a member of the Board of Inquiry.
- 4) Fort McKay to be given sufficient funding to allow it to hire experts in the field of environmental health and toxicology to examine the evidence and to testify at the Inquiry.
- 5) The Inquiry to be held in June to give the Fort McKay Indian Band adequate time to prepare for the Inquiry ....
- 6) The Board of Inquiry to hold community hearings in Fort McKay to ensure that the evidence of community members will be heard.

The terms of reference, Mr. Chairman — and I outline this in a little detail, because I'd like the minister to take the opportunity before the members of the committee, before we pass his estimates, to respond in some detail to the concerns expressed by Chief MacDonald on behalf of the band:

#### TERMS OF REFERENCE

- 1) To examine both the air and water pollution record of Suncor with a view to design change and legal action.

We already have the announcement by the department that legal action will be undertaken.

- 2) To examine all impacts on the Athabasca River including sewage effluent from Fort McMurray and usage by Syncrude.
- 3) To examine the cumulative impact on the Athabasca River from existing and future oil sands development including increased sewage effluent from municipal development.
- 4) To examine potential health impacts from current air and water pollution from the oil sands plants and the potential for health impacts from future oil sands development.
- 5) To review the handling of toxic chemicals within the Suncor plant (i.e. PCB) that are not directly process related to determine the means of handling them and their ultimate disposal.

Those are the specific requests, several of which have been met in a qualified way by the minister's announcement. But I'd like to put those to him directly, in any event, and ask him to respond to them formally in the Legislature, so that we have his position, as it were, on the record in the committee before we vote supply for the Department of the Environment.

Mr. Chairman, I think one really has to spend a little time to find out why people weren't notified. This does concern me. It's fine for the Minister of Municipal Affairs to say that they had alternative sources of drinking water. The fact of the matter is that for years, people have used the Athabasca River as their primary source of drinking water. This isn't the first time we have had what appears



to me to be a failure on the part of somebody, either the Department of the Environment or the company, to notify people downstream.

We had the situation last year with the PCB spills of 1974 and 1978 at the Procter & Gamble plant in Grande Prairie. A spill apparently got out of hand. People downstream on the Wapiti, the Smoky, and ultimately the Peace River, with the town of Peace River having its water intake — so it's conceivable they could have been affected. We had a situation where the department and the company decided that rather than raise concerns, people weren't notified. As I understand the situation in our neighboring province, where a hazardous spill has taken place, there is an obligation on the part of the government, not on the company, to notify people who could be potentially affected by it.

So it isn't good enough to simply say, this is Suncor and Suncor is to blame. Perhaps they are in part, but it seems to me there's an obligation on the part of a department. If the department isn't going to be the defender of people who could be affected from a health point of view, where a dangerous violation of the Clean Water Act has occurred, then who is going to be the public protector in this case?

Mr. Chairman, we have an inquiry into the company; we have charges against the company. But nowhere do we seem to have anybody investigating whether this department was doing its job according to the law. As I look over the evidence, it seems to me that one has to be awfully charitable to conclude that the department has been doing its job in policing the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act. I look at some of these examples: 1980, 2,239 air pollution violations by the province's sour gas plants; 1981, 139 SO<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>S emission violations by Syncrude and Suncor; 1980-81, 357 vinyl chloride monomer emission violations by Dow Chemical and 83 violations by Diamond Shamrock over a 20-month period. Then Suncor, where for all but seven of 43 months, the company was in violation of the limits.

Mr. Chairman, you can say as much as you like that we have to work with the industry. That's true. I don't think anyone would argue that there isn't an important responsibility to work as closely as possible. But there have to be limits as well. Over a period of 43 months, we have continued violations — it's not just the violation of the clean water standards; it's the violation of the clean air standards. When are we going to act? As I said, we now have charges being laid, but almost four years after the violations were recorded.

That kind of action after the fact doesn't lead me to the conclusion that we have the kind of tough environmental policies this government told us they were going to bring in in 1971, when we had Mr. Yurko running around saying that polluters should pay. We had the now Premier on television every second day talking about oil spills. I remember the problems and serious difficulties in Swan Hills, and the tremendous furor the opposition created about those issues, and properly so. But where are they now, Mr. Chairman?

So I would say to members of the committee that I think the minister has some answering to do. Just so there's a complete review of the questions: first of all, in addition to the points that the Member for Calgary Buffalo raised about sour gas plants, I'd like him to deal specifically with the implications for the Peace River country. Secondly, on the hazardous wastes disposal plant, I want to get a commitment from this government as to whether we are going to see them abide by the

ratepayers' decision in Beaver county — a clear, unequivocal yes or no. Finally, with respect to the Suncor violations, I'd like the minister to respond in some detail, including a response to the concerns expressed by Chief MacDonald. Then, Mr. Chairman, I'll probably have some more comments a little later on in the estimates.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister would be good enough to comment with respect to several issues which impinge upon the whole area of Calgary, but in particular the southeast quadrant of the city. The first is with respect to the dismantling and removal of any difficult waste material that was on the site of the CIL explosives plant. It's my understanding that most of that work has been completed and that the bulk of the material was transported to the state of Oregon for disposal. I wonder if the minister would comment further in that regard.

Another matter with respect to the southeast portion of the city of Calgary, which affects other parts of Calgary when the wind changes direction, is the Western Co-op Fertilizers plant. I know that various emissions come forth from that facility. I went out to tour the facility late last year, and I understand that most of the emission from the CIL plant that is apparent to the human eye comes off in the form of water vapor. I wonder if the minister could confirm or deny that, in addition to the other kinds of emissions.

Also I understand that through your department, certain other guidelines and checks and balances have been put in place with Western Co-op Fertilizers, and that you and your department have had discussions with the principals involved. I wonder if you might be good enough to give the Assembly some kind of updating with respect to when these various controls will be put in place, what they are, and if this also has some spinoff effect with respect to their operation in the Medicine Hat area.

Those would be the two prime areas of concern to the southeast part of Calgary, Calgary Millican. It's my understanding that we have not had too much difficulty with the Alberta Processing in southeast Calgary. But in conversation with you, I understand there was some possibility of relocation of that facility as well. I wonder if you have an updated time line with respect to that particular plant.

One other matter is with respect to the former oil refinery site in Ogden, along the east bank of the Bow River across from the sewage treatment facility in Bonnybrook, which is also in Calgary Millican. I wonder if you could comment with respect to the clean-up of that oil refinery site, which is quite close to one of the flyovers of the Deerfoot Trail. As I go through the constituency on a regular basis, I keep looking at the area and see more and more rubble being put in place there. I wonder if your department has had time to do a soil analysis of what is left there on a residual basis, and if it causes any ongoing problem with respect to leaching of material into the Bow River to feed on further down.

Mr. Chairman, my final comment would be through you to the Member for Spirit River-Fairview. This afternoon, he made reference in considerable detail to some correspondence or a document delivered by Chief Dorothy MacDonald of Fort MacKay. I wonder if he would be good enough to share that information with other members of the Assembly. A considerable number of us throughout the whole Assembly are interested with respect to the ramifications of that particular situation.

Thank you.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, if you'd like to have it . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Chair understand that by that tabling, this could be made available to all members?

MR. NOTLEY: Yes. Would you like me to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, we will. Do any other members wish to comment?

MR. KESLER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to address the debate on Environment. I'd like to address my comments to the hon. minister in charge. As I've had some opportunity to be in contact with the people of the Beaver county area, I know the great concern they have. I've looked at the recommendations put forth by the Hazardous Waste Team Implementation Program, to indicate to the minister the preferences and the preferential areas for a hazardous wastes plant. I'm somewhat concerned that the four priority areas were in fact omitted, and a supplementary area was chosen.

I'm also concerned that the people in that area had enough initiative to bring forth petitions and, on minor flaws of gathering names or intricacies dealing with the way the petition was handled, the minister rejects the importance of it. The hon. minister said that the hazardous wastes plant would not be put into an area unless the people of that area were in favor. I find it interesting that now it gets down to the council representing all the people, when there were 600 names on a petition and those 600 people have been overlooked. In fact, there were two petitions. The original one had over 900 people on it; the second was 600.

I know this isn't the first problem with conditions affecting our environment in Alberta in recent months. In the Black Diamond-Turner Valley area, they've had considerable problems with emissions. It's been going on for some years, and only recently has the department investigated and done anything substantial to alleviate the problem. I commend them for doing that, but I also know that that problem has existed for some time. It took a long time before action was taken, and it was done because of severe pressure by some of the residents of that community.

My concern is that the minister says that if the people don't want a hazardous wastes plant in an area, it won't be there. We now read that the people of the Hanna area would welcome such a hazardous wastes plant. If the people of the area — not the council — are inclined to agree, I think that area should at least be explored as an alternative, or other areas should be explored as alternatives, and that the minister should pay closer attention to the recommendations that have been implemented by his team.

I wonder if the reason these petitions and situations mentioned by the hon. member of the NDP concerning the Suncor dumping are not being ignored because of government involvement in business. Alberta Energy Company is involved in the petrochemical industry, the forestry industry, and exploration. I wonder if the people of the province are paying because they would like to ignore the rules of the game. I wonder how the government can enforce rules in a province when they're part of the ball game. I think it's something the people of the province have to look at and realize that that's what happens when government gets involved in competition with the private sector. They don't want to live by the

rules any more than anybody else. Because of that, the action taken is always much slower.

In closing, I'd just like to say that my specific concerns right now are the hazardous wastes situation in Beaver county and the pollution of the atmosphere by many of our gas plants in Alberta. Perhaps the hon. minister should remember the comments by the opposition in 1971, prior to forming this government — that they relate back to the concern they had at that time, and initiate policies immediately to protect the people and future of the province.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to address a couple of remarks. A number of members have spoken on the question of the location of a proper facility for the disposal of hazardous wastes. I'd simply like to address to the minister and members of the committee this comment with respect to hazardous wastes.

During the debate that is occurring with respect to the location of a hazardous wastes facility, from time to time there appears to be a lack of recognition that at the present time those hazardous wastes are being disposed of in this province. In respect of the city of Calgary, those wastes are being disposed of at an open landfill site in the Forest Lawn area. That's where all the hazardous wastes from the Calgary area are being dumped. On behalf of the constituents of Calgary Forest Lawn, we urge the minister and this government not to lose sight of the fact that at the present time, these wastes are being dumped in a facility that is not proper and not protecting the environment in the complete way that we believe a proper facility will. As difficult a decision as this is to arrive at, we in Forest Lawn can certainly appreciate the concern certain residents have voiced about a facility for the disposal of hazardous wastes. Surely wherever that facility is located has to be a far better thing than the way they are presently being treated.

I thought I would just take this opportunity to remind the committee. I don't think I need to remind the minister. I think he's well aware of the fact there is a desperate need in this province for the proper handling and treatment of hazardous wastes, because right now the people of Calgary Forest Lawn are very concerned about the way these wastes are being dealt with.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a couple of brief comments about the process the committee followed in the location of the hazardous waste disposal site. I attended one of the public meetings and was certainly impressed with the tremendous amount of material presented to the public in Alberta. It has been brought to my attention by a professional engineer involved in underground water as his specialty that this is the only province and the only area in North American that has followed this process of consultation with residents before a location has been decided upon.

Obviously this type of consultation brings about controversy, as the location of that type of plant is an emotional issue. As with the development of roadways or any type of development, most residents are not anxious to have development take place near their residence. Obviously with the hazards associated with the movement of wastes and the treatment of the products that would be delivered to this site, it is certainly understandable that there's going to be concern.

I compliment the minister and his department for the methodology they have chosen to find suitable and appropriate locations. For anyone interested in attending

these meetings, it was easy to see the tremendous amount of research and background that had gone into narrowing down which sites would have the least long-term or harmful effects on many factors too numerous to list in detail, such as ground water and animal life. I do think the process is a healthy one. Even though there is controversy, and I'm sure there will always be, as to where the final location is, I believe the process of consultation is a very healthy one. I certainly support the route the minister has taken, and I hope we are able to resolve the final location within the next number of months.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If there are no further comments, perhaps the minister could respond.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, a number of questions were asked on Friday, so I'll start with those. There may be some overlapping with questions asked today, but perhaps I can deal with similar questions by responding just once.

Of course, major interest is in the problem of handling special wastes. The Member for Vermilion-Viking raised those questions in his remarks. At this time, I think it's important to lay the procedures out again before the public of Alberta. I certainly appreciate the comments of the Member for St. Albert on the procedure we followed in developing potential areas for a plant of this capacity.

To outline the procedure we followed: we instructed some specialists in this type of operation to explore, across the province, the sort of combinations which would best meet the standards we would set for a special wastes plant. In doing that exercise, they had to take into consideration a very large number of factors. First of all, they had to consider the general location of the wastes themselves. Then they had to take transportation into consideration, the way in which the materials would be moved. They also had to review population figures. They had to consider the railway system that possibly might be used, in terms of movement. They had to take into consideration the physical conditions, the topography. Of course, they were also concerned about water supplies and other types of facilities, such as supplies for fuel and power. Those sorts of things were used in the whole process.

When they completed that very detailed study, they then had a map which designated a number of sites throughout the province that would be capable, insofar as they could determine, of meeting the very tough criteria we laid out. As the Member for St. Albert commented, it's probably the first time, certainly in the history of Canada and maybe North America, that this kind of system was proceeded with. I notice that our NDP friend to the east, the Saskatchewan government, is now looking at this same kind of procedure, in fact is inviting our people to come in to speak about the most practical process to accomplish the objectives.

On completing that overlay and study, the special committee was given certain instructions, primarily based on the Environment Council of Alberta report, which detailed that it was important from the sociological point of view that we be invited to come into these areas. Some of the members have mentioned potential areas in which we have already been invited. Of course, the county of Beaver is one. The council very carefully assessed the implications, the pros and cons of a potential site in their area and, in their wisdom and assessment, invited the Department of the Environment to go in and do further

assessment. I hasten to add that this is not the only area we are invited into. There are others: the county of Strathcona — I think the county of Ponoka is interested — certainly Hanna, special areas and, just recently, Swan Hills. There's a little place known as Chauvin, close to the border, that is very interested.

