

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: Monday, May 2, 1983 2:30 p.m.

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

## PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

## head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

## Bill 43

Municipal Government  
Amendment Act, 1983

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 43, the Municipal Government Amendment Act, 1983.

A number of amendments to the Municipal Government Act are contained in this Bill. I won't highlight all of them, but I would like to indicate that there is provision in the Bill for authority to a municipal council to establish within the municipality a business revitalization zone.

[Leave granted; Bill 43 read a first time]

## Bill 50

Alberta Energy Company  
Amendment Act, 1983

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being the Alberta Energy Company Amendment Act, 1983.

The main purpose of the Bill is to amend the Alberta Energy Company Act to reflect the publicly announced decision of the government last November to discontinue the previous 50 per cent shareholding of the government in the company and to allow that 50 per cent to drop to approximately 45 per cent, by reason of the successful \$85 million share offer of Alberta Energy Company last fall.

[Leave granted; Bill 50 read a first time]

## Bill 49

## Petroleum Marketing Amendment Act, 1983

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 49, the Petroleum Marketing Amendment Act, 1983.

The purpose of the Bill is threefold. First, it relates the definition of pentanes-plus to the definition in a number of regulations. Second, it provides an authorization for the payment of sales proceeds of petroleum by the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission to an operator or a designated financial institution. Third, it outlines the procedure whereby payment of these proceeds must be made by the operator or the designated financial institution to the owners within five days after receiving them.

[Leave granted; Bill 49 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 49 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

## head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to file with the Legislative Assembly copies of the annual report of Pacific Western Airlines for the year ended December 31, 1982. It will be noted in the report that the company had a net income in 1982 of just over \$6 million, Mr. Speaker, substantially better than the record of Air Canada.

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table in the Assembly today copies of a new booklet entitled Important Facts About The Canadian Natural Gas Trade With The United States, produced jointly with the Independent Petroleum Association of Canada and the Canadian Petroleum Association. This booklet deals with four important current subjects: Canada's gas export record, Canada's supply position, the contractual terms of Canadian gas exports and, finally, Canada's reassessment of the contractual conditions for gas exports.

## head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce to you, and through you to the Assembly, a group of students who are under a certain time constraint, so I regret going out of order here. They are 21 grade 6 students from Richard Secord school in the constituency of Edmonton Whitemud. They are accompanied by parents Mrs. Osachoff, Mrs. Vandertol, and Mr. Kumbongsi, and by their teacher Mme. Aline Savoie. They are seated in the public gallery, and I ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 31 grade 10 students from Ponoka composite high school. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Gary Anderson and by bus driver Juanita De Spiegelaere; they are seated in the members gallery. They are culminating a unit on provincial and federal government with a visit to the Legislature at this time, the beginning of Education Week. As their MLA and principal, I ask them to stand and receive the traditional welcome of the House.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 54 grade 6 students from the Pope John school in Fort Saskatchewan. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Al Stewart and by Mrs. Gibeau and Mrs. Bentley. They are sitting in the members gallery, and I ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the Legislature.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, in advance of introducing the members of the provincial Education Week committee, I wonder if I might have the consent of my colleagues to make a few remarks about Education Week itself.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, today is the first day of Education Week across Alberta, as my colleague the hon. Member for Ponoka just suggested. The theme for Education Week in Alberta this year is Explore Alberta. It has been the catalyst for a variety of exciting activities that have spurred the imaginations of students across the province and in every grade.

This year the provincial Education Week committee sponsored a province-wide art exhibition. Students from all grades were invited to participate. The exhibition also contained a special category for handicapped students, either as a class project or as an individual effort. Outstanding efforts are on display in the Legislature pedway and will remain there for the duration of the week. I invite you, Mr. Speaker, members of the Assembly, and other interested people to view the exhibition to see the artistic skills of Alberta students.

The purpose of Education Week is to highlight education within and beyond the classroom walls. Learning doesn't end at the classroom door. The committee has sponsored activities which reflect other important aspects of school life. Students will honor special school staff and members of the community with certificates of recognition. The committee has also worked with schools to develop other special events that will make this an exciting week to remember for Alberta schools and communities.

I'd like to commend the provincial Education Week committee, composed of: Dale Ericksen, of the Alberta School Trustees' Association; David Flower, of the Alberta Teachers' Association; Ed Kilpatrick, of ACCESS; Lash MacLeod, of the Alberta Federation of Home and School Associations; committee chairman Sarah Jones, of Alberta Education; and Cheryl Edwards, co-ordinator of the week's events. The members of the committee are seated in the members gallery, Mr. Speaker. I ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

CLERK: Ministerial Statements.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have the indulgence of the House to revert to Introduction of Special Guests.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. NOTLEY: I thought you were making a ministerial statement.

MR. PAHL: It's as close as I get.

I was so enthralled by my colleague's words about learning beyond and within the walls of the classroom that I neglected to mention that I had 57 students from the grade 6 class and from the senior English as a second language class of Kameyosek community school here today. By the way, Mr. Speaker, for you and hon. members, Kameyosek means "a beautiful place" in Cree. Principal Ron Hodges and the teachers who are here today — Mrs. Reynar, Mr. Booth, and Mr. Shoebottom — have indeed made Kameyosek a beautiful place because, in addition to operating an excellent recreational and academic program, the school is the holder of 11 provincial track and field records. The teachers and their students are in the public gallery, and I ask them to rise and be welcomed by the Assembly.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

#### Calgary Olympics — Ski Site

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the hon. Minister of Tourism and Small Business. It's with respect to the massive government intervention in the ski business. Could the minister advise the Assembly what the cost of the proposed construction of the new ski area at Mount Allan will be?

DR. BUCK: You'll have to make a lot of snow, because there isn't any snow there, Al.

MR. ADAIR: Before I start, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what that last comment was. I'll ignore it.

The first straightening out that needs to take place — I guess those are the words I should use — is that in the announcement made on Friday, there was in my statement a portion that stated that we would be meeting with the private sector, that's p-r-i-v-a-t-e, [interjections] and that the groups involved in that particular project would be meeting with us this week. The discussions have already taken place with the proponents, and the actual times of meetings have not been identified.

We did announce that should negotiations with the private sector not be successful, in the sense of putting together the financial commitment and the likes of that necessary to see the development of Mount Allan in light of the time frame for the Olympics, we would proceed to see it constructed.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In view of the commitment that the government is going to proceed if they're not successful in working things out with the private sector, my question is: what estimate has the government obtained as to the cost of constructing the Mount Allan facility?

MR. ADAIR: I apologize, Mr. Speaker, because I had that at the back of my mind as well. The best estimate we have right at the moment is somewhere between \$15 million and \$20 million to complete the entire project in its own right, if we were to do it ourselves.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister or the Minister of Recreation and Parks. Given the option the minister announced on Friday, what particular form of budget controls has been considered by the government of Alberta to ensure that there are no substantial overruns, such as we had in Kananaskis?

MR. ADAIR: Would you just state that question again? I got the last part a little bit ...

MR. NOTLEY: What particular budget controls has the government considered so that there are no major overruns, as we had in Kananaskis or as the Olympics had in Montreal?

MR. ADAIR: Certainly from the standpoint of the Olympics in Montreal, I venture to say that the best response would be that we would use the same controls we did in working with the people who put together the facility development for the Commonwealth Games. It was on target, on budget, and met the construction deadlines. That would be the intent of the departments in-

volved in this particular project relative to the costs, if the decision, when made, is that we are to go it alone.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to either hon. minister. Will there be any environmental impact assessment, particularly in light of Canada being a signatory to the world conservation strategy convention sponsored by UNESCO? What commitment can the minister give today with respect to an EIA and the concerns of people in the area, particularly about the mountain sheep?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, two things should be pointed out. We do not plan to hold public hearings, in light of the fact that public hearings held a number of years ago developed the Eastern Slopes policy. On top of that, of course, we put in place the Kananaskis policy. This particular project is within Kananaskis Country.

My colleague the Minister of the Environment may want to add to what I'm going to say. From day one, from the moment we started working on this particular project from a recreational ski point of view and in light of the fact that there appeared to be a mountain that was acceptable and would meet the standards for the Olympics, the officials from the Department of the Environment and fish and wildlife have been very much involved with us and have identified the fact that there are some sheep on one part of Mount Allan that may be affected to some degree. What I said in Calgary — and I'll say it again here, Mr. Speaker — was that when going into the design stage, we would take those considerations and concerns in mind so that we could get the best of both worlds. In other words, the end result may be that we'll have a better environment for those particular animals that might be affected — and I use the word "might" at this particular point — in the construction of a ski facility on Mount Allan.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. What consideration was given by the government to the Farwell proposal, which is very laudatory of the snowmaking approach, which I gather is necessary on Mount Allan because there's no snow. Did the government give any consideration to this particular firm having a major interest in snowmaking as part of their business operation?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, one of the things I may just repeat here is that Ted Farwell of Ted Farwell and Associates has some 20-plus years of experience in ski hills, snowmaking, and a number of other areas. If I may, I just want to read into the record some of the qualifications of the individual involved: 10 years with Ted Farwell and Associates; 10 years with Sno-Engineering Incorporated; between 1970 and 1972, the technical director for the Denver XII Olympic Winter Games organizing committee, for their particular project; and a three-time Olympic ski competitor. As a result of that, we felt that that gentleman and his firm had a fair amount of expertise to offer, along with other experts we were in touch with, relative to what might happen on that.

There was a reference to no snow on Mount Allan. I think it should be pointed out that there is very little snow on any of the Eastern Slopes this year. And that snow problem exists around the world. There is generally some snow, although it's not as much as on some of the other areas. As a result of that, one of the requirements of the request for proposal we placed before the private sector was the inclusion of snowmaking equipment as a

requirement of any facility that may be built on the Eastern Slopes of the Canadian Rockies. Snowmaking is a part of that.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary by the hon. leader, followed by supplementaries by the hon. members for Calgary McCall and Clover Bar.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question really related to the background this particular gentleman has in the snowmaking business. Is there not some danger that he would overestimate the capacity to make snow, as opposed to the natural snowfall on the mountain, in the options the government has to look at?

MR. ADAIR: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. The combination of the natural snowfall as well as the machine-made snow would make the hill, or any particular ski hill in the Eastern Slopes, the ultimate in offering the best for recreational skiers as well as alpine events.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Tourism and Small Business. By developing the Olympic site, would you be encouraging the private sector rather than the public sector?

MR. ADAIR: Just to go over that again, Mr. Speaker, yes. And I think it's unequivocally yes, because it is our intent — I might just read again from the last part, so we make sure we've got it right:

The Government of Alberta would prefer that development of the new recreation day-use ski facility be undertaken by [the] private sector . . .

At the earliest possible opportunity, we intend to meet with the companies involved. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, our number one intent is to attempt to see if it is possible to have the private sector develop that particular facility. If that should not be the case, in light of the time constraints we have relative to the Olympics, then we would move with it.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Could the minister tell the House how he might be able to encourage the private sector to develop this? Also, would they design and develop with approval from the government?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I guess my first reaction is that we would be encouraging the private sector by sitting down and discussing with them what requirements they may have in order for them to look at the project as viable. I'm not sure I can go beyond that at this stage, because it may involve some negotiations with the private sector as to some of the concerns they may raise when they meet with us. However, I should point out that it is our intent to start work on the design of the facility. That may be part of what would take place in providing that design to the private sector, should we be able to work out an agreement between the private sector and the government as to who is going to construct that facility.

MR. NELSON: One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Followed by a supplementary by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

MR. NELSON: I would just like to have the concerns of the environmentalists clarified. Will these concerns be examined in total prior to further development of this scenario for the Olympics?

MR. ADAIR: No question, Mr. Speaker. I'll state it again. We expressed the concern that those points were raised to us from day one. The one key issue seems to zero in around the sheep herd on Mount Allan. But any other environmental or wildlife concerns would be taken into consideration, and we have people from the various departments of government sitting on the committees that have been looking at it to this particular point.

One of the points I made in Calgary was that because the majority of the sheep are on the west side of Mount Allan and some of them do come around to the southeast point, if in fact there was an area where there was some concern, that would be taken into consideration in the design of the facility. But I guess I also stated that I had some difficulty figuring out the make-up of the feet of sheep and how that works in deep snow and, as well, how skiers work on rocks.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Several weeks ago, I asked the minister about the site selection. Can the minister indicate to the Assembly if the decision was made several weeks ago when I asked the question about Mount Allan, or was the decision made just last Friday?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, the final decision by cabinet was on April 26, 1983.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, we were talking about snow and rocks. In the department study on wind velocities, in light of the fact that the director of the development branch of Tourism and Small Business had to walk the last two-thirds of the way down the mountain relatively recently, can the minister indicate what consideration ...

MR. NOTLEY: He was up for a skiing visit.

DR. BUCK: Yes, just for a small skiing visit.

Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate what studies the department has done as to wind velocity, which denudes the snow cover? What studies have been done in that area?

MR. ADAIR: Again, we've been using ... [interjections] Go ahead.

DR. BUCK: We know you're snowing us, Al.

MR. ADAIR: Snow relates to the color of my hair, I assume.

Mr. Speaker, in response to that particular issue, on a number of occasions Ted Farwell of Ted Farwell and Associates provided us with the information as to that. I don't have the specifics here, but I can get that particular quote and point it out to you. There was no significant weather-vaning, and I can't respond as to exactly what that means. But in essence, the thrust was that wind would not be a major factor. There is wind on almost every mountain, so the major concern was that wind would not be a major factor on the Mount Allan site as identified by those who did the studies for us.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my last short supplementary question. Can the minister indicate what consultation the minister, his department, or the government have had with Dr. Read and Ken Read, the world-famous skier? What consultation has the department had on the quality of the hill with these two fairly prominent authorities?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, through our particular section in Tourism and Small Business, we were working with Ted Farwell and Associates. As I pointed out a little earlier, he was an Olympic competitor himself. The Minister of Recreation and Parks may want to respond from the Olympic committee point of view.

DR. BUCK: I said that was my last one, but can the minister indicate if he met with Dr. Read and Ken Read? Yes or no.

MR. ADAIR: The answer was no.

### **Hazardous Waste Disposal**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Last Friday, on page 723 of *Hansard*, the minister indicated:

Subsequent to their application and selection, their parent company, Chem-Nuclear, was bought out by Waste Management Inc., United States.

Was the minister aware on June 29 that Waste Management in fact had made an offer to Chem-Nuclear, and that on July 8, 1982, that company indeed held 51 per cent of the shares of Chem-Nuclear?

MR. BRADLEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In light of the minister's answer last Friday, when did the minister first become aware of the fact that Waste Management Inc. held the majority of shares in Chem-Nuclear?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, that information didn't come to my attention until some time after I became minister of the portfolio. I'd have to check and be very specific as to what particular date that information came to my knowledge, but certainly I was not aware of that last June.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to be a little more definitive? The minister indicated he wasn't aware of it last June; he wasn't the minister. Has the minister any information of a more definitive nature that he could share with the House as to approximately when he did become aware of it? Would the last couple of weeks be a ballpark figure that the minister would identify as being correct?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, in terms of the issue the hon. leader is bringing forward today, in terms of detail, I would have to say that I became aware of news reports in late March which indicated that there had been renewed charges against Waste Management Inc. I think it would be fair to say it was in that time period that I became more aware of the details with regard to Waste Management Inc. and its acquisition of Chem-Nuclear. Until that point in time, this specific question had not been an issue or had been raised with me in any detail that I can recollect.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the hon. Attorney General advise the Assembly when the Attorney General's Department was asked to review the record of Waste Management Inc. for the first time?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, it was last year. The way the matter came up at that time — as between me and the predecessor of the present Minister of the Environment — was by way of allegations made in newspaper articles that came to my attention. At that point, I raised the matter with the then Minister of the Environment for the first time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the hon. Minister of the Environment advise the Assembly whether he has had an opportunity to check with his departmental officials with respect to the communications system within the department? The minister indicated that he was not made aware of this until recently. Yet in September, in a letter to the shareholders, we have the chairman of the board of Waste Management making reference to the earnings of this particular firm, Chem-Nuclear, in their report.

My question is: has the minister asked his department to do a review of the process by which information of this sensitive nature apparently fails to get to the minister immediately?

MR. BRADLEY: Again, Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader is referring to events of last fall. I'm not able to respond with specifics with regard to events of last fall.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The minister does, however, have the right and obligation to respond to specifics now. Can the minister tell the House whether, since assuming the office of the Minister of the Environment, he has asked his officials for a report on the communication of this kind of information to the minister?

MR. BRADLEY: No, I haven't, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

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

MR. NOTLEY: The Attorney General indicated that the department was asked to look into it because of newspaper reports. Could the Attorney General advise the Assembly whether the parent company's record of fines and convictions was uncovered as a result of that initial investigation, and whether that information was delivered to the present minister's predecessor?

MR. CRAWFORD: No, Mr. Speaker. Actually, the matter is quite uncomplicated. What occurred was that I made certain inquiries of departmental officials because of newspaper articles and, as I indicated, at that time had said to the predecessor of the present Minister of the Environment that there were concerns.