On the basis of those invitations, we have agreed to go in and, with our overlays, site these potential locations with the council and proceed to test. Even though we have all this information, the most important part is to be totally assured about the water table itself, to make sure that if there is a water table, there's sufficient protection between the surface and the water table. That has a lot to do with the kind of soil structure in particular. Having done that, the most immediate concern is the area of the county of Beaver, which is quite high profile at this time and which is planning a plebiscite on this issue.

The Member for Vermilion-Viking, because of his constituency and his interest himself, asked a number of other questions about the implications of how we can best help and properly handle the project, if the county and the general feeling of the people of the area are in favor of it. I think one of the questions that arose from the discussion was the role of the public, and I think we're seeing this particular role. We go in at any time and are invited by the public to go through the information we have on these sites in other parts of the world. They're not a strange and new phenomenon in the world. They may be strange and new for the province of Alberta, but these similar high-technology incineration operations, which we anticipate will eventually be built, are not new to the United States or to parts of Europe, particularly West Germany. In the Sarnia area in Ontario, I visited a plant which operates continuously. So as I said, they are not new in the world, but they are a new phenomenon to Alberta.

The question was asked about alternatives to a treatment plant of this nature. I think our preference would be that industry handle this problem. However, this is not always practical. For example, it would be practical for industries of upwards of 6,000 workers, these major kinds of industries you find in some parts of Europe and the United States. But they're not a practical kind of solution to the wastes that many of the smaller industries create. In fact, if these industries were required to handle these small amounts of material in the way we see they should be handled, I don't think these industries could exist. I'm sure it's not the intention of the public in general in the province to effectively eliminate industry. We all require it, for our own needs, for employment, and so on.

So the next alternative to industry itself handling the product, which is not always practical, would be to use a facility in which we would just store materials — permanent storage. This is done in parts of the world for some materials. But the only reason it's done is that a proper treating process has not yet been arrived at.

I don't think it is a permanent solution for some materials. For example, there is a special process in the experimental stage for polychlorinated biphenyls, which were used in most transformers until recent years. Although some other theoretical ideas are out front, the only other alternative we are aware of at this time that's fairly practical is high-temperature incineration. But techniques are being developed. As the technology improves insofar as handling these materials, other ways of treatment will be found. It's an ongoing, very scientific technology that we're talking about. Initially we think that incineration is the best answer for a fair number of

the materials we talk about. That's the direction in which we are moving.

Mr. Chairman, the intention is to use one or two sites in Alberta for an incineration process. The Environment Council recommended two. As we proceed, I think we may eventually have to have two. However, in the interim, one would certainly meet the needs of the province. We would also have to have in place, which we contemplate by way of legislation, the manner in which some of these materials will be stored temporarily. They may be temporarily stored on the site of the industry or at special regional landfill sites. We intend to work out a system with the industry concerned. Included in that — which is in the amendments the Member for Vegreville is bringing in on hazardous chemicals — we will set up a manifest system which will essentially track the materials from their source to their disposal.

Insofar as transportation, we have the transportation of dangerous goods legislation in the House at the present time. The Minister of Municipal Affairs is piloting that piece of legislation through. That legislation is designed to deal with the problem without incursion by the federal government on this issue. In addition, my own legislation will deal primarily with the loading and removal of the materials at the source where they will be handled. So we now have legislation in the Legislature, which will deal with movement.

A question was asked about land values. From what I observed at Sarnia insofar as affecting the land around the area, there was little if any impact. The barley field was up to the boundary of the property, livestock were grazing, and so on. The same thing is evident in large plants in western Europe. I think it's more an emotional problem than fact. I can't add much more to that. Land values are affected by events: they go up or down depending on the event. I haven't any hard evidence to indicate that it would have any impact on land values. It certainly will be a positive thing in terms of the economics of the area, because it will employ a number of people, both at the plant and in terms of transportation. In that respect, it should have a very positive economic effect. That deals primarily with the economics.

The plant itself, when you're talking about incineration, plus laboratory facilities, storage, and so on, will probably be in the area of \$25 million to \$50 million in terms of total value. Then you have the subsequent staff of 25, perhaps more depending on the volume of material and the shift work. This all adds to the economics of the operation.

The member asked about the importance of monitoring. Our intention is to bring in legislation dealing with a Crown agency this spring. That Crown agency will be given the responsibility of certain things, which will be spelled out in the legislation. However, our own legislation will come into place and will be administered by the Department of the Environment. It would be overseen, in a sense, by the Crown agency. In other words, anyone could go to the agency with an expression of concern; the agency would be responsible for directions to the department, and so on. That will be spelled out more precisely in the introduction of the legislation.

A question was also asked about water lines and landfill, and on ownership in particular. First of all, on the utilities, the county of Beaver has asked, in their negotiations with us, that we use natural gas for fuel. We certainly have no objection to that, if we can get a supply of the required volume of gas close by. The other concern the county had in their communication with us was with

regard to the servicing of roads and possibly the water supply. Our responsibility, through negotiations with the proponent and the county concerned, will be to deal with these issues, deal with the requirements in terms of the approach to the plant, and that sort of thing.

Insofar as ownership, it was recommended by a number of leading people in the province — some felt that private enterprise should do it; others didn't have the confidence in that respect, so they argued that the province should do it; and some don't have confidence in the province. Our best solution to that was to propose a combination of two. We are looking at the Crown owning the land and private enterprise constructing and operating the plant. In effect, the Crown agency will supervise, manage, and be the liaison between the public and the operation itself.

I think it's important at this time to advise the public in general as to the interest in the construction of a plant. There were 19 applications to us, insofar as showing interest in plant construction. Since that time, we've had a chance to go through the submissions. We have narrowed the number to four, which I think I should mention because no doubt there's a lot of interest in who will eventually construct. These are Chem Security Limited, Genstar, which is an IT corporation, Stablex of Canada Limited, and Tricil Limited. I haven't listed these in the order of their acceptance, by any means. It's simply a list of four major proponents we will be negotiating with in terms of an eventual settlement. I don't want to spend any more time on that. Perhaps there will be other questions. I hope I've dealt with the issues raised by the Member for Vermilion-Viking on that issue.

The other questions were raised by the Member for Clover Bar — not questions, in a sense, but observations that while he thought the department was doing a pretty good job, they weren't perceived as doing a very good job. Perhaps I can deal with some of those issues with the Member for Spirit River-Fairview when I come to his name on the list.

The Member for Cardston asked a question with regard to the sanitary landfills — the role of the departments and their responsibility, and whether there was any funding available for the Cardston sanitary landfill. Perhaps I can answer that my understanding is that about \$260,000 is in Vote 2 in the estimates for the Cardston regional sanitary landfill, if everything comes into place. I say that and put the caveat on because, as you know, it's awfully difficult to find these sites. Once we've found them, we're never sure they're going to meet our criteria in terms of water table and so on. In many cases, they have to be approved by development permit from the local authorities. One has to have an agreement in place. Then the Department of the Environment will fund the capital costs, provided everything meets their requirements. They go from there: maybe pick up part of the costs this year; if there are additional capital costs, picked up in the ongoing years.

The role of the departments is a confusing one. My hon. member to the right here, who is usually to my left — he can't be to my left, because I have books all over his desk.

MR. BOGLE: To your left only in terms of . . .

MR. COOKSON: Yes, that's right. It's a figurative comment.

We have worked out what I think is probably as satisfactory an agreement as we can with regard to the land-

fills. Basically the Department of the Environment is doing the funding. For the time being, we're continuing to do the funding for regional landfills specifically. There's no funding for the garbage dumps. I leave those to the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health; not really. The reason we've funded regional systems is that we're trying to pull two or more municipalities together. This is one of the ways we do it. Until now, we take that responsibility for the actual licensing and supervision. It's handled through the Department of Social Services and Community Health, primarily through the health units and their support staff. I think it's important that the public understand the different roles of the two departments. I know we've been confused about those two roles, and I know the public has been.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

The other question asked by the Member for Cardston had to do with the drainage program. I think that was asked by other members. For the year 1982-83, no funds are available for this work, unless they are by special warrant or some other way we could fund them through some of the other funding processes. At the present time, there is before the government a request for decision, to do with a joint statement by the Minister of Agriculture and me some time ago, when we talked about a possibility of on-farm drainage. As you know, we do funding for other projects where they have to be dealt with through the municipality. This would be a departure from that procedure.

It is a complex issue, because when does on-farm drainage become off-farm drainage? Our department is responsible for the Water Resources Act. In a sense, we jealously guard that responsibility. Water that originates on one property and finds its way onto another property often creates more problems than it solves. Under the Water Resources Act, we have in place requirements for permits, licensing, and caveats on the property. This has to be in place to protect waterways which find their way from one quarter section to another, and so on down the road. However, when we get it in place, the program will deal primarily with on-farm drainage within that quarter section. It will be a funding process where the individual farmer can acquire some assistance.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Across the province?

MR. COOKSON: Right across the province. However, the primary interests, which originated the concept of the program, are primarily in the north. We'll have to wait and see what shakes out of the submissions that go to government on it.

I think the Member for Drumheller asked some questions about the status of the regional water system out towards Chestermere, in the Calgary area. I'll see if I can find that.

I'll just quickly run through the total picture on the regional utilities study, since questions may be asked later. Maybe I can solve them too. It indicates that the Airdrie area is being implemented. Construction of water and sewage services to Calgary is about 70 per cent complete. Questions may be asked on the situation at Cochrane. Consultants completed a conceptual design report outlining two sewage options, and routes. The intention is to meet with the proponents on April 19 to discuss funding. The council of Chestermere Lake wants to connect to Calgary, with a design for about 3,000

people, since Strathmore is making provision for its own services. Negotiations are ongoing between Chestermere Lake and the city of Calgary. As yet, no final decision has been made on that issue. Crossfield is interested in a potential sewage service tying into the Airdrie line. At this time there is no consideration of tying Okotoks, Black Diamond, and Turner Valley into the Calgary system. We are presently working jointly with the city and the municipalities to work out some agreement with regard to any tie-in. I think that pretty well deals with some of the issues raised by the Member for Drumheller.

The other question raised had to do with Crawling Valley and Bassano. The Crawling Valley reservoir is located within the Eastern Irrigation District, which is being investigated as part of the internal storage component of the water resources and development in southern Alberta, a program announced in August 1980. The indication is that a reservoir at this location could provide about 75,000 acre-feet of live storage. Over 17,000 acres of irrigable land could be supported from the reservoir at present, and a potential 30,000. The preliminary cost estimates on the Crawling Valley reservoir are about \$9 million. Under the announced program, the province would fund the capital costs. The Eastern Irrigation District would fund all the land assembly costs and be responsible for all future operation and maintenance. In passing, however, I would like to note that that funding would all come from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, and could perhaps be dealt with again in the trust fund estimates.

The March '73 agreement was that the federal government agree to rehabilitate the Bassano dam. This has been delayed, pending clarification of the ownership of the river bed. In the meantime, PFRA has spent about \$800,000 to keep the structure functional for at least 10 years. The terms of the federal/provincial agreement have been extended to 1988, by which time PFRA is prepared to fulfil its commitment to totally rehabilitate the dam as originally planned. Resolution of the river bed ownership question is proceeding. That has to take preference.

A question was asked regarding the ring road process around the city of Calgary. I have a pretty detailed document to indicate the progress being made. It would take some time to go through the total detail of the ring road. Perhaps I should outline this generally to the public, though. Our government originated the concept of the ring road or utility corridor around Calgary and Edmonton some years ago. It was originally designed partially as a restricted development area over which we could eventually protect an area when the cities grew to a certain size. Since then, the idea of the utility corridor has been included in the RDA. We have designed approximately a half-mile width in both Calgary and Edmonton, which would take care of the needs of ring roads, power, pipelines, and that sort of thing, for many years to come. We have a policy of prioritizing the land we will acquire for certain purposes.

In the case of Calgary, because of future road development, we are aggressively negotiating land in two or three specific areas. Many areas in the Calgary utility corridor will not be needed for many, many years, and we don't interfere in any way with the use of the land, provided it continues to be used for its present purpose. However, if the owners wish to change the use of the land, they have to get approval from the Department of the Environment. I guess a rough estimate would be that we have bought somewhere in the area of 15 to 20 per cent of the area needed for a utility corridor. We continue

to purchase. If individuals wish to retire or leave the area for any reason at all, we ask them to contact us. It doesn't necessarily mean we will purchase the land, but we'll certainly give them a hearing.

The question of the problem of policing regional landfills was also raised. I think that was the main question from the Member for Drumheller. As far as we're concerned, since at the present time they're licensed by the Department of Social Services and Community Health, they in turn would police them and ensure they are properly managed. If they perceived there were violations, it would be their responsibility to lay it out pretty clearly in their licensing procedure, and to enforce.

To the Member for Edmonton Glengarry, I missed the point; I think it had to do with the dams being in conflict with water quality. Maybe the member could raise that point again. There is always an argument made by some folks that because the Department of the Environment is building dams, it's not interested in the environment — in fact it may interfere with the environment. I think that is best left to some philosophical, intellectual argument in the House sometime. There are pros and cons to dams, like everything else. A lot of positive things have arisen because of our ability to manage the water systems.

The Member for Edmonton Glengarry also asked about monitoring of air quality in areas, and the fact that the budget has been reduced in that particular vote. Perhaps I can review it again. If one looks at that vote, last year we purchased a special unit, which put our estimate up for the year '80-81. Thereby, the percentage appears to have dropped. But in fact we have pretty good funding in that particular vote for managing the air.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might just restate the question I was trying to pose last Friday. I was asking: does the fact that the department has a dual responsibility, both to build dams and to be the guardian of water quality, present a problem — a conflict of interest, if you like — because by doing one, you interfere with the other. How does the Department of the Environment internalize that fundamental problem?