What occurred then was not an investigation. I don't know that that would have been justified, based upon newspaper articles. Inquiries were made, and a review of what could be treated as either known or reasonably ascertainable circumstances was done. The process was that police were asked, through the RCMP, to make

inquiries in the United States. They did so, and the report that came to me was that there was little information other than newspaper stories. I think it would be fair to say that some of the agencies contacted in the United States evidently did not want to speak of whether or not specific charges were made as part of their report. Investigatory steps, such as searching of court records and so on, were not done. They were merely inquiries.

I take responsibility for the fact that nothing more than that was done at the time. Perhaps something more than that could have been done at the time. But since everything was based on newspaper articles which were speculative, perhaps, or at least unconfirmed at that point, it seemed to me that the inquiries through the RCMP were an adequate follow-up. That was done, and the conclusion was that there was no indication that this was an organization that should not be dealt with.

#### Summer Temporary Employment Program

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Manpower is with regard to STEP. Could the minister indicate whether the some 5,000 STEP positions have been filled at the present time, or are open competitions going on in the departments of government?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, under the provincial government department element, 1,541 positions have been approved at this moment. I could not tell you whether they're all filled.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in the pamphlet that was distributed in the last few days, could the hon. minister indicate why it is indicated that there are 5,000 positions for Alberta youth throughout the province? What plans are there to make those other 4,000 jobs available so that youth who are seeking employment will have the employment promised?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, the procedure a student would use in accessing the provincial government positions would be to communicate with provincial government district offices and the various departments. Each department does its own selection. The Alberta Department of Manpower simply provides funding to the other departments. So in sum and substance, the positions are available for students to compete for.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, could the minister clarify where the other 4,000 positions will be located? As well, how many of the 1,000 jobs are now available to young people? My understanding is that those 1,000 jobs were already allocated to young people in this province before the pamphlet was sent out last week.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not exactly sure what the hon. member is driving at. STEP, particularly the provincial government element, has been around some time. Most postsecondary students will start lining up their contacts probably well in advance of the announcement. If he wishes more specific numbers as to which departments have positions and what number of positions they have, I'll be glad to provide that, and I will take that as notice.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, can the minister assure the Assembly that the positions in terms of STEP are

being advertised and that there are competitions for those positions for the young people?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, since much of the hiring is done by other departments, I will also take that question on notice. I can't give you the assurance that there are formal competitions. I would hope there are not, though, with a view to efficiency.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. As well, would the hon. minister report back to the Legislature the number of remaining jobs available for young people in STEP? If there are none, as my information shows, then as well I think the minister could indicate to the Assembly what steps will be taken by government to remedy that situation.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I will endeavor to do that. But I also take this opportunity to remind the hon. member opposite that approximately a week and a half ago, we announced the Alberta youth employment program. The small business support and farmer support elements are estimated to create an additional 2,000 jobs between May 2 and October 28, 1983. At this point in time, 24 projects have been approved under this program — 76 jobs used up. So if you're looking for a program to refer young people who weren't successful under STEP, I recommend that you refer them to the Alberta youth employment program.

#### **Social Allowance**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Before implementing the recent social allowance changes, did the minister seek advice from his officials regarding section 2(f) of the Canada Assistance Plan agreement with the federal government, which specifies that welfare decisions must be appealable?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, in consultation with the department in advance of the announcement of any of the changes to social allowances, there was no indication of any legality problems in terms of cost sharing with the federal government.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Before implementing the changes, did the minister consult with the federal government regarding the appeals section of this agreement?

DR. WEBBER: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. In view of the fact that welfare recipients cannot appeal the new rulings on shelter allowances, asset limits, and assistance for employables, would the minister indicate why this does not violate section 2(f) of the Canada Assistance Plan?

DR. WEBBER: I don't know if the hon. member is looking for a legal opinion or not, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: It could have that meaning, but I wasn't going to be overly zealous in looking for it.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure I'm qualified to give any legal opinion to this House. However, I can

indicate that the legal opinion indicated to me was that an appeal process is built into our social allowance system and that there would be no problems in terms of any cost sharing with the federal government. I haven't received any concerns in this regard until the point the hon. member just raised.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. In view of the fact that we're talking about nearly \$300 million, will he get a firm guarantee from the federal government that the province will not lose this money?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, if we don't have any concerns in that regard, I don't see any point in running to the federal government and asking them.

MR. MARTIN: You'd better take a look at 2(f) then.

A supplementary question. Will the minister review the policy on appealability, in view of the Federal Court of Appeal decision of April 27, which permits citizens to challenge the degree of provincial compliance with the Canada Assistance Plan agreement? That changes the picture.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what the question is. The hon. member is indicating quotations from a particular section. Is he asking me to review 2(f)? If it makes the hon. member happy, I would be happy to review 2(f).

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'll try to do the minister's job for him. There was a recent court case on April 27, which said that welfare recipients [interjections] can now challenge provincial governments. Will he now look into this as it applies to Alberta, in the specific areas that we're talking about?

MR. NOTLEY: And make changes accordingly.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has posed the question; I will follow it up. I might add that if there were any concerns regarding federal government sharing, I would have known about them long ago.

#### **College of Art**

MR. LEE: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Advanced Education. Is the minister in receipt of a formal recommendation or a recent recommendation from the board of governors of the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology, which recommends the concept of autonomy in some form for the Alberta College of Art?

MR. JOHNSTON: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LEE: Mr. Speaker, could the minister indicate if he is aware, either verbally or by telephone conversation, of the positive, unanimous recommendation of the board of governors for some form of autonomy for the Alberta College of Art?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is asking whether or not I'm aware of the decision of the board of governors, I can advise the Assembly and the member that I am aware of what the board recommended. As to the process, I must admit that the board's decision was communicated to me via the media.

I had an opportunity to meet with a small committee of the board of governors last Wednesday, however. In that meeting, the group and the chairman of the board took the time to advise me of what they would be recommending to the board of governors. Officially, however, I have not received any particular communication which would set out either the report or the copy of a board minute which would move a resolution to suggest autonomy for the Alberta College of Art. I am waiting for that. When that happens, of course, other decisions will then be triggered.

MR. LEE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate if he is favorably disposed to the concept of autonomy for the Alberta College of Art?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, along with all my colleagues, I listen very carefully to any recommendations made to us by citizens of Alberta or by boards of governors of institutions, in particular. In this case, a small committee of the board of governors at the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology has taken the time to devote energy, effort, and intellectual ability to make a recommendation — a somewhat challenging recommendation, I might note — suggesting that the Alberta College of Art should be considered as an autonomous organization within the college system in the province of Alberta.

That is not a light recommendation, Mr. Speaker. It is one which would require a considerable amount of study by the government in terms of finances, in terms of the future, and in terms of the methods, systems, and the way it would operate. So in that light, first of all, the consequences of the decisions are important. It is important to understand and address carefully the decision in terms of the implications for our budget process of this Assembly. Finally, it would be in that light that I would consider it once I receive a formal recommendation.

MR. LEE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate when this House will be advised of his considered review of this subject and when we might expect a positive initiative to see this brought about?

DR. BUCK: Between sessions.

MR. JOHNSTON: I had a famous reply to that question once before, when the Member for Little Bow asked me. But I will hold that for the Member for Calgary Buffalo.

I'll simply state that in this light, given the seriousness of the decision and the implications for finances that I noted, I would imagine it will take us some time to properly evaluate the decision. I suggest that once we get the recommendation, we will embark on that process. I doubt very much if we could see autonomy for the college within the period of a year.

MR. MARTIN: Way to skate, Dick.

MR. JOHNSTON: You could learn from this.

MR. SHRAKE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate to members of the House what action, if any, will be taken on the creation of an Alberta College of Art diploma or degree, separate from the normal two-year SAIT diploma?

MR. JOHNSTON: Again, Mr. Speaker, in response to the request of the students, who really were at the heart of this movement — and I must give them the credit for taking the initiative and bringing the issue forward to the board of governors and to myself. One of their concerns was that a diploma which would recognize their artistic and creative ability in the form of art and in the form of programs offered by the College of Art was not being offered. So I think it would be fair to say that if autonomy were given to a new board of governors of the College of Art, a special kind of diploma which would recognize the learning and artistic ability which has been recognized by that institution would be given. It would not be a degree; it would be a special kind of diploma.

### **Methanol Gas Plant**

MR. SZWENDER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Economic Development. Could the minister inform the Assembly as to the status of the Biewag methanol gas plant proposed for Waskatenau?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, the proponents of that facility have asked for a deferral on two of the requirements of board approval and permitting. That's been granted. Before a permit is issued, they have also been required to show me a copy of a sales contract for the full capacity of the plant, in terms of who will use it and where it will be going. They haven't done that yet. Until that's in place, nothing more will be done.