I'll give you an example. We have a proposal for hydro-electric power on the Slave River. There are some environmental questions there with the nesting habitat for pelicans, as well as the impact of backing up that river into the Athabasca. How does the department accommodate those concerns with the apparent responsibility to construct a dam? How does a department like the Department of the Environment accommodate the need for flows of water for fish in the Red Deer River with the Dunvegan dam? As I understand it, some people in the Fish & Game Association I've been talking to, claim the department's estimates of water flow are too low to maintain a good fish stock in that river. Again, there seems to be conflict.

Mr. Chairman, I guess the other point that makes me even more nervous is that we're only spending \$2.5 million on air quality. Last year was considered abnormally high, and we're going back to our old levels again in dollar terms. It doesn't seem to be an appreciable amount of money. Is the department not considering having its own permanent monitoring stations in some areas of particular sensitivity? I ask about the Fort Saskatchewan area specifically, where we have a concentration of petrochemical industries. My constituents are downwind from that petrochemical complex. Surely the department should have permanent fixtures in place, rather than just having a mobile station which may or may not take

readings. Surely we can find an extra appropriation for that. Those are my concerns.

MR. COOKSON: The member raises two interesting points. It gave me a chance to get a little rest, too.

There's no question that arguments are posed about the construction of dams. The member raises the Slave River example. Certainly if the dam went ahead, there would be a possible impact, among others, on the pelicans in the area. By the way, a federal/provincial environmental impact assessment is now proceeding on that issue in that particular area. We follow the procedure that all dam proposals are involved in some way through public hearings of some nature. The one at the Dickson dam, and the proposal for the Three Rivers dam, was carried on by the Environment Council of Alberta at the time. That whole process is always done by public hearings and submissions by the public in general.

I guess the problem is that, depending on your point of view, one group perceives this kind of thing as something that is going to destroy the environment and specific things; for example, the pelican issue on the Slave River. Others perceive it another way. They say that without controlled flow throughout the year, a stream becomes so low that it creates a problem with plant growth, or that fish can't move properly, or that the oxygen supply runs out. There are always going to be these arguments on both sides.

When we do our environmental impact assessment — and based on the submissions by the public in general — we try, the same as the ERCB, to take all these factors into consideration and weigh them very carefully. In some cases, we've had major investments; for example, to handle the fish movement problem. I was looking at one at Slave Lake not too long ago, which hasn't been too successful, by the way. It was designed to permit the movement of fish upstream. Hopefully, when we get through the public process and our own analysis, plus those public hearings, we can come up with something that will meet most of the concerns of the public. We'll never meet them all. Perhaps that's a little too much to hope for.

I think it's important for the public to understand the position of government in terms of monitoring. First of all, we have taken the position that, generally speaking, the polluter has to pay; it must be the responsibility of the polluter. That's number one. We have to satisfy ourselves that the polluter is totally involved. Over the years, we have deviated a little from that position, in that we have devised funding schemes to help out some of these pollution problems in a financial way. But we try to keep that to a minimum. On that basis, we say that the polluter has to report too. It must be the company's or the polluter's responsibility to report to us as a regulatory body.

I think it's something the public has some difficulty with. But there are virtually thousands of industries across Alberta, and more all the time. And the costliness of having to set up a totally integrated system of monitoring is just not practical, and I don't think it's necessary. We encourage industries to participate, to discipline and police themselves, and in that we have a pretty elaborate system of reporting they have to follow.

When I first took on the ministry, I too had the impression, as one of the public, that industry was more interested in what they could get away with than what they could do to improve the environment. But an interesting thing in the case of Refinery Row was that a group of five industries pooled their resources. It cost them a

fair number of thousands each year. They put up their own monitoring system in a specific area to measure the ambient air quality. That reporting goes into our central system in Environment. To me, that was a responsible move on the part of those industries. That particular monitoring system is located in a schoolyard on the east side of Edmonton. I think the students are involved in reading the monitors. So the responsibility still has to remain with industry.

The Department of the Environment can, and does, move in occasionally. We have a number of portable monitoring devices. They're pretty active; they're not sitting around gathering dust. Whenever we have an area we consider a problem, or whenever someone has reported a problem area to us, if we have the equipment free at the time, we move it into that area and monitor the emissions.

Not very long ago, we were asked by the mayor of Fort Saskatchewan, along with others, to check the emissions in that area, as far as the people of Fort Saskatchewan were concerned. So we set up a piece of equipment right in the downtown area. That piece of equipment may still be there. It continues to monitor materials like  $\text{SO}_2$ ,  $\text{NO}_2$ , and  $\text{H}_2\text{S}$ . We're particularly interested in the vinyl chloride emissions. Those reports are coming in. So far as I know, the ambient standards are being met quite handily in the town. So I think that's a positive thing we can do.

But it still falls back on industry to report daily, or whatever the licence calls for. That licence, of course, is for a period of time and can be subject to change. It spells out precisely what the industry has to stay within, insofar as the stack emission is concerned. In some cases, we measure the ambient, but often the ambient is more of a guideline to the total combination of emissions than the stack, which is specific to an industry. However, I'd be very happy if the Member for Edmonton Glengarry can entice the government to put some more money into the budget, and we'll play it by ear. I have to talk to Treasury.

The Member for Grande Prairie asked about water standards in pulp mills. I have at hand the surface water quality objectives. These standards were established in joint consultation with the federal government. I think the prairie provinces' water agreement includes these criteria. The most up-to-date document is January '77. Without going into detail here, I think it's important that if any of the public are in doubt about standards insofar as the biological oxygen demand, bacteriological problems — in particular the coliforms — color, temperature, odor, pH, suspended solids, organic and inorganic chemicals, pesticides, toxic chemicals, radio-activity, and unspecified substances are concerned, the document contains all that.

Insofar as color is concerned in particular, it gets pretty technical. I know the member is interested in the Proctor & Gamble pulp mill in the Grande Prairie area. We've had some meetings with them, and continue to work with them on their color standards, because they have had some problem with regard to that. The general quality objective is that the color not be increased more than 30 color units above natural value. Explaining that to the lay person gets pretty complex. We do have a system of measurement for color, and if we find the color exceeding that, we have to move in and work with the company.

The values embodied in Table I are objectives, and they are subject to modification, as science and technology work towards a better understanding. These objectives are not static, but will be reviewed accordingly and re-

vised if warranted. By the way, the standards apply to all the province; they're not specific to any one part. They're standards we consider common to most parts of the province.

A question was asked regarding the Slave Lake stabilization timing. This project comes out of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, so it's not funded through my General Revenue votes. The information I have is as follows: at present, cutoffs 4, 5, 6, and 8 are completed; 2, 3, and 7 were to have been constructed last fall and winter, but we're having trouble with right of way. At present we're negotiating with the Sawridge Indian Band for an exchange of land for cutoff 7. We've had ongoing discussions with the Member for Lesser Slave Lake and some of the parties concerned in this. They have their own special advisory committee.

I think the Member for Grande Prairie was mostly interested in the land. It's estimated that it will protect about 32,000 acres of agricultural land from major flooding, and it will also reduce the problem on about 31,000 acres of Crown land. Insofar as disposition of these Crown lands is concerned, this has not yet been settled, so it's something we will have to address ourselves to. As I say, this funding is coming from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

A question was also asked about the concept of a regional pipeline to La Crete and other places. I guess we have one of the earliest regional systems in the province in the Donnelly-McLennan area, which is an open-channel regional water system. Insofar as pipeline, we haven't really addressed ourselves to a system that would involve a number of towns. A study has been done there, and until we have further information, I can't really comment much more on that. The economics have to be worked out. If you combine three or four towns, one treatment centre, and one sewage facility, the economics have to be worked out in terms of having four or five water treatment and sewage lagoon facilities. Of course, there is also the problem of trying to get water which, strangely enough, is a real problem in parts of the north. Even though they have the mighty Peace, most of it heads north.

Plans with regard to a waste plant: I think I mentioned that in the last while, Swan Hills has asked us to look at a special waste plant in that area. On the overlays, there may be some other areas in the north. I haven't really had a chance to look at the detail, but that's available if the member would like to look at it.

The Member for Vegreville asked questions. One of the member's interests was our procedure on water line easements. I think the member raised an important concern. Normally we leave it to the local authority. But in this case, because of the timing and urgency of the line, we went in and negotiated to acquire easements. The problem often is that you go where there is the least line of resistance in terms of dealing with the public, make your deal, and subsequently it gets tougher and tougher.

The member raises a genuine concern as to how we deal with the person who gave his easement for a very nominal sum, and subsequently finds out that his neighbor, whom he never liked too well anyway, drove a tougher bargain. Our procedure has generally been that once the total line is negotiated, we will take another look at any indication of unfairness in terms of easement settlements. I just want to assure the member that that is still ongoing. Of course, that doesn't mean that because we paid \$20,000 near the city, as compared perhaps to \$1,000 close to Vegreville, we're now going to pay a

blanket \$22,000. Land values change according to the area you're in. Normally it decreases in value as you move out of the centre. But it does mean that, all things being equal, we're prepared to look at the original agreement and settlement. I think that's the best way I can answer that very important question.

The member also asked about the drainage program, and I think I've responded as to the procedure with regard to that. We will be tracking a joint program through the system with Agriculture and Environment on that problem.

I think the other question asked was the role of the environmental centre with regard to wastes. We have always expected that the qualified people at the environmental research centre, if called upon, would attend functions and give their expertise in this particular area. I think they have done this insofar as interest in a special waste plant.

The Member for Edmonton Gold Bar raised the question about the ring road and the dangers of transportation of dangerous goods. The purchases in the Edmonton area, insofar as the utility corridor, are more advanced than in the Calgary area. However, strangely enough, as yet we haven't had extreme pressure to purchase any specific part of the utility corridor. We know that has to come, but we rely on other departments to prioritize the area they would like us to initiate in terms of purchase. We are concentrating on one or two spots but, generally speaking, there hasn't been that kind of pressure. Although we continue to buy as land comes up for sale, keeping in mind the limitations of budgeting, there is a limit to what the province can spend by way of land, and certainly land that may not be used for a number of years. But I think it would probably be safe to say we've purchased 30 per cent or 40 per cent of the utility corridor of about a half-mile width in the Edmonton area.

I can't help the member much with the problem of flooding homes. It is a local authority responsibility, and I recognize the problem. The two cities have never received any funding from our regular water and sewer programs because of their low per capita debt load in this area, with the exception that we have agreed to fund for phosphorus removal. Calgary has received considerable funding in just the last while, or will receive that under the budget. We leave that responsibility with the local authority. They have to determine how to put their lines in to give the best service, and it's up to the constituents to approach the local authority on this problem.

However, the member might be interested to know that a device has recently been patented which in some way automatically shuts off or certainly minimizes the risk of flooding basements. I think the Research Council of Alberta did some work on that. I stand corrected on that; it's patented. So far, it's an exciting piece of equipment and is being ordered by a large number of people across the continent. So it might be worth looking into.

The Member for Calgary Buffalo talked about the beetle problem, and by "beetles" I'm not referring to the singers. It's true that we did a tour of the area. I think the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest responded to the member. I have a copy of the correspondence. Insofar as how we have responded to the problem, Environment's role was primarily to go in, take a look at the problem, and make recommendations to Public Lands and Wildlife, and Energy and Natural Resources. It may be that the member might want to ask some further questions. I haven't got the exact details of the communication be-

tween our departments and could check to see whether it was verbal or by letter.

I can indicate, though, that the major concern I expressed was the minimizing of the erosion in the area by whatever methods Public Lands and Wildlife, through forestry, would be using to carefully supervise that. I also stressed that as much as possible we have to minimize the further spreading of the pine beetle, because I can visualize the problem moving north and inundating huge areas of pine. In other words, I was saying in my recommendations: do what you have to do to minimize the spread of the problem.

When we did our quick tour, we just flew over into British Columbia. That's a frightening thing to see, because the British Columbia government appears to have simply given up on the problem, probably because of the inaccessibility of the area. On the British Columbia side, through the mountains adjoining this area, huge areas have been inundated by the pine beetle, and the timber is just standing there. It's going to be a tremendous fire hazard in years to come, plus the problem of the pine beetle perhaps spreading. When we get into the estimates, the member should perhaps question Public Lands and Wildlife on the work done there specifically to deal with the problem.

A question was asked about the Shell and Gulf plants at Pincher Creek and the health problem. The member probably knows we in Environment have done a lot of work to attempt to determine the problem there. Eventually we simply came to the conclusion that insofar as our own equipment and expertise, we could determine nothing that could cause health problems. At that point, based on other recommendations, the judgment decision was made that Social Services and Community Health review the problems of the residents in the area. However, we did some assessment work with a special piece of equipment from Ontario. That piece of equipment is so sensitive that it can detect hundreds and thousands of combinations of compounds. In fact, it's so complex that we are now looking at a special committee of people with this kind of general expertise to try to assess the results. Perhaps I can provide more information on that issue at a later time. That is ongoing, and hopefully we can conclude that matter before too long.

However, as you know, the exact problem has been turned over to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health, and they have allocated some funding. They're presently doing an analysis of individuals there, to determine if some of these compounds or elements are in fact causing the problem. By the way, my understanding is that one of the plants is in the preliminary stages of possibly closing out. I don't know which one it is, but . . .

MR. NOTLEY: It's Gulf.

MR. COOKSON: It's Gulf.

The Member for Redwater-Andrew asked about services for water drainage. I think I answered that, insofar as the program is still on the drawing board but will be coming.

The Member for Wainwright asked about the problems of waste burning, problems of handling waste, and the possibility of burning instead of using the regular landfill. I can tell the Member for Wainwright that we've had a good look at the possibility of incineration. British Columbia is fairly well advanced in this area. Our major concern is the operational cost. However, we're deter-



mined that there will be an incineration unit somewhere in this province in the very near future.

Then the question is: what kind of agreement can we arrive at insofar as the local authority? There has to be some commitment by the local authority or authorities; it may be that two or more would go together. I think there is some preliminary funding somewhere in my estimates, and we're going to press on. Hopefully before too long, we will have an experimental unit which incinerates, rather than using sanitary landfill.