MR. SZWENDER: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister indicate whether the construction plans as now proposed are of the same magnitude as originally proposed?

MR. PLANCHE: Aside from the deferral of the permits, Mr. Speaker, there have been no changes at all in the initial concept.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister indicate what length of guaranteed contract his department is looking at? The minister has indicated there must be a sale in position. Of what duration must that sale contract be?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, the presumption was that the term of the contract would be long enough to amortize the capital cost of the plant and to accommodate banking arrangements. That would certainly be the understanding I have of the kind sales contract I'd see.

### **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

#### **head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

14. Moved by Mr. Crawford:

Be it resolved that the white paper respecting the re-enactment of the Legislative Assembly Act be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing.

[Motion carried]

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to the rest of the Assembly, a grade 8 class from Eckville junior and senior high. They're accompanied by their teacher Mr. Ken Parsons, parent Mr. Stan Myers, and bus driver Mr. Larry Staples. They are seated in the members gallery, and I ask them to rise and receive the accord of the House.

head: **COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY**

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

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

**Department of the Environment**

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Has the minister any opening comments?

MR. BRADLEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I certainly do want to address a few remarks to the Assembly. Last year in the estimates, the former minister went over a fairly extensive review of a number of the very important areas the department has been involved in over the year. It isn't my intention to repeat that today, but I do want to deal with a few specific questions and issues before receiving questions from hon. members with regard to the department's estimates.

The first issue I would like to discuss is the progress we're making, slow as it is, toward establishing a special waste facility in the province. I just received some information which gives me the opportunity to respond to a question the hon. leader posed in the question period today, as to when the department received information with regard to the acquisition of Chem-Security by Waste Management Inc. On July 30, the former minister received a telegram from Mr. Johnston of Chem-Nuclear Systems, advising the department of the impending takeover by Waste Management Inc. I'm also advised that the apparent effective date of that takeover was November 30, 1982. I want to have that put on the record today.

With regard to our progress toward a special facility to handle hazardous wastes in the province, it certainly is a continued commitment of the department and, I think, a priority of government that we proceed as quickly as we can to select a site and have a special waste facility developed. To date we've had slow progress with regard to the selection of the site. We've gone through a process which several other jurisdictions in North America are duplicating, or looking at and asking us questions about, in terms of our province-wide search for a site and the public-involvement process we've been going through with regard to the establishment of a site.

We've been commended from a number of quarters as to the process we've been going through. Certainly one of

the keystones of our process to date has been that we desire public acceptance of the final site that is selected. In terms of the selection process, we have only been proceeding in terms of drilling, et cetera, in municipalities where we've received an invitation from local authorities to look at and consider their area. This has been followed up by an extensive public-input process.

Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure whether, in the final analysis, we'll be able to conform to that principle of public acceptance. But I certainly think it is a worthy objective, and one we should be heading toward. I note, though, that the Environment Council of Alberta has recommended that the importance and necessity of proceeding with establishing a site is paramount and that the objective of public acceptance should not be followed in terms of their priorities; that the necessity of establishing the facility should come first. As I said, we certainly desire to follow the objective of public acceptance; I am committed to that.

But in the final analysis, after we get the results of our drilling, if we do not have a location in the province which meets that particular objective, I am going to review the entire process of special waste facilities siting to see if we should be taking another approach with regard to that matter. In terms of my priorities in the department, the siting of a special waste facility to handle chemical wastes is a priority over the next year.

I also want to comment today with regard to the question of acid rain. It seems to have a fairly high profile in Canada. Reducing acid rain certainly is an international concern, in terms of the discussions between Canada and the United States. I think all governments in all jurisdictions are committed to the very important goal of reducing acid emissions, and it's a worth-while goal in terms of our national commitments.

[Mr. Thompson in the Chair]

I would like to review some of the work we as a government have been doing in the province of Alberta with regard to acid deposition and acid precipitation. We've been involved in a number of projects over a long period of time, and perhaps haven't communicated as well as we could to the public of Alberta the work that has been done with regard to the situation and our research in that area. A committee of officials from Environment Canada and from the departments of environment of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba was recently set up. They met to review the information available on acid-forming emissions in western Canada and their effects, and put together a committee to look at long-range transportation of atmospheric pollutants in western Canada. Their conclusion was that there is not a serious problem in western Canada.

I'd like to quote from a report done by the various partners to this research: Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Environment Canada. The report is entitled Transport of Acid Forming Emissions and Potential Effects of Deposition in Northeastern Alberta and Northern Saskatchewan: A Problem Analysis. That seems to be the area where there is the greatest concern in terms of acid-forming emissions. On page 36, in their conclusions and recommendations, they came to this conclusion:

At present, no environmental damage attributable to acidic deposition has been detected in the region.

This conclusion is supported by soils, surface waters and vegetation surveys.

That conclusion was made, but there's a continuing



commitment by the governments involved to continue monitoring and research with regard to the transportation of atmospheric pollutants in western Canada.

I'd like to review some of the very important work done in the province over a long period of time, and also relate to the committee the extent of Alberta's involvement in research with regard to acid precipitation and the work of this committee on long-range transportation of atmospheric pollutants. I look at the budget put forward for the period 1982 to 1985 with regard to this committee's looking at these questions. Alberta has committed significantly more funds to this type of research than the other three provinces, the Territories, and Environment Canada combined.

For example, the total budget for 1982 is some \$2.9 million. Alberta's share of that research component — the work we're doing — is \$1.7 million, compared to \$567,000 for Environment Canada, \$15,000 for the Northwest Territories, \$313,000 for Manitoba, \$55,000 for Saskatchewan, and \$186,000 for British Columbia. Our commitment over the next three-year period is in the same sort of ratio, in terms of the dollars we're expending on this research and the total dollars expended by the five parties. I think it's very significant, and we should put out to the people of Alberta that we are involved in a lot of research with regard to acid emissions, particularly from sour gas processing plants and other sources.

Perhaps it would be useful now to go over, in some detail, some of the work that has been done. Over the past number of years, there have been 59 scientific papers published in well-known scientific journals, and conference proceedings from 71 research projects funded by Alberta Environment: 33 relate to air, and 26 relate to land and water. We've also held symposiums, et cetera. The most recent was last March when the province sponsored a symposium on acid-forming emissions in Alberta and their ecological effects.

In terms of this year's expenditures, we're doing a number of projects in the air area and also the water components, aquatic sensitivity mapping. We're doing a number of research projects with regard to acidic soils in the province of Alberta, looking at their buffering capacities — a very significant part of the research. Permanent sampling plots are being established. We have some significant research going on at the Environmental Centre at Vegreville with programs established at our inhalation toxicology laboratory to look at the effect of hydrogen sulphide and sulphur dioxide on animals. I'm going to expand on some of the work we're looking at doing there. As I say, the total in 1982-83 in these various components comes to almost \$1.7 million.

In terms of acid deposition specifically, we're looking at funding a number of projects: dry deposition of acid-forming emissions in Alberta, air-borne pollutant measurements, and projectatory analysis. As I said earlier, we're looking at surface waters, aquatic sensitivity mapping. We've commissioned studies to look at our nitrogen oxide emissions for Alberta in the last four-year period. We've done a similar one, forecasting sulphur dioxide emissions from 1980 to the year 2000. A similar forecast is being done with regard to nitrogen oxide emissions, looking at different technology for emissions and controls.

In terms of soils geology, I mentioned earlier a soil pH program for the sour gas industry. Another component is sensitivities of soils in Alberta to acid additions, long-term measurement of acidification of non-cultivated soils in Alberta. We are doing a number of things with regard

to soils and geology: some more important work on vegetation and soils, specifically the physiological effects of low concentrations of oxides of nitrogen on Alberta plant species; impacts of air pollutant mixtures on forest vegetation and soils, specifically oxides of sulphur and nitrogen; just a number of very important research projects.

With regard to inhalation toxicology and the effect of sour gas emissions on animals, we have a facility under construction at the Alberta Environmental Centre in Vegreville specifically dedicated to this important work. The approximate cost of this facility is some \$965,000. The annual operating budget in terms of the programs of inhalation toxicology, which should give us a lot of very important information about the effects of hydrogen sulphide and sulphur dioxide gases on animals and, subsequently, this can be extrapolated to humans ... Work is also going to be conducted in terms of long-term exposure to these substances, hydrogen sulphide and sulphur dioxide, in the subacute or low chronic level area.