The Member for Spirit River-Fairview asked a number of questions: the comment on sour gas in the Savanna area, the problems of special wastes, the plebiscite, Suncor emissions, and the MacDonald letter. I don't know whether I can answer the questions specifically. The member seems to indicate that perhaps we aren't doing as well as we should in Environment. I take some exception to that. I think we're doing a pretty good job. That is not to say we can't improve, but it's certainly not the intention, I hope — and I'm sure it's not the intention of the Member for Spirit River-Fairview — to shut all industry down. Perhaps he can elaborate on his position in that regard. Nor do I think it's the intention of the member to end up with possibly a couple of thousand more civil servants galloping around the province . . .

MR. NOTLEY: Not that either.

MR. COOKSON: . . . poking their noses into private industry, and eventually . . . [interjection] I can just see it, Mr. Chairman, a thousand more cars and a thousand more civil servants. The cars would be colored pink, and galloping around poking into the constituency of the Member for Vegreville, trying to find out . . . It's not hard to understand why the member has trouble getting industry in his constituency. I think they're scared of the place.

It's also interesting that the member always attacks the corporate bums. He inherited that from the federal government. He never attacks the co-ops, which is a strange thing, and he never attacks the farmers who use a lot of chemicals, and the waste materials they have. It's always the corporate bums, and it's always a long way from his constituency. There seems to be some relationship between that, but it may be just coincidental. It's an observation I've made over the years. [interjection] Well, don't feel too bad; we wouldn't want you to lose your seat.

AN HON. MEMBER: What do you mean, we wouldn't?

MR. COOKSON: It was interesting, in going through this document, that the member has a great way with charts and interpretations and misinterpretations. The member is quite a hit-and-run artist. He gallops out to the press and then gallops back in here.

AN HON. MEMBER: You sound like you're jealous.

MR. COOKSON: I was looking over the document which the Department of the Environment tabled on the Suncor situation. I'm not going to apologize for Suncor, because I think they're big enough to take care of themselves. Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that as quickly as we could, we initiated, first of all, a control order so far as the water problem was concerned. I think the following week we ordered an inquiry into the whole procedure, and subsequently laid three charges. One will deal with the failure to report, which the member

commented on; another will deal with violation of the standards of the licence, which members commented on; and the other, which deals with the fisheries problem, is under the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife. So I think Suncor has a fair amount on its platter, and it would be improper for me to comment as to the outcome of the charges.

When the member took this document home and spent the evening reading it, it was kind of interesting that he took the charts representing 43 months. If you look at the charts on compliance, they involve six different chemicals: the NFR, which is a non-filterable residue; the oxygen demand; the oil and gas emissions; phenols; ammonia/nitrogen; and sulphide. The charts report for 43 different months throughout a period of three and a half years. They indicate that at certain times, maybe one of those six violated.

When the member came up with his figures, I think he indicated that they were in total compliance with the licence only three or six times during that period of time. But one has to remember we're dealing with six different chemicals. The more you add to that, of course, the tougher it gets for a company to meet totally all those compliances in one month. It makes it pretty tough. So the member probably argues that even if you violate one of them, you're in total violation of the licence. I just don't agree with the argument. If you were totally in violation, that's one thing. But when you're in violation of perhaps one of them — and in most cases they were reported and recorded. Maybe I can review with the member the sort of thing we've gone through. When we reviewed, we found 66 violations and 192 compliances during that period of time. It's a matter of interpretation. I just don't agree with the way the member indicated they were totally in violation.

We went over the summary of Suncor effluent reports, and the member gallops outside and tells the media we're doing nothing, that there's no progress. I went back to November 1978, when the licence was issued, and reviewed the work the department has done. The Member for Spirit River-Fairview seems to have that naive idea that when you get a major plant on stream, it's just a matter of turning the key and you shut the whole thing down — in the middle of January — and then you open it up again five minutes later. It's not that simple. I'm sure that if the member had any experience in the field of business, he would know that we have to work with the companies.

The problems upstream were dealt with in November '78. We documented each case. In April '79, there was a break-up on a waste-water pond, and at that time the oil and gas were a problem. In July, they had the annual plant turnaround, which is the time they do their house-keeping jobs for the year. There were some start-up difficulties. In August '79, they had a fire at the plant which affected their oil tank system. In September '79, the result of the fire had an impact on their waste-water treatment system. In November '79, they had a wood stove line failure overflow to waste water in the pond. In January '80, they had a freeze-up in their line system, and had some problems with oil and gas in the system. In March '80, they had the problems of spring thaw, which effected some excursions in the system. In August '81, they had a problem with excursion due to plant start-up, again after the annual turnabout. Subsequently they had more problems when they got into January '82, which is the point when we started to zero in on what we considered serious problems.

Again, I don't want to comment on anything that might be construed as impacting on a court case. I just want to assure the member and the public in general that we have proceeded on Suncor and that we have been monitoring them. Perhaps we need to tighten up our monitoring. I don't apologize for that, and I think some orders have gone out within the department to do just that. But the fact of the matter is that the situation is not quite as bad as the member pictures.

In response to some of the member's concerns about enforcement by the department as far as air is concerned, here is another document the member should take home and use for evening reading. This particular document, *Still Waters*, was put forth by an independent committee of parliamentarians across Canada — John Fraser, I think, who's a former Conservative minister. We have a fellow by the name of Roger Simmons. I think we have some NDPers on here. But even with the NDP members, they gave us a pretty positive report insofar as Alberta is concerned.

The public worries a lot about the SO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the province, and rightly so. I don't hesitate to support their concerns. But sometimes somebody misconstrues how serious the situation is. I looked at the figures across Canada to indicate just how much SO<sub>2</sub> is being pumped up in this province. I'll go through them quickly to indicate how Alberta stacks up as a fast-growing province with massive industries. These are annual emissions of SO<sub>2</sub> in thousands of tonnes. We go to the maritimes. Of course they're down: Newfoundland around 62. They don't really have any kind of problem, except they've got no jobs. Prince Edward Island has the same trouble: they have lots of potatoes but no work. Nova Scotia has the same problem: they have no SO<sub>2</sub> emissions, but they have no jobs. Then you get to the important figures. I think that Quebec puts 1,099,000 tonnes into the air; Ontario puts 2,321,000 tonnes; Manitoba . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I hesitate to interrupt the Minister of the Environment, but this committee has no power to stop the clock, so I think we have to have the necessary motion to rise and report.

MR. COOKSON: Could I give three figures?

MR. NOTLEY: He's just in full flight.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We'll allow the minister three figures, then.

MR. COOKSON: Little old Manitoba has 601. Saskatchewan, where all the people have left, is down to 41; Alberta has 511, which is 100 less than the province of Manitoba, and we have two major tar sands plants, plus all our sour gas. There's some other good reading here. I commend it to the Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. PURDY: 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, although time has run out under *Standing Orders*, if there's no objection, I would like to move that when the Assembly reassembles this evening at 8 o'clock, it be in Committee of Supply, and that the Assembly now adjourn until the Committee of Supply rises and reports.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

[The House recessed at 5:32 p.m.]

[The Committee of Supply met at 8 p.m.]

#### head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

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

#### Department of the Environment

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe the minister is still responding to some comments of hon. members.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, when we wrapped up for lunch, I think I was reviewing the comparison of the SO<sub>2</sub> emissions across Canada, and indicating the good situation the province is in at the present time insofar as the total industry we have in the province. However, one has to be on guard, and it's not our intention to relax our standards in any way. In fact at Grande Prairie recently, I made the statement that we would attempt to maintain our total SO<sub>2</sub> emissions primarily the same for the next 20 years. That depends on a number of factors. All the new sour gas plants of large capacity are recovering about 98-plus SO<sub>2</sub>. In fact from 1974 to 1978, we were actually able to reduce the total SO<sub>2</sub> in the air.

There was the question about the problems in the north insofar as acidic soils. We participate in the public hearings, either as intervenors or on occasion on the panel, and the new major plants have new instructions insofar as total sour gas emissions are concerned. We are working closely with Agriculture insofar as monitoring and baseline studies, so that we can more accurately predict whether in fact there has been any deterioration of the particularly sensitive soils of the north.

However, I've said that other factors cause the soils to become more acidic. We also have to address ourselves to that. Agriculture is concerned, and so are we, about the use of certain fertilizers and some of the farming practices. Even the growing of canola is having an effect on the pH. It's one of the reasons, too, why we support — and the Minister of Agriculture has responded — funding assistance on freight for the use of liming to bring the soil

back to a point where it can be as productive as it was prior to the change in the pH.

The Member for Spirit River-Fairview raised a question about the plebiscite, the position the province would take depending on the outcome of the plebiscite. I responded in the Legislature that the problem with plebiscites is that either way they make a lot of people unhappy. The plebiscite is a local authority plebiscite, and the action the province may or may not take will hinge on the outcome. I think it will be soon enough, at that time, to determine what further action the province might take. The local authorities themselves, pending the outcome of the plebiscite, may make recommendations. We'll certainly listen carefully to them.

The question was raised regarding the inquiry for Suncor. I think that's pretty well laid out in our public statement. Three members would be selected by Environment and three by the Energy Resources Conservation Board. Those six would conduct an inquiry as to the Suncor situation and, if necessary, would have the authority to require witnesses to appear. Those hearings will be held in the Fort McMurray area and at Fort MacKay.

Chief MacDonald raised a number of points in the letter to us, based on a meeting with the Fort McKay Indian Band. I think we've basically responded to the letter by way of the inquiry. That was part of the underlining thing. The Chief raises the question of subpoenaing witnesses. That authority will be possible. Of course the onus will be on the band to make presentations to the board of inquiry. We'll attempt to accommodate by way of timing so that all can appear. Primarily it is to determine why these events happened in the case of Suncor, and to recommend ways and means of improving their system. But that's really where the inquiry is.

The Member for Calgary Millican raised several questions with regard to the CIL explosives plant and what happened to the material. Most of that material was shipped down to Oregon. It does underline the importance of a facility of our own because of the extremely high cost and the distance.

We have had some ongoing discussions with Western Co-op Fertilizers. Most recently in dialogue with them, they have committed themselves insofar as timing. They have both the Medicine Hat and the Calgary plant. We have a compliance date for various works. For example, their time frame for the number one plant: sulphuric acid, a compliance date of December 31, '84; nitric acid, a compliance date of December 31, '82. Prill tower, ammonium nitrate, has a compliance date of December 31, '82. Evaporator, ammonium nitrate: the compliance date is the 31st, '82 — and ammonium phosphate, in a letter from Dr. Nielsen to Mr. Solodzuk, May 21, '80. We continue to review the problems of Western Co-op Fertilizers, but that essentially brings one up to date with the situation.

I think the Member for Calgary Millican inquired about Alberta processing. I might be able to pull together some more information for the member, but if it's a matter of relocation, the department has a policy. I might be able to get the information to you as to where that's at at the present time. We did have a program in place for the special plant here in Edmonton. On occasion we use this policy, if it's an extreme environmental problem to relocate. I'll see if I can get that information for the member.

Mr. Chairman, I'm still going here. The Ogden Gulf plant is being cleaned up at the present time. It's changed hands two or three times since its inception. There are

signs of some mercury contamination. At present, as I understand it, we're on the site supervising the clean-up. We'll probably have to confine the contaminated soil for the time being, either on the site or possibly an arrangement with Calgary, unless that material too can be shipped south toward Oregon. At this time I don't think I can respond any further than that, unless I can get more up-to-date information.

The Member for Olds-Didsbury actually didn't ask any specific question, but indicated some concerns about the hazardous waste plant. I think I've pretty well covered the procedures we tend to follow.

The Member for Calgary Forest Lawn commented on the need for proper handling of wastes. I think we are on the same wave length insofar as handling. I think I've pretty well stated the position we are in, and the legislation that will be coming. I appreciated the comments from the Member for St. Albert with regard to the procedures we followed in siting.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Minister, I have a question, but I need a yes or no . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. member use the proper form of address through the Chair, please.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, I hope you would direct the minister to give me a yes or no answer — I'll accept a maybe. Is there any possibility of funding for the many sewer projects still on hold in the 1982-83 budget? One word.

MR. COOKSON: Do you want a yes or no answer?

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes.

MR. COOKSON: Maybe.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I certainly look forward to this opportunity to respond to the minister. We've been treated to an almost Fidel Castro-like marathon effort on the part of the minister, with a little bit of cracker-barrel, Lacombe-style home cookin' thrown in. But in general comment, Mr. Chairman, to sort of paraphrase Churchill, I might say that never has a minister used so many words to say so little about such an important topic.

Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with some of the specific observations the minister made. First of all, on the question of the failure of proper notification of the Fort McKay Band . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we have order, please.

MR. NOTLEY: . . . the minister made the observation that it was unfortunate Suncor had not notified the band. There's no question that that was unfortunate, but I would refer the minister to page 675 of *Hansard*, May 12, 1981, on the question of whether it is strictly the responsibility of the company to notify people downstream. To refresh the minister's memory, on that particular day I put the question to the minister: has any consideration been given to following the Saskatchewan approach where there is a spill report centre, and where there is notification of people downstream? Mr. Chairman, I'd like to quote the minister's exact words, so he can apprise himself for his response:

For example, if we saw a situation where it would be

of danger to the public in general, the first thing we would do is alert those downstream or wherever it may be.

With the minister's answer from 1981 before us, I put the question to him again: why did the department not notify the people in Fort MacKay? It is one thing for the minister to say it's unfortunate the company didn't do that. The reason I asked for the terms of reference of the inquiry is that there is an obligation on the part of the department, the government of Alberta. The question I would clearly put to the minister is: why did the department not notify the people of Fort MacKay?