Some very important work is being done and has been identified in terms of the work at the Alberta Environmental Centre at Vegreville. Since the centre was established, it's been an important component. I don't believe we've really taken the opportunity to advise the public of Alberta of the important work being done there with regard to the effects of these emissions on health, particularly in terms of animals and the extrapolation to humans.

Another very important area the department has become involved in has just been announced. The Alberta petroleum industry/government environment committee has been doing a number of things to review the impact of acid-forming gases in the province and has come forward with a recommendation that there should be a research project in this area particularly. We have signed an agreement with the petroleum industry to do acid deposition research. This program will take place over the next seven to eight years.

The province's commitment would be to fund 50 per cent of that research. A steering committee will be made up of officials from the Department of the Environment and various members of the petroleum industry — the Canadian Petroleum Association, the Independent Petroleum Association, and a number of private companies — involved in sour gas processing, and also companies involved in the production of electricity whose emissions would also impact on the environment in terms of some of the substances produced from their stacks.

This is a very important research project the government is involved in. We're going to fund up to 50 per cent of the cost. Over the seven- or eight-year period, the magnitude of research is estimated to be in the area of \$7 million to \$8 million expended in this area. I think it's a very significant part of the program the province has developed, working on and responding to concerns about the effects of some of these substances. As I indicated, a lot of long-term research has been done, but this is in addition and reflects the government's commitment in this very important area.

I just want to make a few more comments on the subject of sour gas processing and the impact on our environment. I think we have to look at the acid rain issue and the question of what our contribution to that problem is, because we do make a contribution to the amount of these substances getting into the atmosphere. I think it's important to look at the Senate subcommittee report, to look where these emissions are in fact coming

from in Canada and also what is being done in jurisdictions to reduce or eliminate sulphur dioxide emissions from our processing plants.

In terms of the Canadian total inlet of sulphur into processing plants, whether they be sour gas or thermal energy generating facilities, our inlet is two times the total inlet of the other provinces in Canada which produce sulphur dioxide, being Ontario, Quebec, and Manitoba. In terms of processing, we take in two times the total amount of the other three provinces. What is really interesting is to look at the emissions from the processing plants. Our emissions are one-quarter of the combined emissions of the other three provinces, which shows that we are doing a significant job in this province in cleaning up the gases that come out of the processing industry. That's actually an order of magnitude of eight times; we're doing a much better job.

If you look at some of the other provinces in eastern Canada where the problem of acid rain is said to be, they are not doing as good a job of clean-up from these processing industries as we're doing here in Alberta. In the overall sulphur gas processing industry in Alberta, we generally remove 97 per cent of the sulphur compounds from the tail gases. That is very significant. When you look at the amount of sulphur that goes in and the amount that comes out, in terms of Alberta's situation and the other provinces who have an acid rain problem, I think we're making a very significant movement forward in this province, where we've been committed to the removal of these substances for some time.

It should also be noted that from 1974 to 1981, there's been a 10 per cent decrease in the amount of sulphur emissions from the processing industry in the province, but the number of industries involved increased from 77 to 114. The absolute volume of sulphur going in increased, but there was an actual decrease in the amount of emissions going out of the stacks.

Another area I want to comment on briefly, before taking questions from hon. members, is regional waste management. We've been establishing regional waste authorities and assisting regional landfills throughout the province. We've taken a new step in the current year, and we are funding a research project with regard to incineration in the town of Wainwright. We will be covering the cost of installation of this incineration equipment and, over a three-year period, will be assisting them in terms of the operating costs. That's a new direction we've initiated in terms of a pilot project to get a better and closer handle on the actual cost of incineration. From time to time, we receive inquiries on this matter of whether we should go to incineration or landfill. We wanted to get some very detailed cost information.

Mr. Chairman, I'm looking forward to the questions of the hon. members. Perhaps we could have the questions, and then I would be prepared to respond after all hon. members have had an opportunity to put forward their concerns.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a few general observations as we look at the estimates of the Department of the Environment and, during the course of my remarks, I will pose some direct questions.

I have to say at the outset that my attitude toward these estimates is colored in no small part by a constituency event last year that showed a rather irresponsible attitude on the part of the Department of the Environment, but nevertheless united people in all three political parties — the local Conservative Party, the New Demo-

cratic Party, and the WCC — and that was the way the Department of the Environment handled the Inverness gas plant at Silver Valley, north of Spirit River. I just want to take a moment or two to go over that information because this is the first time we've had an opportunity to meet in committee since last year. I think there are some lessons to be drawn from that unfortunate experience.

Hon. members from other parts of the province may or may not know that much of the soil in the Peace River country is very sensitive to emissions from sour gas plants. As a result, when Inverness indicated their interest in undertaking a project in the Silver Valley area, there was naturally a large outcry from people affected. Why? Because if the value of the soil goes down, the people who are going to have to pay that price are the men and women who settled in the adjacent region.

If I have a special soft spot for one particular area in my constituency, I suppose it's this region. Over the last dozen years, I've seen people who worked on the oil rigs in the wintertime — and their wives had to stay at home — with beat-up trucks and vehicles to try to make ends meet in the first years. They carved out a new area, one of the most recent homesteading areas in that part of the Peace River country, a very fine community that has progressed in a very real way.

Mr. Chairman, Inverness decided they would build a gas plant without any sulphur recovery equipment. The normal hearings were held. The ERCB held hearings. Some 400 people turned out to ERCB hearings. I think members can well testify that when you have that kind of turnout in a community with just a few hundred people, there is a tremendous amount of public interest.

In any event, the ERCB granted the go-ahead. The basic arguments were that notwithstanding the impact on the soils in the area — and I might say that there was some real concern by people in the Silver Valley region, because they had to obtain the okay from a couple of soil specialists from the Department of Agriculture regional office in Fairview to go to the hearings, and they were told at the last minute they couldn't make submission. In any event, the point is that the ERCB said, we will authorize the Inverness project. They looked at the cost figures for the company and decided that the concerns of the community would be set aside.

I don't think it was just because it was before an election. But, Mr. Minister, I tell you that we had an issue which brought people together, regardless of their political point of view. One of the most eloquent spokesmen for the local concerns was the campaign manager for the WCC candidate. To his credit, the local Conservative candidate spoke out rather effectively on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, we arranged a meeting with the minister in early July where a delegation of people would come down from Silver Valley. Two days before the meeting, we got a press release from Mr. Cookson's office — the current minister's predecessor — saying that the government had looked at the ERCB report, and the Inverness project had been authorized. You can well imagine that there was a good deal of anger in the community.

Mr. Minister, what upset me is that a few days later, I had the opportunity of meeting with the Shell people who are proposing a major gas processing plant west and a little bit south of Spirit River. Unlike the Inverness project, this is a plant that is going to have the most modern sulphur recovery equipment that has been designed. When I met with the project engineer of the Shell project, I was told that the Department of the Environment was

advised, as early as April, that Shell was going to go ahead and that Shell would be prepared to go into a joint venture arrangement with all the companies, including the properties owned by Inverness.

We could have had one much larger gas plant that would have employed people and would have been of much more benefit to the community of Spirit River. But the point is that we would not have had a sour gas plant being constructed without sulphur recovery equipment; we would have had one decent venture.

It's not very often that you find Grant Notley standing up in the House making the case for a multinational oil company. But the fact of the matter is that here was a proposal from a multinational oil company that would see the construction of a gas processing plant that had proper sulphur recovery equipment, and we had the Department of the Environment allowing a truncated approach where we have this little plant being authorized that's going to dump all kinds of contaminants into the atmosphere and jeopardize the soil in the region, when they had an option which the engineer from Shell advised me he had told the department about.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, how we can be serious about protecting our soils and the environmental health of our people when we have this kind of example. The minister's predecessor, Mr. Cookson, was obviously a little embarrassed when we had a group of people coming down from the Peace River country and two days before he'd issued a press release authorizing the Inverness project. But I say to the minister that a department that gets itself into that kind of situation sooner or later loses credibility.

Mr. Chairman, this minister has a tremendous responsibility to restore the credibility of the Department of the Environment to the level it enjoyed between 1971 and 1975. Members of the House will recall that from time to time I had differences with the first Conservative Minister of the Environment, Mr. Yurko. But the fact of the matter is that during those four years we had some important initiatives and strong administration. We knew that there was a Minister of the Environment who saw his major mandate as the protector of the environment.

In the last two terms we've seen a switch, a modification of the role of the Department of the Environment, and in the process, a slow but sure erosion of public credibility. I say to the current minister that perhaps the most important responsibility he now has, is to begin a step-by-step action plan to restore the credibility of the Department of the Environment.