During the course of the minister's remarks, he basically argued that although the company was in violation of their licence to operate for 36 out of 43 months . . . I noted he said that I was naive, because we just can't close the plant down. Well, no one is suggesting that, Mr. Chairman. We're not talking about a matter of a few days; we're talking about 43 months, three and a half years of consistent violations of their licence to operate under the Clean Water Act. The minister went on to say that it really isn't quite that important because there are six various indices under the provisions of the Act — which is true — and the company didn't violate every single one of them on 36 of the 43 months, which is also true. But in my judgment, that hardly mitigates the issue. We have standards set — standards for the licence, standards under the Clean Water Act — and to put it mildly, it is a rather curious form of application of the law if we're saying to polluters: because you haven't violated every category, it's not a serious problem that you violated some categories. That's like the minister being caught by a highway traffic policeman who finds the minister speeding, and the minister's response is, well, I haven't violated all the provisions of the Highway Traffic Act, therefore I shouldn't be caught on this one. I would think most of our local patrolmen would say, but Mr. Minister, you have violated this one, therefore you're going to get pinched — and properly so.

Mr. Chairman, it isn't good enough to say that because there are other categories that the company didn't violate, somehow everything is fine. I say to the minister that that is not an acceptable approach to the administration of the law in this province. If you want to change the law — and we've had representation from time to time that the law should be changed — if you want to change the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act, then come to the Legislature and take the political flak that will invariably accompany changing the law. But don't have a law which is good, like the Clean Water Act, and then say: what's a violation here and there? Mr. Chairman, the minister's responsibility is to administer the law. If the law isn't workable, let that minister come forward and justify to this Legislature why there should be a change in the law.

Mr. Chairman, the third thing I'd like to deal with is the remarks the minister made with respect to Still Waters: The Chilling Reality of Acid Rain. As I listened to the minister this afternoon, I recalled this document. I must confess I was as intrigued as I was when the minister released the pollution control division report as if he had the final smoking gun that would wipe out the case I made from time to time, except my recollection of this report is that it was a little different from the one the minister gave.

I might point out a small item: the minister had mixed up a member from Quebec with the New Democratic member on this particular committee. I regret that, because the party I'm associated with, as the party he's

associated with, are doing all we can to get representation in Quebec and neither of us is doing very well. But it would be nice to have some representation in that province. However, Mr. Chairman, I received a letter from the chairman of that subcommittee, dated September 1981; and I'd like to quote:

I am pleased to enclose a copy of "Still Waters", a study and report prepared by the Sub-committee on Acid Rain of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry of the House of Commons.

It goes on to point out that this committee is composed of members of all parties.

We have concluded that acid rain is a devastating environmental threat and it is hoped our findings may help to convince others that the sources of acid rain must be controlled effectively and immediately.

We must act now. Our course must be decisive and final. Our goal must be the abolition of acid rain.

Mr. Chairman, we then turn to the section that deals with Alberta. Rather than this section telling us what a great job we're doing in the province of Alberta, we find that's not quite what it says. For example, on page 74 it points out that while the companies have developed better technology for reducing the sulphur dioxide emission, that

The Alberta target . . . [that is, the standards the minister is setting through his department] . . . is, therefore, less exacting than the technological capability expected to be utilized by the proposed oil sands plants.

In other words, the private sector has set a higher standard than the standards set by the Department of the Environment. That's hardly an indication that we have a champion of the environment. It may be an indication that the private sector, properly so, is looking at higher standards. One would hope so. As the minister well knows, one of the major arguments of the mid-70s was whether or not Syncrude should be expected to install the best possible sulphur emission technology. It goes on to say:

The Sub-committee is very concerned about the trend toward greatly increased emissions of sulphur dioxide and nitrogen oxides in Alberta. There is evidence already of acid rain falling in the Cree Lake area of Saskatchewan and it has been suggested that the acid was sourced in Alberta. Vast increases in the emissions of acid rain . . . in Alberta pose a threat to sensitive regions in northern Saskatchewan and perhaps in similarly sensitive areas farther east in Manitoba.

We have no wish to make recommendations that will disrupt or unduly delay the development of Alberta's economy. *Nevertheless, we are convinced that it is essential to pursue industrial development utilizing the best available emission control technologies.*

Mr. Chairman, we have the companies with a higher standard than the regulations set out by the minister's department. This is in the document that the minister told us indicated Alberta was doing such a good job.

The committee then goes on to quote Dr. Martha Kostuch — and I'm sure all hon. members are aware of that very capable Albertan, representing the Public Advisory Committee of the Environment Council of Alberta — recommending in her testimony a goal of zero increase in sulphur emissions in Alberta up to 1990, and an annual decrease prescribed each year thereafter. Mr. Chairman, then the subcommittee report says:

the Sub-committee recommends that the Govern-

ment of Alberta accord maximum priority to control of acid rain-causing pollutants from industries in the province.

Mr. Chairman, as I read over *Still Waters: The Chilling Reality of Acid Rain*, rather than a vindication of the Department of the Environment, I would recommend to the minister that he might want to read that report again. As I see it, as far as this department is concerned, there is still a lot on the agenda in the oil sands region of the province.

Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with two other items, putting those in the form of specific questions. I forget which member raised the question of the Gulf plant at Pincher Creek. The announcement has recently been made that that plant is going to be closed down. However, I've been advised by residents in the vicinity of the Gulf plant that they've been suffering particular ills since the process of shutting down began. They're not quite sure what the reason is, whether there seems to be some problem with the closing down of the plant itself. My question to the minister would be whether the department has ascertained whether there are any particular problems with the close-down. The local assertion is that problems could range anywhere from a broken gas line to leaking valves in the trucks carrying the condensates from the plant. Mr. Chairman, in view of the widespread concern over that plant — I realize it is being closed down, but the process of closing down these plants can involve some risks, and that being the case, I'd ask the minister to respond during the estimates.

The final subject I'd like to deal with — and I think it would certainly be inappropriate during the course of the estimates of the Department of the Environment if we did not spend a little time discussing what this government is proposing to do on water diversion. Mr. Chairman, the minister mentioned with some degree of pride the various officials in his department, as I recall his initial comments. It's worth noting again the letter from Mr. Melnychuk, the assistant deputy minister back in 1979. I want to put to the minister whether the observations contained in this letter in fact still represent government policy.

As you are aware, Environment is proceeding with the Dixon Dam on the Red Deer River which will provide flow regulation for that river. The first priority in our view is on-stream flow regulation on the Oldman River. The Three Rivers Dam site has been recommended. The second priority would be additional flow regulation on the Bow River. The Dalmead site downstream of Calgary has been considered in a preliminary way.

Then in the course of that letter, Mr. Chairman, on page 3:

In conclusion, present policy does not preclude inter-basin transfers, but does emphasize using existing supplies fully first. Further to this, it should be noted that any dams and reservoirs being planned and built now, such as the Dickson Dam on the Red Deer River, are being located such that they will "fit", be effective and serve as part of the eventual concept of inter-basin transfers of water.

Mr. Chairman, last fall we got into quite a debate in this House over a point of privilege. The proper place to discuss government policy of this nature is quite properly here in the course of the estimates. Last fall the Premier indicated that the Minister of the Environment — the Premier [said], sometimes you lose some, sometimes you win some. I gather the minister and the Premier lost a battle for an experimental project.

What I would like to know, however, is where things stand at the moment on the question of water diversion. We've got northern MLAs representing this party running around saying, oh, I'm opposed to water diversion, and southern MLAs saying, I'm in favor of water diversion. I want to know where this government stands on the issue of water diversion. The place we have to find that out, Mr. Minister, is during the estimates of the Department of the Environment. Because the building of dams, trenches, and all the rest of it — while I know the Minister of Transportation is very much enthused about this, it comes under the department of the Minister of the Environment. I want to know whether the Minister of Tourism and Small Business is right, because he says he's opposed to water diversion, and so am I. I want to know if that's the position of the government. The Minister of Utilities and Telephones tells me he is opposed, and the Member for Bow Valley is in favor. But I want to know where the government stands on water diversion.

We had this happy little meeting of Tories a couple of weeks back. They had a little discussion on it, and by a motion of two to one . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Bigger than yours.

MR. NOTLEY: . . . they pass a resolution saying the party's in favor of water diversion. Well I'm not interested where the party stands on water diversion. I want to know where the minister and where the government stand on water diversion.

Mr. Chairman, so we don't have to drag it out of him question by question, I think the minister should take this opportunity to give us the full report on just where things stand on the issue, what the committee that the Minister of Transportation chairs is doing — but the estimates come under Environment — whether there's any possible link with the Dunvegan dam, because we have the water committee report, tabled in the House last fall, indicating that one of the important things in planning Dunvegan is whether or not water diversion is in the cards. That's whether you build the medium, the high, or the low dam. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be useful for the minister to lay the cards the government has on the table at this point, bring us fully up to date on what has happened, what meetings, if any, have occurred, what initiatives the government is taking, and not only where the minister stands personally but what decision, if any, the government has made. If they haven't made a decision, when is it their intention to finalize a decision?

When I see memos, such as the one by his assistant deputy minister Mr. Melnychuk, saying we're locating these dams so they fit into water diversion, then are we not getting a quiet policy of water diversion without a public commitment to take the flak? The minister is smiling at the moment, but I think it's not a smiling matter to a lot of Albertans. We'd like to know; we have a right to know. The place we have a right to know is in the discussion of the minister's estimates, and I would welcome the minister to advise the committee during the course of the evening's discussion exactly where the government stands on this issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Red Deer.

MR. MAGEE: Mr. Chairman, I think I'll hold my comments, if you will, until we get into the vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Calgary Mountain View.

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Chairman, I was trying to get your attention so you could see the hon. Member for Red Deer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would judge then that it's the minister's turn.

MR. COOKSON: The Member for Spirit River-Fairview is up the creek as usual, without a paddle. Actually, the member's undercover agents didn't get the correct story from the conference the Conservatives had. If I remember correctly, a constituency in the north voted against the concept of interbasin transfer, but the young Conservatives had a resolution in favor of it, and when the blood had all been let, I think the young Conservatives won the resolution on the issue.

MR. NOTLEY: Where are you then, Jack?

MR. COOKSON: Well, I can assure you that I'm not in the middle of the river, especially without a paddle or a canoe.

MR. NOTLEY: But are you over your head?

MR. COOKSON: There was some suggestion when we discussed the Dunvegan dam that it could be either the high level, the medium, or the low level. Taking into consideration where the hon. member's located, in respect to him, I thought if it was at the medium it wouldn't flood him out. But on second thought, I think we'll go for the high level, and that ought to solve our problem over here. Since a lot of members perhaps don't know that the Member for Spirit River-Fairview lives on the banks of the Peace River, above Dunvegan, I'm not sure whether the medium dam will flood him out or the high level, but perhaps I should check the specs.

MR. NOTLEY: Just let me know what you're doing.

MR. COOKSON: We'll let you know in lots of time.

To answer the first points first — I don't know whether they were points, or really what they were. I think the underlining thing was that members' quotes dealt with where we felt there was a significant indication of danger downstream, we would immediately advise. In those spills that occurred, and I referred to them earlier — phenols, oil products, and so on — we have to use a judgment on these things, and in terms of the capacity of the river, there was no significant danger at all. In fact I think the Minister of Municipal Affairs responded to the member several days ago, insofar as Fort MacKay was concerned, that the province has funded two sources of water supply for the people up there, and they also had transportation by way of truck available to them. There's absolutely no need to acquire water supply for drinking purposes from the river, and there's some considerable doubt whether that in fact even did happen. Even if it did happen, there would be no reason for anyone to use water in its raw state without proper treatment in terms of boiling.

Insofar as the water transfer, I made an earlier comment that if the member can find anything in my estimates that relates closely to any concept of water transfer, he's finding something I haven't been able to find. There's no intent to be involved with water transfer at

this stage. I think the Premier responded to that pretty clearly, that we have funding . . .

MR. KROEGER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I notice the Member for Spirit River-Fairview just went into interbasin transfer. He just brought in a glass of water.

MR. NOTLEY: Who's that young man interrupting the speech?

MR. COOKSON: That's something to take into consideration perhaps when the Member for Spirit River-Fairview's colleagues to his left and on the right side of his political beliefs comment as to the importance of water, that it is an extremely important issue. I was glad the hon. Minister of Transportation interjected, because he's been a leading proponent of distribution of water around the province.

In his statement, the Premier made what we would be doing in terms of funding quite clear. That is in the estimates. There's nothing there in terms of basin transfer. We have an ongoing program in the south dealing with the South Saskatchewan basin capacity. We anticipate that report will be available to the public sometime in 1983. At that time we're going to have to assess the capacity of the total system there, as to what we can do, if anything, to facilitate additional water or, essentially, what decisions then have to be made. But our policy has been, and continues to be, maximum use of the basins themselves until such time as some new direction has to be taken.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, a couple of questions to the minister. One deals with the water pipeline that goes to Sheerness out of the Red Deer River. The question raised with me was with regard to off-site damage that may occur during the construction of the water line. Has the minister had any representation with regard to that? I think it's the same as any other pipeline with the same kind of damages, but the people who have grazing leases in the area and have already made satisfactory contracts with the company putting the line in were asking that question. Has the minister addressed that specific item?

MR. COOKSON: Essentially, the funding for this comes from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I guess the question is whether we would deal with them similar to the way we're dealing with the Vegreville pipeline. The answer is yes, we would deal with them on the same principle.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, are there situations where damage occurs off the purchased right of way; that is, off site on the private property or on the leased property? If damage occurs in the grazing area or whatever, is some type of compensation available, or is compensation worked out between the developer and the leaseholder following the damage? How is that handled in these situations?