Mr. Chairman, why do I say that there has been a loss of credibility of the Department of the Environment? One might look at some examples over the last few years. We've had the PCB problem with Procter & Gamble and the emission of PCBs into the Wapiti River. We've had some of the problems that occurred with the Suncor plant at Fort McMurray. We've had the whole situation in Pincher Creek which the now minister has to take responsibility for. As a result of, I think, relatively lax administration on the part of the Department of the Environment, we now have a situation which has captured the headlines.

It is as a result of problems which have developed, at least some of which, Mr. Minister, must be laid at the doorstep of the Department of the Environment. You can't entirely blame the companies and sort of sidestep the problems which have come to public light without recognizing that over the last several years at least, there has been some real responsibility that, in my judgment, has to be placed directly on the doorstep of the Department

of the Environment. We had the changes made in this House in 1977 that reduced the effectiveness of the Environment Conservation Authority, turning it into the Environment Council of Alberta.

Mr. Chairman, when you add the cumulative impact of a number of these things — we can talk all we like about a few studies that have been commissioned. And I welcome some of the comments that the minister made today. But the fact that we are finally spending some money on acid rain studies does not negate a track record on the part of the Department of the Environment which has reduced the credibility of that department since 1975.

I would say that if the minister could — I don't know whether he wants to emulate the political career of his prestigious predecessor, Mr. Yurko. But I think if he would follow the administrative lead and the gutsy approach that Mr. Yurko took to administering the Department of the Environment, Albertans, regardless of their political vantage point, would be much happier at the end of three years than they are at the moment. I suspect that whether or not members in this House want to admit it, that would also include a large number of Conservative Albertans.

Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with some of the issues that I think are relevant right now. Many of these things that I've identified are matters that I can't, in all fairness, lay at the doorstep of the present minister. They are the legacy that he brings to the department. However, I think there are some things on which we can judge the minister.

First of all, let's look at this question of the whole waste disposal issue. I recall listening to the minister's predecessor talking in this House during Oral Question Period and Committee of Supply about how careful the government was going to be in evaluating the various proponents for a waste management disposal company. As you know, the government had rejected the proposition that it should be undertaken publicly. I find it rather interesting that we can get into socialized skiing but can't look at public development of a waste disposal plant. In any event, the government said, we're going to take the private enterprise route; fair enough. We had 19 proponents, and on July 7 the government indicated that Chem-Security was the firm that was best suited to undertake this important assignment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take just a moment with the minister here to review the information as I have it. If any of that information is incorrect in any way, I hope the minister will take the opportunity to set the record straight. It is my understanding that on June 29, 1982, Waste Management Inc. made a formal offer to purchase Chem-Nuclear. This was Chem-Security's parent company. That was June 29, 1982, a few days before the government announced its decision. On July 8, 1982, Waste Management Inc. already had 51 per cent of Chem-Nuclear's shares. This was one day after the government made its announcement which, as I recollect, was July 7, 1982. On July 23, 1982, Chem-Nuclear agreed to a takeover by Waste Management Inc. At that time, Waste Management had 53 per cent of Chem-Nuclear's shares. On September 30, 1982, the chairman of the board of Waste Management Inc., Mr. Bundtrock, in a letter to shareholders, included Chem-Nuclear earnings in Waste Management's nine-month earnings.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if that is true, then one has to ask, what happened in the case of the evaluation by the department? In answering the question today, the minister indicated that on, I think it was, July 30, the department was aware of Waste Management's purchase

of Chem-Nuclear. Why was there not at that time a thorough review of Waste Management Inc.?

It would seem to me that when one looks at some of the suits outstanding against this particular firm — I want to take just a moment or two to go over this. It's fine to say that we've ceased negotiating with Chem-Security now. But what we have to explore in the estimates of the Department of the Environment is: what happened that this information wasn't available to the minister so that the decision could have been modified?

Why do I say that, Mr. Chairman? Last year we were told that there was some urgency; the government had to proceed. We all realize that a waste management plant is an important objective. There's some very real danger in not having one. So there's a sense of urgency. We also have 18 other proponents who, in good faith, had gone through the exercise which the government itself had set out, made proposals to the department, and been bypassed when the government chose Chem-Security. That being the case, we have an obligation in committee to find out what happened. Was it the former minister's fault? Was it a deputy minister's fault? What was the process by which there appeared to be a breakdown in communication in the Department of the Environment on this crucial matter?

Mr. Chairman, the information that I have with respect to the parent company is really quite astonishing. For example, we have a \$1.1 million lawsuit filed recently against Waste Management Inc. by the Illinois attorney general, charging it with illegally disposing of 400,000 gallons of toxic chemicals at its Calumet, Illinois, waste site. In 1980, another subsidiary of Waste Management was fined \$19,000 for improper handling of PCBs and for failing to keep proper records.

In Colorado, the Supreme Court shut down a disposal site of Chemical Waste, a Waste Management Inc. subsidiary, for violating the solid waste Act. The EPA levied \$48,000 in fines after learning the site was leaking toxic chemicals. In the process, they discovered that the company had kept two sets of books, one documenting the leak, the other not. Well now, that's a very interesting firm with which we're going to be doing business. In Iowa, another Waste Management Inc. subsidiary company is facing a lawsuit from its former chief chemist, who alleges that the company altered or destroyed test results revealing high toxicity in waste awaiting disposal.

Mr. Chairman, there are several others here, but I just want to mention two that I thought were particularly interesting. During the past decade, Waste Management Inc. has been involved in several law suits relating to illegal business practices. In one case, the company paid a \$50,000 fine and agreed to cease trying to influence the Teamster's union.

Well, I'm sure the rural members would love to take that back and put it in their report. I can just see the Member for Edmonton Glengarry at his next constituency meeting, talking about the way we do business in this province. I'm not sure whether or not we're going to be bringing Mr. Fitzsimmons in, if we can get him released from jail, in order to help us with our new firm here.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, in Georgia in May 1980, Waste Systems Inc., another subsidiary of Waste Management, was indicted for price fixing with three other disposal companies and was fined \$375,000 after being convicted. Mr. Chairman, the thing that amazes me — and I'd like the minister to respond specifically to it — is that in the Special Wastes Update, the assistant deputy

minister states: "Chem-Security and Waste Management Inc.'s record of compliance in their activity" in other provinces and states "has been excellent". There may have been laws that this parent company didn't break. But to suggest that the record has been excellent — I guess I would simply say in a very generous way to the minister: on what evidence was his assistant deputy minister's assurance based?

And on the basis of those kinds of statements, what kind of confidence can the public of Alberta have in the operation of this department? Actions between July and November are not something we can lay at the door of the minister — true. Those are responsibilities of the former minister, responsibilities of Executive Council as a whole. But the way in which the government responds subsequent to the minister's appointment is the basis on which we have to test the minister's ability to handle a department that, in my view, has a tremendous credibility gap to overcome as far as the public is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, there are several other areas I'd like to deal with in the course of my remarks. I mentioned the Inverness gas plant in Silver Valley. We have the blowout at Lodgepole. We have the controversy over Quirk Creek west of Calgary. We have many of the issues that surround the development of the Gulf and Shell plants at Pincher Creek. The position I've taken and continue to take right now is that we need a set of province-wide hearings on the development of the sour gas industry; no question about that.

Part of that approach has to involve a proper evaluation of the health impacts. One of the real concerns I have about the government's decision to go ahead with a modified study in Pincher Creek is that here was the opportunity, when we had the proposal by the Canadian Public Health Association, to do a comprehensive study. Instead, we're getting a report which may or may not be ready. The Minister of Social Services and Community Health indicated in March that he thought it would be ready at the end of the month.

It's now into May, and it looks as if there's at least some possibility that this report won't even be tabled during the spring session of the Legislature. I hope I'm wrong, but there's at least a definite possibility that one of these reports won't see the light of day until after the Legislature has been packed off for the summer. In any event, Mr. Chairman, I think we had an excellent opportunity to have a proper health study in the Pincher Creek region, which could have given us a data base on which to hold proper provincial hearings as well.

Now I know there are trade-offs between industrial development and environmental matters. No one needs to say that. But when we have more gas now than we can sell, I really question at what extent we should be putting Albertans' health and safety at risk or, in the case of farmers in the north country, the investments that these people have ploughed into improving their land over more than a decade, because of the interests of the industry in Alberta.

I say to members who I know would join with me in expressing concern over what happened in Pincher Creek: what would occur, Mr. Minister, if we had a major difficulty with some of those gas plants which are very close to the city of Calgary? What would happen if we had a Lodgepole blowout in one of those plants in the Quirk Creek area west of Calgary with the prevailing chinook winds? What would be the impact? Somebody says, you're scaring people. Well, one of the responsibilities is to anticipate problems that could occur — I hope

they won't occur — because blowouts are one of the inevitable consequences of the natural gas industry. It's one of the reasons we should have province-wide hearings.

There are several other areas I'd like to deal with while I have the floor. The first is the question of what we intend to do with the development of the South Saskatchewan River system. We have the proposed Three Rivers dam and discussions which are now going on with the people at Brocket as to perhaps constructing that facility there. I think it would be useful if the minister brought us up to date on just exactly where that process stands today.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to telling us what the government plans to do, whether it's the intention of this government to reject the Environment Council of Alberta position, which was that the Three Rivers site was the least useful site for this kind of water management facility — if that's going to be the route, then I think we should know what the government's intentions are. But I would say in raising that issue that we have to take a close look at the cost benefits of some of these dams.

I know that within the Department of the Environment, we have quite a few dam builders. All we have to do is look at the controversy we had over the Red Deer dam, the leaked memos which became the centre of a fair row in this House in the fall of 1981, and the suggestion at the time by Mr. Melnychuk that the Red Deer dam was located where it was so that it could fit into the eventual objective of water diversion.

When the Premier says that this government has not decided in favor of water diversion, I think I would tend to accept that. He says it in the House. If he says it in the House, I have to accept it. But I say to the members of this committee that I believe there are people in very senior positions in the Department of the Environment who are committed to massive interbasin transfer, who see the planning of these projects, not just isolated on the basis of basin-by-basin management but as part of the eventual objective of bringing to this province the prime project, which was rejected by this minister's predecessor, Mr. Yurko, in the early '70s. But if we set aside the question of interbasin transfer, then we have to look at how we arrive at these cost benefits for environmental projects.

We already have one example. Despite the enthusiasm of the hon. Member for Barrhead, whose effervescence in discussing the advantages of the Paddle project is only exceeded by the length it takes to do it, there don't seem to be any cost benefits that make sense. The original government proposal on the Oldman project, I believe, was that the benefit, compared to the costs, would be in the neighborhood of 3:1; in other words, the benefits would be three times the cost. But after looking at the figures, the Environment Council of Alberta concluded — and this is assuming \$114 million for the Three Rivers dam — that in fact we're not looking at 3:1 at all, but .6:1. We now have Mr. Melnychuk saying that it's going to cost \$168 million to build the dam at Three Rivers. I ask the minister if he could share with the committee the latest figures the government has on benefits to cost.

I might also ask the minister what they have done with the 1978 Wright-Mansell report on the methodology for evaluating the economics of water resource projects in Alberta. As I understand it, this report suggested that we should have more clear-cut guidelines for determining the costs and benefits and that there has been a tendency to underestimate the costs and exaggerate the benefits from

these projects. In any event, I would like to know what the government has done with this report, and why we do not have rules and regulations re cost/benefit analyses, requiring specific disclosure if a project goes ahead in spite of negative benefit/cost ratio. I think that's certainly a valid comment when one looks at the Paddle project, but the Paddle project is pretty small compared to some of these other much more costly proposed dams.

Mr. Chairman, several other issues I'd like to raise relate to the Oldman and the Three Rivers projects. I'd like to know specifically from the minister what the government is going to do about the South Saskatchewan studies. Will the policy options for the South Saskatchewan basin be placed before the public before a cabinet decision on that matter? It would seem to me — and I'd like to make this as a positive suggestion — that what we might do is ask the Environment Council of Alberta to hold hearings on those policy options.

The ECA is a body well suited to hold hearings on the entire South Saskatchewan River system. We have all kinds of implications: the potential irrigation the government tells us about, the contractual water-sharing arrangement we have with the province of Saskatchewan, the potential economic development of Lethbridge and Medicine Hat. These are the kinds of things which, in my view, would justify proper hearings by the ECA. I'd like the minister, in a specific response, to bring us up to date on where things stand on the South Saskatchewan River basin and whether any of these studies will be released to the public.

We could get into the discussion of irrigation. I think there's certainly a very important role for irrigation in this province. But I have to tell you, Mr. Chairman — and I know you come from a southern Alberta riding, as does the minister — that I have never been able to understand why it is that we have an 86:14 formula in irrigation districts, when it comes to taking water to a farm, and in northern Alberta we have a 75:25 cost-sharing arrangement. We have a lot of arable land that could be opened up in northern Alberta. In order to open it up, we have to have major investments in the form of water resource expenditures.

While it's a little better than the old 50:50 formula, the 75:25 formula at the moment still means that many worth-while projects don't get off the ground, because it's just not possible to dig up that other 25 per cent. I know we discussed this when the now Minister of Housing, when he was the Member for Lesser Slave Lake, introduced in this House the motion on the ECA report. But I think the 75:25 formula is out of date. It would seem to me that if we can justify 86:14 in southern Alberta, then we should be looking at the same sort of thing in the northern areas of the province.

A couple of specific questions on another area: I'm told a portable sour gas plant east of Claresholm is being approved. I wonder what we're getting into with this sort of thing. It seems to me that if you have a portable plant without any emission control equipment in a sour gas field, we're going to find that this will be a ruse to get around regulations on the part of proper sulphur recovery equipment. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that if we're going to develop sour gas fields, it's not an unreasonable proposition to say that the best technology must be used in order to protect people in the area.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we have the most recent events in Pincher Creek. I'd like some assurance from the minister as to how this Gulf evaluation committee is going to work, and whether it is going to hold its meetings in

public, particularly how the public at large is going to be treated; for example, Gulf being able to make their representation to the committee in public. I think it would be unfortunate if we had a closed-door approach on this particular matter.

Finally, I realize the ERCB is going to be holding hearings on Lodgepole. But it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that Lodgepole is surely a warning bell for people in this part of the province. We have to make sure that there is the most comprehensive assessment, not only of the health impacts of that blowout but of the larger question I raised before, the development of our sour gas industry. Here we had a situation where for many weeks we had a well totally out of control. I come back to the point I raised a few moments earlier: what if that had been one of the wells close to the city of Calgary? What would we have done? How would we have been able to deal with it? Certainly it would have tested our emergency measures capacity in this province.

Surely that must cause at least sufficient concern that we will get from this government a commitment to hold the kind of hearings that groups across the province have been demanding. I'm not just talking about opposing political groups in other parties but people who are generally concerned, not only about environmental issues but, for that matter, the economic impact on other industries. It seems to me we have a growing demand for proper hearings so that a framework of policies is set out.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that one of the things we could expect from the minister — especially if he wants to redeem the credibility of the department, which was held in very high esteem, as I mentioned, between 1971 and 1975 — would be for the minister to take the lead as an advocate of this sort of public hearing, policy formation process and that, in the next few weeks, we would have an announcement from this government that instead of just looking at these things in isolation, the time has come to have comprehensive investigations of what went wrong at Lodgepole. We need to know that. We need to know the technical questions. We need to know from the geologists and geophysicists whether the company made certain serious errors that could have prevented that particular blowout. That's technical information, and we should have it; no question about it. We also need to look at these things not just in isolation but in the larger context of how it affects overall government policy.

Mr. Chairman, those are a few initial comments. It's quite possible that I'll have additional observations to make, that I will be moved to respond to observations by other members of the committee. But having raised those concerns and undertaken a set of questions I would like the minister to answer, I await his response.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. minister prefer to answer on an individual basis, or would he prefer to wait and have questions from other members of the committee?

MR. BRADLEY: I'd like to hear from other members, please.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, first of all, I'd like to congratulate the minister on his appointment. I think he's going to bring a lot of energy and enthusiasm to the department. I have known the minister for quite awhile, in the Young Conservatives before I was elected and since then. He used to be the caucus youth adviser, and I used

to get a good deal of advice from the hon. member in that capacity in the last caucus. After my remarks this afternoon, I suspect I might get some more.

As well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank a couple of people who, in the last couple of months, helped me prepare for today: Don Appleby, Elmer Kure, Roy Ozanne, and Tony Ferguson of the Alberta Fish & Game Association; people in the Environmental Law Centre; and Martha Kostach. I share a lot of their concerns about environmental policy and would like to bring some of those to the floor of the Assembly.