MR. COOKSON: In the case of our Vegreville line, we delineated a specific area for an easement, and an additional area outside the easement for a working capability. We paid an amount for a sort of rental of that or for damages that might occur. I think each project is dealt with, depending on the situation. If there's a concern by

the group in that area, it may be that in the negotiations we follow through with them, we specify the area we need and then make allowances for any damages. I think it's understood that if our people cause damage, they should pay for it. It may be that we have to go back on the contractor because he may be outside the terms of reference of the lease, but I would have to look at the situation.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Would the minister update where the department is with respect to the dam on the Oldman River? I think it's important that the dam proceed as soon as possible, because the development of irrigation in southern Alberta is just about totally reliant on seeing that that dam is developed. I understand that discussions are proceeding with the Peigan tribe to put the dam on the reserve. What time limit would they have before discussions cease and the Three Rivers site is looked at? It becomes even more important that the dam proceed when you consider that the minimum flow at Fort Macleod has been down to about 30 cubic feet per second at times. With a dam on the Oldman, I think the minimum flow going by Fort Macleod would be 137 cubic feet per second. So any development of industries along the Oldman River, whether downstream from the dam toward Lethbridge or wherever . . . Our large water users aren't going to locate there, of course, unless they have an assured supply of water. So proceeding with the dam is important, and it can't wait. Would the minister respond to that concern?

In addition, as far as the expansion and upgrading of the total irrigation system in southern Alberta, particularly workers proceeding on the new weir on the Peigan Reserve, the contract being out, are there developments with that? Also, the increased size of the canal going from the weir downstream to Keho Lake — any developments there might be with respect to the landowners at Keho Lake and their concerns about the land they would lose by the expansion of Keho Lake. Are the concerns of the landowners, who have been there now for a few months, being addressed? Basically, is that work ready to proceed? I would appreciate a response from the minister on those concerns.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COOKSON: The Member for Macleod raises three questions. Mr. Chairman, they all really apply to estimates under the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. But if I might just briefly . . . By no later than fall, we hope we will have clarified the site of the dam, either Three Rivers or the Peigan Reserve. I've instructed the people there that we simply have to have this answer, that people have a right to know and not have it out there too long. The progress is excellent on work on the reserve. In fact just briefly reviewing it this morning, hopefully the base for the flume across the river is in place before they have problems with the water. The other work is pretty well on time. We issued two major tenders and, as you know, we have ongoing negotiations on land ownership around Keho Lake, which has delayed us a little. But we think we're following a pretty good time schedule as far as construction.

A further note for the Member for Little Bow on the Sheerness pipeline. The line is being constructed by Alberta Power, and Alberta Power will settle damages. Environment is cost sharing on the project.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, I have certainly advocated water resource management in this province, and I agree, as the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview said, that some day down the line we'll be looking at transferring water. However, before we look at transferring water, I think we have to manage the water on the river basins we have. Appreciating that any dams put in are under the heritage trust fund, I would like to ask the minister . . . He indicated that the report on study of the rivers in the province would be coming out in 1983. I was thinking of the Bow River basin especially. The minister says it's going to be 1983 before the report comes out. Is he saying that this report will have to be out before any more work will be done or any more consideration in this area as far as the Bassano dam or the Eyremore dam is concerned?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the minister's response. I was aware that it was through the heritage fund, but also that the Department of the Environment was taking care of the dams and a possible dam on the Oldman.

The other question I have is with respect to Willow Creek. At the outset, I'd like to say that I appreciate very much the efforts the department made with respect to the water crisis experienced by the communities of Clare-sholm and Granum. I don't think anyone could ever complain that the Department of the Environment didn't do all it possibly could. It spent some \$63,000 on the two communities to try to get the water through. That included a blasting contract. I appreciate that very much.

I think a couple of people in the department have to be recognized. One is Mr. Fonstad and the other is Dick Kambeltz who put in tremendous hours. I think the minister should be aware that he has people in his department like that, who went above and beyond the call of duty to try to do whatever they could.

Mr. Minister, the response would have to be on doing something to see that that situation doesn't recur. There would have to be some kind of reservoir of water either on or off stream. Are the minister and his department prepared to work with those two communities to do whatever can be done to see that the situation is rectified? I realize that since 1908, I believe, there never has been a situation like that. Maybe it will never recur, but in this day and age we can't afford to have communities without water, and a possible fire or something like that when there just isn't water to take care of that situation. Mr. Chairman, would the minister work with those two communities very closely in the next short while to try to see that that situation is rectified?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, yes. Insofar as Willow Creek is concerned, I appreciate those comments. I'll see that they're passed along to the fellows. It was a difficult time for the two communities involved. If it's January and your water supply is wiped out, that's a pretty delicate situation as far as the people are concerned. We'll have ongoing communication with the communities, and hopefully we can resolve the strange phenomenon that happens occasionally in that particular system, where the water moves down into the gravel, ices up, and subsequently eliminates the source of water.

Insofar as the Member for Bow Valley is concerned, the announcement does not in any way affect progress that's going on, and announcements that have been made from time to time in our estimates under the Heritage Savings Trust Fund for internal storage in some of the

areas — I think one of the areas the member represents. The federal government has pretty well taken over the maintenance of the Bassano Dam. I think they've spent something like \$800,000 in upgrading. My understanding is that they'll continue to upgrade. They've committed themselves to that, and also to clarification of the ownership. Once that's resolved, of course the province would be prepared to take a look at taking over the operation. So that will continue.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions for the hon. minister. One is with regard to the TAGA unit — trace atmospheric gas analyser — which was in the Pincher Creek area last summer, I believe. I wonder if the minister might be able to advise us when the department will have reviewed the results of that testing, and when the test results will be publicly released, in particular with regard to the Waterton Shell gas plant and the Gulf plant down there.

Secondly, I wonder if the minister might be able to bring us up to date with regard to reclamation of coal spoil piles in the Crowsnest Pass. What is being anticipated with regard to the piles, particularly the Greenhills site in Blairmore? Thirdly, since the hon. Member for Fort Macleod brought up the question of the dam site on the Oldman River, and given the fact that when the original announcement was made, it was determined that we'd be looking at having an operational dam in the 1990-1995 period, I recognize that the question as to location of a dam site on the Oldman should be settled as quickly as possible from the point of view of the constituents I represent. The uncertainty is certainly wearing on them emotionally, et cetera, and they would like to have a clear-cut decision one way or the other.

But even given that, I believe a proper amount of time should be given to the Peigans at Bocket to come up with a decision. I would not like to see us come up with an artificial deadline of September. But if time was required for them beyond September, there would be some leeway. We wouldn't be saying yes or no in September, if the Peigans had not come up with a proper presentation at that time. I say that because we are not anticipating having this dam operational, according to the announcement of the department in September 1980, until the 1990-1995 period. We should be making the right decision, not necessarily one that's set by arbitrary deadlines.

MR. COOKSON: With regard to the dam timing, I appreciate the comments by the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest. In my latest discussions with the Peigans, they anticipate two votes on the reserve. One will be a vote to determine whether there is interest in a dam on the reserve itself. Once they've cleared that hurdle, the second vote would be on the terms that would be agreed upon by the two parties concerned. My understanding is that that would be no later than the fall of '82.

A number of things are happening there in preparation for the vote. We are in close communication with them. We have an advisory committee busy working on the various components of the potential of a dam. At the same time, we're having sort of unofficial discussions with the chief and members of council as to the terms that would result from the potential of a dam on the reserve. So all these things are going on as quickly as possible, and hopefully we'll be able to meet the time frame.

The trace atmospheric gas analysis unit was brought in from Ontario on rental for a specific period of time. It's a very complex kind of unit. I had a chance to go through

it. It's a large motorhome, in a sense, with all this really complex equipment in it for analysis. Earlier in my estimates, I mentioned that the analysis is so complex that once we have the results, we're having trouble trying to analyse how we should use this information. At present, we're looking at a committee of research people in the different faculties to sit down and try to analyse the results and recommend how we should handle it.

As far as the coal spoil piles, again we're into heritage trust expenditure. But we are doing a number of things in the Pincher Creek-Crowsnest Pass area to solve the spoil piles. We've had ongoing negotiations and discussions with a company in the main area of the pass, and of course we have an agreement with them as to how they should process and reduce those piles, in particular one pile, and how to reclaim the area. We have an advisory committee that meets on occasion to review. We're working jointly with Transportation in co-ordinating eventual construction through there and use of some of the spoil piles for base. If my memory serves me correctly, another company is interested in processing another part of the coal pile area. So we are making pretty good progress. If we don't, we are always reminded by the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, if there's another question on this subject, that's fine. I'm on a different subject.

MR. BRADLEY: A supplementary, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the TAGA unit. Does the minister have a time frame when he expects the committee of researchers looking at the results to report with regard to the information gathered? I understand the TAGA unit was rented from an Ontario firm at a cost of some \$50,000 a day. After examining the results, is the department considering purchasing a similar type of unit for use in Alberta, or will they be looking at some sort of rental contract agreement to continue the use of this type of monitoring, which I understand is a mass spectrometer?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, we do have a time for the committee to report. It's not going to be a pension plan for a group of people to sit down to try to analyse, so I don't think it will take too long. Until we get an analysis by this group, we can't really say whether we should consider the use of the unit or whether, as in my estimates, I'll indicate that this last year we purchased and have fitted out a much less complex unit in California, but we think it will do the job. Perhaps that's the answer. We should keep our options open, insofar as this unit is concerned, until we get a report from the group. I think the cost was a total of \$50,000. It may be in my estimates. If I'm incorrect on that, I'll be corrected.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to raise a question that flows from the decision on the Odyssey project. I'm going to deal with the project itself when we get to the department of the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife. I think quite an important question of principle arises out of a Development Appeal Board decision which, as the minister probably knows, is being appealed. That DAB report ruled out the testimony of groups such as the Wilderness Association, the Alberta Fish & Game Association, and the Alberta League for Environmentally Responsible Tourism, on the basis that they didn't have a direct interest in the Odyssey project. I think there's a very important principle at stake, because when you have major projects of this nature which have



environmental implications, obviously you have groups such as the Wilderness Association, the Fish & Game Association, among others, that will want to make representation. However, if the precedent of the DAB report stands, then they won't be able to make representation.

I presume that any follow-up by the government will involve several departments. Undoubtedly one of those will be the Department of the Environment. I presume the Department of the Environment, the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife, and perhaps one or two other ministers will have to make a decision. But if the DAB decision is upheld, then we have a very serious restriction on the right of these province-wide groups to make representation on environmentally sensitive issues.

Is the minister in a position to advise what follow-up, if any, the Department of the Environment or other departments of government have made as far as reviewing the DAB report and monitoring the process of the appeal, and whether any consideration has been given to legislation? My understanding from the groups involved is that they would like to see legislation which would clarify the right, at a session such as this, of province-wide public interest groups that may not be directly affected to make representation.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Municipal Affairs should perhaps be mentioned, since the development appeal is established under the local improvement district, the municipal Act. Generally speaking, we have the environmental impact assessment on these kinds of projects. In this case, that was no exception. Under the environment impact assessment, it's required that the public at large can make representation. I am saying that the public is not prevented from participating and dialoguing in the process. This was the case, and is the case, in most major projects where there is an environmental impact assessment. The public has a chance to participate; they can question, cross-examine, and present papers. They don't have to be from the specific area.

First of all, my understanding is that the local authority in this case would pass a motion under the municipal Act accepting the concept of Odyssey. Subsequently, there is an appeal process for this sort of thing. I have no quarrel with that. Personally, I'm not sure whether the local authority has jurisdiction under this section to confine the appeal to only those specifically involved or interested. That sort of procedure is required in the case of annexations, where in my own constituency the local authority ruled only those interested. The difference was that they told outside groups that if they wished they could go to their elected representative, who in turn would act as a spokesman for them. If the member remembers the ruling in the case of the annexation of Edmonton, there are certain ways of handling the problem of massive submissions by individuals, rather than having individuals represent groups. I know that in the case of my own constituency, the elected representative for that area represented the groups.

I don't know whether I can comment further on the point the member makes. Quite frankly, I'm not sure of the direction given by the local authority to the appeal board itself.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the question really is just what three ministers, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Minister of the Environment, and the Associate Min-

ister of Public Lands and Wildlife, are doing. The DAB ruled, as I understand the ruling, that because groups such as the Fish & Game Association did not have a direct interest, their submission, their presentation, was not considered. Now these groups are taking the matter on, and it may well be that during the appeal their right to be heard will be upheld by the courts. However, I've had at least some representation made to me as to whether one of the contingency plans the government would look at would be legislation which would clarify the process, so that when we have a DAB hearing on something of this nature, these province-wide organizations would in fact be able to make representation, and their representation would be considered by the DAB in the course of their deliberations.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon I asked the minister if he would make some remarks in regard to his trip to the Scarpe Valley area of southwestern Alberta. He did allude to the trip. The specific information I would like to get from the minister is the recommendations he made to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources in regard to logging practices which were subsequently modified.

MR. COOKSON: When I spoke before dinner, I think I mentioned that I was concerned about two areas. One was the problem of erosion. The other was to minimize the spreading of the pine beetle north. Insofar as my own legislation and authority is concerned, that's all I can really do. The Department of Energy and Natural Resources has its own forestry branch, and the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife is involved with it. I think the member would have to pursue the specific direction given to the forestry branch, in terms of clean-up and direction. It would be beyond my department, without legislation, to tell them how they should clean up a problem of this nature. My role in this particular case was primarily advisory and not through legislative authority.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, could the minister then indicate whether or not officials or the ministers of those respective departments accompanied the Minister of the Environment to the Scarpe Valley area to view the damage being done by the pine bark beetle?

MR. COOKSON: Not the ministers. We had one of the officials of the forestry service with us, who was able to show us essentially what their intentions were and how they were to handle it. We subsequently had informal discussions with the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding, when the minister was questioned in regard to this matter last fall in the Legislative Assembly, that the Department of Energy and Natural Resources acted on recommendations made by the Department of the Environment, specifically the Minister of the Environment. I see the minister nodding in agreement at this point. Again, I would like to know what those recommendations were, specifically to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, that motivated that department to make modifications to the logging practices in that area.

As a supplementary question, would the minister also indicate what modifications were made to the logging practices?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, it's nice to know you've had some influence in redirecting another department, how they should handle their affairs. But the member has to remember that the departments — in this case Energy and Natural Resources and Public Lands and Wildlife in a sense worked together — are as much concerned about the problem as Environment would be. I'll check to see if any formal letter went from me to the department. I know we did have informal discussions with the minister concerned, and we had officials of the forestry department with us when we did the tour. As a result of that, obviously some changes were made.

MR. SINDLINGER: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if I might ask the minister if it was an official of a department making a recommendation over the minister's signature, as opposed to the minister himself making the recommendation.

I think it's important that the Legislative Assembly know exactly why the logging practices were modified in that particular area. It's not that I don't agree that the pine bark beetle is a problem. Of course it is, and certainly it's the responsibility of the government to minimize the spread of that beetle. But there are people in that area who are concerned about the spread, and the damage that will be done to the environment and to their business in the area. I think it would help them understand the problem a great deal more if the minister could recall exactly what those recommendations were and make them public.

I've made a considerable effort to understand the problem by talking to all parties involved. I'm aware of the response the government has made through the department and through the member of the Legislative Assembly for that area. I've also taken the time to talk to the logging company. I spoke to the vice-president and to one of their main foresters in Calgary, who demonstrated to me quite satisfactorily that there were reasons for what they were doing. However, there hasn't been a demonstration to the people in the area in total so that they completely agree with what's going on there. Some people are aware, but it would be very helpful if everybody knew all the reasons.

I don't want to be referred to another department and ask them at that particular time, because the Department of the Environment did play a very specific role. The minister did indicate that those departments responded to recommendations by the minister. I think it's only fair that we be aware of what those recommendations were.

I appreciate the undertaking the minister has given us, that he will go back through the records and see if there was a written communication to the other concerned departments. I would also like to know if any there were minutes of verbal instructions or recommendations given to the other departments. I would ask the minister to give us an undertaking that he will not only attempt to find out if there is any correspondence between his department and the others, specifying what those recommendations were, but also any verbal communications as well. The reason for that is there is considerable concern about the environmental damage that has been done in that area — the Beaver Mines area, not the Scarpe Creek area. I've been there to view that, and there's a problem there as well. I'll leave that.

I'd like to go on to one other subject, if I may, Mr. Chairman, before we get onto the vote, in regard to the Moose Mountain pipeline hearings. I wonder if the minister might bring us up to date on the status of those

deliberations and the position the Alberta government has taken in that regard. For the benefit of the members, I might point out that the Moose Mountain pipeline project is a pipeline application before the Energy Resources Conservation Board. It entails the development of seven high-sulphur gas wells in the Kananaskis Country area.

As well as the question I posed with regard to the status of that application and the government's position thereon, I would also like to know the government's attitude with regard to developing gas well sites in Kananaskis Country. We have expended over \$100 million to develop it for recreational purposes, yet here we are allowing the development of gas wells at the same time. So I might leave that with the minister.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COOKSON: I can't tell the member exactly where the hearing process is. I think the ERCB had one hearing and scheduled another. One of the major concerns expressed was the problem of crossing the Bow River. There was some concern with regard to that. We had some correspondence on that. Of course, we had our own people there to cross-examine the applicant. The ERCB itself, under Energy and Natural Resources, holds the hearings. We come in as interveners in the examination. I'm not sure whether we were asked to sit on the board in this particular case, but I'll check that for the member.

With regard to the crossing problem, I think we are now more or less assured that the depth at which the pipe will be placed and the distance back at which it crosses the Bow River, or at least goes down to a depth, has minimized any kind of risk. The ERCB is looking at safety precautions insofar as in the event of a rupture of any kind. I guess we now just await the ERCB recommendation based on the public hearing process, which will eventually come to government.

Insofar as gas plants in Kananaskis Country, the normal procedure is for a private company to make an application. That application contains a site. The next procedure is to make application to have an Energy Resources Conservation Board hearing. It may very well be that an application within Kananaskis Country would go past the Citizens' Advisory Committee in Kananaskis Country, and subsequently would likely be referred to the Minister of Recreation and Parks for input, since it comes under the jurisdiction of Recreation and Parks. Perhaps I could check to see whether that procedure was followed in this particular case. That's generally the procedure that's followed, and then you have the hearing process and the recommendations. The ERCB takes all the input from the interveners into consideration. I understand that Andy Russell was probably one of the leading advocates of certain things, amongst others. They have an opportunity to express themselves and make their arguments before this panel, and subsequently the recommendations are made. Then it's government's duty to assess the recommendation and accept or reject it.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, once the ERCB recommendations are made, would it then be the government's position to assess that decision and decide whether to proceed, endorse, or come back with a counter-argument? In addition to that, I would like to ask whether the government took a position on whether the delivery point for that pipeline would be the Quirk Creek gas plant or the Jumping Pound gas plant. How many gas wells would have to be developed in Kananaskis

Country before it would become a matter of concern to the Department of the Environment? Has an assessment been made to determine how many gas wells Kananaskis Country could accommodate without compromising the integrity of the environment, not only in its natural state but in the state it is now in as a result of the development of Kananaskis Country?

MR. COOKSON: I missed the first question.

MR. SINDLINGER: We'll start with the last question. How many gas plants could Kananaskis Country accommodate before the environment, in its natural state, would be compromised, or the Kananaskis Country as developed?

MR. COOKSON: The member asked a question with regard to compromising the environment. I think that process would have to be determined through public hearings. I don't know whether one could arbitrarily determine how many gas wells would then start to compromise the standards set down for Kananaskis Country. Perhaps I should be referring this to one of the other departments, and the member should question Energy and Natural Resources on the process of the number of wells in a given area, for example.

Our duty and responsibility in Environment is to intervene at the hearing. Occasionally we are asked to sit on the panel to examine and essentially state whether we find that the project meets our environmental standards. If we can satisfy ourselves that the reclamation will be done properly, that the water table will not deteriorate, that air quality is not unduly affected in any way — it has to meet our clean air/water regulations — we generally go along with the project. In some cases, the aesthetic thing is raised. This was raised in the case of TransAlta and their power lines to the south. At the present time recommendations are coming out that those power lines be done in a certain color to minimize the aesthetic impact, and we whole-heartedly support and recommend that. This sort of thing comes out in the public process by the ERCB. Of course the ERCB then approves subject to Environment, and we spell out the things we expect to happen.

I'm afraid I missed the first question the member asked.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, the minister has just indicated that we, the Department of the Environment, spell out the things we expect to happen with regard to the environment in these particular projects. I also note that the description of the ministry indicates that the ministry is responsible for the co-ordination of policies and programs, et cetera of other departments. With regard to the development in Kananaskis Country, I would have thought the department would have spelt out the things it expected to happen in that area, but I have the impression that that has not yet occurred. If we go to the rhetorical question of how many gas wells Kananaskis Country could accommodate without compromising the integrity of the environment, there isn't an answer, because I suspect that an environmental impact analysis has not yet been done. If an environmental impact analysis had been done, one might be able to say with a certain degree of confidence that perhaps Kananaskis Country could, just for speaking purposes, accommodate one million gas wells. We know that's not true. On the other hand, we don't know if that one million could be 100,000, 100, or even one natural gas well in that particular area. I

would seek an undertaking from the minister that prior to acceptance of the ERCB recommendation in regard to the development of the Moose Mountain pipeline and the seven natural gas wells, there be some sort of assessment done to determine whether or not the seven gas wells in themselves and the pipeline will in fact compromise the environmental integrity of Kananaskis Country.

Kananaskis Country required a great deal of vision to be undertaken by this government, to preserve a recreational area in its natural state for the people of the province of Alberta. After having gone ahead and done that, and spent over \$140 million on it, we then come in and start developing gas wells and pipelines on it. It seems to me we're working at cross-purposes. It's like a road-paving crew going in the day after a line-painting crew has gone on a road. One day the line crew paints the lines on and the next day the asphalt crew puts asphalt over them. We have to make sure that the development of those natural gas wells in Kananaskis Country is not going to damage what we've gone to great lengths to ensure in the first place. I would simply seek an undertaking from the minister that some sort of environmental impact analysis will be done by the department, to ensure that Kananaskis Country is not compromised by the development of the gas wells and by the pipelines in the first instance. In the second instance: define the limit to which that development can go, because if we start developing seven gas wells in Kananaskis Country today, tomorrow it's going to be eight, next year it's going to be 18, and so on until all the gas wells are developed. We'll find that Kananaskis Country is all torn up for the gas wells.

It's fine to say that there are some protections in regard to the areas around those gas wells and the pipelines, but it takes a heck of a long time to replace the natural state of the environment once those gas wells have been developed and the pipelines put in place. That's about the strongest representation I can make in that regard. I ask the minister to please give it consideration.

The other question I asked was in regard to the government's position on the ultimate destination of the Moose Mountain pipeline. There was an alternative. It was not only the Quirk Creek gas plant but also the Jumping Pound gas plant. I asked what the government's position was on that, and the means by which the government had arrived at that position.

MR. COOKSON: I've got a little more information and an update on the hearing process. The hearings are concluded now. The ERCB report is not in as yet. The process is that the government will consider the report by the ERCB. There were three separate hearings: Quirk Creek, Moose Mountain, and Jumping Pound.

I have no quarrel with the comments the member makes in regard to the development. The Eastern Slopes policy, of which Kananaskis Country is a part, pretty well spells out what can or can't be done, or should or shouldn't be done, in specific areas. You have the environmentally sensitive areas, wildlife habitat areas, the general areas, the areas where development can take place, this sort of thing. I would venture to say that there will be very careful consideration given towards any undue development in Kananaskis Country that subsequently would take away from the attractiveness of the area. That would take place only in areas which met the criteria laid down by the Eastern Slopes policy which the province is following. If the member remembers, not too long ago we asked a company not to drill, even though

they held the lease in a specific area, because of the Eastern Slopes policy. That's all being monitored very closely.

In addition, we have the Kananaskis Country advisory committee, which reports pretty well directly to the Minister of Recreation and Parks. I am part of an internal cabinet committee that reviews pretty well any activity which takes place within Kananaskis Country. Any of those kinds of things would come directly to us, in terms of applications and so on. In this respect, Environment would have input in some project of this nature before it got into the system by way of hearing.

I can't answer the other question. Maybe I can find the information. It specifically asked for the proposed route of the Moose Mountain pipeline. Is that the question the member asked? If that's part of the hearing process, we won't know until the ERCB makes its recommendation to us.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, after listening to the minister's comments, it seems to me it might be wise to stop right here with the development in Kananaskis Country. There's really no need to develop those gas wells there, other than the fact that we might be denying the applicants the opportunity to develop their natural resource, or their proprietary right over the gas lease, or whatever. We have such an oversupply of natural gas in the province today, there isn't an urgent need to develop that natural gas.

If it can be demonstrated that we're impairing the profit development of that particular company by not allowing them to drill there, the Alberta government has the ability to take their royalties in kind, as opposed to cash. Or at least there's the possibility, if this company in this particular case is being denied profit, to change in some other area. Natural gas and crude oil exchanges are going on all the time all over the place. It might be beneficial to say: stop, let's not allow any of these natural gas wells to be developed in the Moose Mountain area in the Kananaskis park. Once we get started on that, the seven wells are going to damage the environment. There's no question about it. Once we get going on the seven, there's going to be more following that. Why even start in the first place? There's no need to develop those gas wells. If they need the profit from the development of that gas, let them take their profit somewhere else in some other lease. We can exchange that with them. That's no problem.

Coming back to the pine bark beetle, I would like to make one more representation in that regard. I would ask the minister to look at those recommendations in regard to the Scarpe Creek area, where logging had been planned, but because of the minister's visit, recommendations were made to other departments and logging practices were modified. There was an area — Scarpe Creek — that was left alone.

I ask the minister if he would take those same recommendations used in the Scarpe Creek area and look at the area immediately east of the Beaver Mines Lake area. Extensive logging has already been undertaken around that area, but it would be possible to take those recommendations used at Scarpe Creek, apply them in the same situation to that area east of the Beaver Mines area, and stop the logging there.

The reason I'm making that representation is that there is a small business man in that area whose business is tourism. He has a guest ranch there, and people come from all around the world. It's a beautiful setting, a

beautiful environment, but if logging goes on past the area it has already gone to, it's going to decimate the terrain immediately in front of his guest ranch. He would be willing to suffer the consequences as those which are going to be suffered in the Scarpe Creek area. I think it's a marginal type of thing, because it hasn't been decisively and conclusively demonstrated that cutting down all those pines is going to stop the spread of the pine bark beetle. We can stop there and allow that person to continue his small business, and also use it as a control area — a control area compared to the cut area — to see if, in fact, cutting practices do have an impact at all on the pine bark beetle.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have an opportunity to contribute for a few seconds with regard to discussion on the pine bark beetle and its spread in the Castle River drainage area. I appreciate the interest the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo is showing in the castle area.

Earlier he made some reference as to whether there had been ample opportunity with regard to the public being informed of what is taking place. There are really two parts to the program. There is a salvage program, which is aimed at harvesting merchantable stands which otherwise would go unsalvaged or uncut. A great amount of merchantable timber would just be left to either rot, decay, or catch fire. There's a second part of the program, which is a control program. There are two aspects to the program in the pine bark beetle infested area. The control program basically is being done north of Highway 3, and really doesn't have a great deal of effect on the Castle River drainage area. The salvage program is of course germane to the Castle River, Beaver Mines, and Scarpe Creek areas.

There have been extensive public meetings and input with regard to the salvage program in that area. As I recollect, public meetings were called in Hillcrest to discuss both the control and salvage programs. There have been extensive meetings with interest groups who requested an opportunity to have input to the forest service with regard to any of their logging plans; for example, the Alberta Wilderness Association, the Alberta Fish & Game Association, and private individuals, including the guest ranch operator the hon. member has mentioned.

With regard to the specific case of the guest ranch operator, he's been assured that no logging would take place which would have an impact on his operation without some direct consultation with him, and to ensure that if logging does take place, there would be minimum impact with regard to his operation. That commitment was undertaken by the director of the Alberta forest service at a meeting with him in the spring of 1980. I myself met with that operator as recently as a week ago Sunday, and again assured him that no logging would take place until there had been consultation with him, and to ensure that if any logging did take place, it would minimize an impact on him, and that no decision would be made with regard to logging in that area until such meetings had been taken to have direct consultation with him.

There have been public meetings; two in Pincher Creek. There was a very extensive symposium on the pine bark beetle in Coleman, in which a number of different groups participated. I think the program has been necessary with regard to salvage, from the viewpoint that if these massive acreages of timber killed by the pine bark beetle are not logged, particularly in the intensively used recreation areas — we talk about Beaver Mines Lake.

Last summer we had a very dangerous situation there. About 160 campers must have been in that area on a weekend. The timber killed by the pine bark beetle was right up into and adjacent to the campground area, and in fact necessitated the closing of part of that campground. Some of the campers were very concerned about the logging taking place there. When it was explained to them how dead and dry this timber was, and how prone it was to catching on fire, they soon realized that perhaps they should get their camping vehicles and move out of that area, given the very extreme fire hazard and danger in the area.

Those are some of the reasons behind the necessity to salvage in that intensively recreation oriented area. The department of forestry, where I think this discussion properly lies — under the estimates of the Department of Energy and Natural Resources rather than Environment — did respond to a number of concerns of individuals and groups and came up with some fairly sensitive logging plans for the Beaver Mines Lake recreation area and the cross-country ski trails in the area.

I think you have to apply different criteria to salvaging stands killed by pine bark beetles in relatively flat terrain versus the much steeper area in Scarpe Creek. Scarpe Creek is basically an area which hasn't been touched by a great deal of human recreation or activity, whereas in an area like Beaver Mines, where you have a campground adjacent to the timber killed by pine bark beetles, from just a safety point of view it's very important that you get that timber cleaned out of there and replant and reforest it. I know the forestry department has plans to plant a number of seedlings in the area. They are also going to plant some fairly fast-growing poplar/aspen types of trees, attempting to get that area back into a useful campground as quickly as possible. They are also redesigning the campground area and expanding the number of units there. But I think the salvage in that area certainly has been necessary.

Just to go to another area, the member was talking about Kananaskis Country. As I recollect, when Kananaskis Country was set up it was not going to necessarily restrict resource development. There would be areas within Kananaskis Country where existing resource development would be allowed to continue, with the emphasis there perhaps on the east side of the Fisher Range. The area that would really be designated and protected from resource development would be on the west side of that range in Kananaskis park. The member suggested there was oil and gas exploration going on in Kananaskis park. It's in the recreation area as opposed to the Kananaskis park specifically.

I know there's been a great deal of discussion and concern about the extent of the gas exploration in the eastern edge of Kananaskis Country, but that has been an historic gas exploration area. And I don't believe it was the intent of the government when they set up Kananaskis Country to cancel all the resource leases in the eastern part, but to have a multiple use approach to it, have the major emphasis on recreation but also allow the public to have a better understanding of multiple use and what could take place in a multiple use area. Any resource development which would take place would be on a basis sensitive to the recreation needs of the users in that area.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder what those pine trees and pine bark beetles ever did when there wasn't a government of Alberta. I'm sure they got along quite well, and things resolved themselves in their natural

way. I'm very interested in the comments about minimizing the damage and minimizing the environmental impact on that particular area. What I've seen there hasn't been a minimization of the environmental impact; it has been a maximization, because the logging there has been clear-cut logging. If 160 campers were at that campsite a couple of years ago, I can assure you there aren't going to be any campers there over the next few years because of what has happened to the campsite. The campsite has been pretty well ploughed under, along with all the trees, the undergrowth, and the shrubbery in that same area.

I ask the minister: exactly what specific, hard-copy assurances have the people in that guest ranch area been given that there will be (a) consultation before logging and (b) a minimization of environmental impact? I personally don't think that an assurance of consultation before logging is worth very much, because what it amounts to is a logger, or whoever is in charge of that, going in prior to the fact and saying, hey, guess what, we're going to log here tomorrow. To me that doesn't give any assurance that there's going to be a minimization of the environmental impact. What I would like to hear the minister say specifically is that there will not be any more logging east of the Beaver Mines area than there is now. I'm sure the same rationale could be applied to that area as was applied to the Scarpe Creek area. There's no reason for those trees to be cut down if we follow that logic.

I also wonder whether that logging would be "merchantable", as the member terms it, if it were not for the fact that the Alberta government is paying a substantial subsidy to have the trees cut down. I put that question to the company logging in that area and asked them if they would still be there, cutting down those trees, if they were not getting a subsidy. The answer was unequivocal and quite clear: no, it was not an economic or financially feasible operation without the government subsidy. So to say that it's an operation to salvage the merchantable timber is not quite correct, because it's not financially feasible without the government subsidy. In terms of fire hazard and pine bark beetles eating away at those pine trees, again I have to ask the question: what would have happened if the Alberta government had not been here?

MR. NOTLEY: You're on, Jack.

MR. SINDLINGER: Just let me put one last, final, very specific question to the minister. Will the minister give us some assurance that there will not be any more logging east of the Beaver Mines Lake area?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think the question should go to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. He's the minister responsible for the Alberta forest service and the approval of any logging plans — not the Minister of the Environment.

MR. NOTLEY: Have we got a new minister?

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, on that point, I would not want the minister to slough off that responsibility, because this book is quite specific in saying that this department has the responsibility for co-ordinating the programs of the entire government in these specific areas, and I don't think that responsibility should be shirked at this point in time. Furthermore, it was this minister who surveyed that area to determine whether there was in fact a substantial problem and what should

be done about it. I think it's incumbent upon this minister to maintain the responsibility he undertook in the first place, and not shuffle it off on another minister.

MR. NOTLEY: You're on now, Jack.

MR. COOKSON: I believe so. Now is the time. The light is on.

I can't give the member that kind of assurance. I'll make note of it. It's specifically to check the logging progress east of Beaver Mines, and I think the member has made fair representation. All I can say at this time is that the suggestions will certainly be passed along to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, under whose estimates the votes are included insofar as funding for supplemental assistance in terms of harvesting the timber. There's no expenditure, as such, in my own department for this sort of thing.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, in the Kananaskis area will be the Olympic sites and so on. Has the government established a committee to assure us as Albertans that whatever environmental impact there could be in that development is looked after? Is there a team within the department? Is an adviser from your department working with the Olympics group at the present time to ensure that all development is being controlled and carefully observed?

MR. COOKSON: A number of committees are, in a sense, monitoring the total development in the Kananaskis Country. We have an interdepartmental committee of deputy ministers, which my own deputy sits on, insofar as any matters of development that come under the Department of the Environment through the legislation we administer. In addition, we have the interdepartmental cabinet committee chaired by the Minister of Recreation and Parks. He receives direction or advice from a Citizens' Advisory Committee in the Kananaskis Country area. These matters come before this cabinet committee. We meet regularly and review these kinds of issues with this committee, and make recommendations to cabinet. There's also a public document stating the objectives of Kananaskis Country.

I think there are enough committees and officials involved in the total operation that we can assure the public in general that we'll certainly do our best to minimize the environmental problems insofar as the proposed 1988 Olympics. In addition, the whole area is overlaid with the Eastern Slopes policy. So I think we have enough checks and balances in the operation. If we don't, I'm sure someone will remind us before the development is over.

MR. R. SPEAKER: The minister is saying that no special person or committee of government or no special emphasis has been put forth by the government to look at co-ordinating what's going to happen in the area where the Olympics are going to be developed. It's just committees that are now in place. If by chance they are able to observe or hear about what's going on, whatever necessary precautions are to be taken, will happen. Is anyone assigned to work with the Olympics committee out of Calgary in terms of their ongoing planning? Does someone sit on the committee? Does someone report to this ministers' committee or to a minister in government? Has any kind of mechanism like that been set up, or is the government taking a hands-off approach right now?

MR. COOKSON: We're projecting quite a ways ahead, eight years. There are still a lot of unknown questions. Of course, even the siting is still an area of exploration insofar as the government is concerned, in terms of the hill development and so on. But we do have one person who has been with Kananaskis Country since it was first designed. That's Mr. Ed Marshall. I'm not sure what his capacity is.

AN HON. MEMBER: Managing director.

MR. COOKSON: Managing director. He is, in a sense, liaison between the Citizens' Advisory Committee and the cabinet committee chaired by the Minister of Recreation and Parks. He also liaisons with the special committee in Calgary that's planning this big event. So at present, we're still six years away. We think we have sufficient in place, but we may have to add to it.

Agreed to:

1.01 — Minister's Office	\$166,723
1.02 — Deputy Minister's Office	\$542,610
1.03 — Finance and Office Services	\$1,696,802
1.04 — Systems and Computing	\$1,759,977
1.05 — Communications	\$371,701
1.06 — Library	\$301,530
1.07 — Personnel and Organization Development	\$454,305
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$5,293,648
2.1 — Program Support	\$682,225

## 22 — Air Quality Management

MR. MAGEE: If I may, I have held off for some hours. Instead of asking a general question, I would like to get to some specifics on air quality management.

While I'm on my feet and before I ask my questions of the minister, I would like the indulgence of the Assembly, through you, Mr. Chairman, to talk briefly about Main Street-Alberta. As most members probably know, Main Street-Alberta was a project of the Devonian Group of Charitable Foundations. Main Street-Alberta was started in 1973 and is concluding this fall. Its primary purpose I feel — although I didn't study the exact detail when it was originally announced, in reading the 22 criteria that were established, I noticed that 10 had to do with the planting of shrubs and trees.

I think they have done a tremendous job in setting an example for all Alberta to recognize within the villages, towns, and cities that they co-operated with those municipal communities in showing what could be done in the way of assisting in air quality management. I would like to commend them publicly for their 158 projects throughout Alberta and thank them on behalf of this government, in fact all the people of Alberta, for this leadership role. This leads me to ask the minister: in air quality management, has he considered any amount of money to be set aside for insuring more clean air by improving the number of trees, particularly coniferous trees, in urban areas, be they villages, towns, or cities?

If I may, before I lead into my next question on this same subject, I would like to bring to the members' attention the very great value of trees in an urban setting, relative to what trees can do for air pollution control matters. I'm not going to go into a great dissertation here

tonight, because I'd like to serve notice that at some time, if an election isn't called, I will produce a private member's public Bill that would lead into this subject in greater detail. But just to pique the interest of the members, the public, and the department, I would like to state that trees and shrubs in an urban setting have a great measure of smog control. It's been proven in California, for one, that a great many pollutants have been taken out of the air as a result of having trees and shrubs in proliferation. Also this is nature's air freshener. We all know the smell of cities with their automobiles, the pollutants that come out of smokestacks, albeit with controls and so on. Trees, in effect, through the process of photosynthesis, take in carbon dioxide and expel oxygen and thereby freshen the air in urban centres and communities.

In addition, greenbelts throughout urban centres and around villages, towns, and whatever, also play a great part in producing clean air and oxygen. During the 23,000 times we each inhale and exhale in the course of a day, in some cities, we as oxygen generators, are only getting 1,000 parts of oxygen to particles. It should be in the area of 2,000. Trees, with their leafy limbs, will pick up many of the pollutants floating in the air and, in effect, catch them. When the next rain comes, of course, it washes the leaves clean in more of a dust form that runs down the gutters and into the sewer systems and so on. So it performs a very, very advantageous need. I could go on about dust traps and advantages of trees and shrubs and so on, but I won't at this time.

I realize that the Department of the Environment isn't totally responsible for producing trees. Presently the Department of Agriculture has a very beneficial program in providing a provincial tree nursery for farmers to have trees as shelter belts surrounding their farmsteads. The Alberta government also has the Alberta Horticultural Research Centre at Brooks, which provides seedlings and trees that many of the landscape people throughout this province use as seedlings and starters. These trees could be provided at government expense for organizations such as the Devonian Group to use in their programs of main street beautification and clean air conditions. Certainly during the last 10 years — if not 10, about eight or nine — the Devonian Foundation of charitable organizations has led the way. I contend that we as a government should get involved to a greater degree. As they phase out their programs this fall, we should start to consider utilizing free enterprise to supply, in conjunction with the municipal programs and probably some provincial government financing, and also by individuals — so it could, in effect, become a three- or four-pronged effort to produce more trees within the urban setting. I realize that the Department of Municipal Affairs has programs that have been utilized in the municipalities. But it goes farther than that, because if one is to get the volume of trees necessary to do the type of work in cleaning the air and so on, we must go beyond just boulevard planting on wide streets. We have to look at little pocket parks and things of this nature. I'm quite proud of the constituency

that I represent in the city, because recent figures have indicated that that city has more green space per capita than any other urban municipality in Canada. Our city officials were long-sighted enough that instead of taking the municipal reserve in the form of moneys, they almost invariably took it in land. They created a great number of patches of grass throughout the city, but frankly they are not planted with the variety and number of trees that should be planted to do much of this work of cleaning the air for the citizens.

If they haven't provided in this budget, I would like to suggest that this government provide in budgets to come — and it might be a small amount of money to start with, but to set the scene, because finally we have to recognize the practicality of getting the economy back on its feet. Wherever possible, we should stimulate private enterprise during this period of economic uncertainty. As time goes on, I think we should provide more and more money to work with landscape people in private industry, municipalities and government, to provide trees on a subsidy basis to urban dwellers, so they can plant added numbers of trees on their property — an encouragement and incentive to plant trees. We could get into the whole area of energy saving costs and things of that nature, but I want to stay on the specific subject tonight of air pollution control.

I would appreciate the minister giving some answers to the questions. Has any money been provided in this vote for the programs I have suggested? If not, could the minister indicate plans he might have in this somewhat narrow field, to which trees can provide a very advantageous urban benefit to our citizens?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise for a different purpose, not to add to those excellent remarks, but to suggest that in light of the hour, the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Having heard the report and the request for leave to sit again, are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, as to business tomorrow, it is intended that the Assembly sit tomorrow night. We will be continuing with the estimates of the Department of the Environment and, if there is time, Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

[At 10:13 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]