Mr. Chairman, I have had a chance to go through a number of annual reports of the department. I would like to start off with the observation that we're not doing very much in enforcement. In 1980-81 we had something like 746 complaints and only three prosecutions. The year before, we had 864 complaints for air and water quality violations and five prosecutions. The year before that, we had 562 and, again, five prosecutions. When I was taking sociology at university, I learned that enforcement, in large measure, was determined by the seriousness of the enforcement agency in picking up on complaints and following them through. I suggest that this record, which is also being carried through today, does not suggest that the department is very serious about enforcement.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to break up my remarks into a number of different headings and, having done that, make some remarks. I have about five pages of notes, so you'll have to bear with me. First of all, I would like to touch on ambient air quality. Our legislation is basically geared to detecting ambient air quality standards. I'd like to ask the minister: is the department planning to monitor stack emissions more? I know it does some now. Is it also going to consider requiring that tracer elements be injected into emissions, especially in problem areas like Fort Saskatchewan, where we know there are problems but don't know who is responsible for them? From our area readings over the last year, we know we have high emissions in certain areas, but we don't know who is responsible for them. How often are most plants' stack emissions checked, what are they checked for, and who checks them? Is this pattern the case in all stack emissions, or do we identify some bad actors and take special care to monitor their emissions?

AN HON. MEMBER: Don't forget Edmonton water.

MR. COOK: I'm coming to water quality later.

A number of companies in Alberta are bad actors and consistently exceed air standards. I would like to cite Suncor as one example. What kind of monitorings are taken of these companies? Are they monitored more often than the general population? Would the minister list the companies in the province that are bad actors for air quality? I'd like to know the top 20 companies that violate our air standards.

Mr. Chairman, there don't appear to be any controls over odors of municipal dumps. Why is that? I refer to discussions about dumps in the city of Edmonton.

Mr. Chairman, I will move to the second point. I'd like to argue that one of the biggest problems our department has had is relying on companies monitoring themselves. That's theoretically a good way to go. But in the Suncor hearing, the judge was quite critical, given the fact that the quality of the monitoring was poor. The company was simply able to say that the monitoring was suspect. They were not sure of its reliability, therefore they couldn't tell whether the readings should have been higher,

lower, or if they were just right. Should we be looking at creating some sort of environmental conservation authority or resources board that would have the moneys the companies now pay to have monitoring done paid to this third party? It would establish standards for monitoring. I am concerned that we cannot rely on companies monitoring themselves because of remarks of the judge in the Suncor hearing and the defence provided by lawyers for Suncor. Should we be looking for some other method to get readings we can trust?

Does the minister feel there is a conflict of interest when the agency that sets the limits is also doing the negotiating and arbitrating when there are violations? Again, in a case where a company is violating our standards — it's not usual in our system of law for the policeman to also be the judge and jury. Should the department be creating this kind of agency to monitor these companies and municipalities? Then the department would act as judge and jury rather than having them all done in the same place.

I would like to talk about water quality. I had the chance to go through the Edmonton sewage system a couple of weeks ago, and I was very impressed with the operation. I would like to point out that Edmontonians spend about \$7 per person per year for operating costs of their sewage system. I would like to flag that simply to make the point that I have often heard it said by people in government that if we do much more, it's going to cost so much more to upgrade our secondary and tertiary treatment of wastes. Mr. Chairman, I find that argument somewhat incredible, because we're spending so little on sewage systems now. I don't think a little more investment in this would significantly alter the costs borne by Albertans. We are paying \$7 per person per year to operate our sewage system here in the city of Edmonton. I know that because I've gone through the annual report and through the plant, and that's what I'm told.

What does the department test for in its water standards for a sewage outlet? I understand that our only real tests are for fecal coliforms, and no other pathological substances. Why is that? I'd like to refer to beaver fever in the city. There are a number of physicians in this city who believe that our drinking water standards — not for water let out, but processed water we have as intake — are not good. On a per capita basis, the incidence of beaver fever in Calgary is much, much lower than in Edmonton. There has to be some major difference.

AN HON. MEMBER: Less beaver.

MR. COOK: It's not that at all.

Our standards for fecal coliforms are much lower than for other provinces. As I understand it, the federal government's standards are 100 parts per 100 millilitres. Our standards are 10 times as high; you can have 10 times as many and meet our standards. In British Columbia it's 200 parts. I'd like to suggest that a lot of our smaller towns are able to dump their waste into the river with primary treatment only. All that does is remove some of the solids from the process, and not many at that. Should we be looking at secondary water treatment for larger communities in the province, outside the major cities?

Mr. Chairman, I have in front of me a document called Water Resource Management Principles for Alberta. Based on our legislation, it is a statement by the provincial Department of the Environment on its water management principles. On page 10, item 5 lists the preferential uses for water in the province. The concern I have is

that those preferential uses do not even mention recreation or water quality. They refer to human consumption, food consumption, and industrial use, in that order — and that's all. According to this document, apparently we're not concerned about using our rivers and streams for recreation and water quality for people to enjoy. I'd also like to suggest that if fish are happy in that water, likely people are going to be happy with it as well. It's not recommended that you eat the fish you catch in the North Saskatchewan downstream from Edmonton, and there's some concern about that.

I'd like to ask the minister if he's considering having some concern for recreation inserted in our water resources legislation and policy. If he would, this would impact on the regulation of dams and rivers. For example, TransAlta is applying to have the river downstream from the Bighorn regulated in such a way that it would threaten our national historic site at Rocky Mountain House. Also, the river is less usable for canoeists and people who want to boat on it or use it for fishing. I think that's a concern we should be injecting into our legislation, so we consider those other aspects of water use.

Mr. Chairman, I was looking over the departmental budget, and frankly it seems that the clear mandate of this department with regard to water is for water resources management, which is a euphemism for diversion and dam building. I'd like the minister to comment on the relative importance of dam building versus water quality, and what we plan to do about that. The amounts to be voted contrast dramatically. Of about \$18 million being spent on pollution prevention, only about \$2.5 million is on water quality. That contrasts with almost \$100 million being spent on water diversion. Frankly, those priorities don't make sense to me.

When the department is making recommendations on water management, does it consider the amount of water required by aquatic life in Alberta rivers? There are weirs, dams, and other water blockages the department authorizes, which have very low water outflows — so low that people in Fish and Game, and also, I understand, the departments of wildlife and recreation, have very serious concerns about the ability of those streams to maintain adequate aquatic life. Is the department looking at this? Does the minister have a policy statement on it?

Mr. Chairman, there are no current regulations I know of to protect ground water sources. If these get polluted, they are very difficult, in fact almost impossible, to clean up. What steps does the department propose to take to protect ground water sources, and have we identified those sources that charge our rivers and streams?

I'd like to point out the Strathcona industrial complex, Mr. Chairman. We have a number of open ponds and collecting sites. As I understand the geology of that area, it's largely glacial till and gravel. The dumping that takes place on the surface in that area simply leads to discharge, with seepage into the North Saskatchewan River. I'm concerned that these dumps can contaminate our rivers and our ground water supplies. I would like to ask the minister: do we check on dumps and sewage sites like that, and check for seepage and where that seepage goes? How often and how thoroughly do we monitor all dumps like that in the province? Do we do it every year?

Mr. Chairman, it's come to my attention that fish in the North Saskatchewan River near the Saskatchewan border have been banned for human consumption in the province of Saskatchewan. Why is that? Why is it that fish are good on the Alberta side but not on the Saskatchewan side? Since fish migrate back and forth, is

there concern about that? What is the source of the pollution that affects the quality of those fish?

I'd like to ask how many water quality biologists are on staff with the department. I'd like to know basically how that compares to last year, and what their responsibilities are.

I'd like to touch on acid rain. Earlier this afternoon the minister spoke about the studies being done, and I congratulate him for that. It's true that we are doing a pretty good job, given the poor job of other provinces. But does the minister have a policy statement or an objective, a standard, he's reaching for? Are we simply going to study the problem, or do we have an objective that we're going to reach at the end of some process?

Mr. Chairman, I'm concerned about the levels of technology for sulphur control. I wonder if the department has any objectives in trying to have companies meet certain standards of technology — be it best available, most practical, or simply what's currently available — and do we have any policies requiring companies to upgrade when they modify or expand their plants? Mr. Chairman, again, I'd like to pay particular attention to Suncor. Last year Suncor was given permission to expand its plant. Suncor has also been the subject of numerous citations and control orders. Yet I understand that in the new, enlarged plant, there is not going to be significantly more investment in environmental control, either for the old facilities or for the new plant being proposed. It would seem to me that when a plant is being upgraded, it would make good sense to require the company to upgrade its environmental control for the old plant as well as the new plant. That should be a condition of expansion.

What standards do we have for the emission of hydrocarbons into the air? What hydrocarbons do we test for? Again, I'm concerned about the Fort Saskatchewan area, because I live in north Edmonton. A couple of years ago I was knocking on doors on a beautiful June day, and all of a sudden there was a very strong odor, which was the subject of a lot of concern by my constituents. The concern I had after that, Mr. Chairman, was that the department could not identify which company was responsible for the emission of those hydrocarbons. That goes back to my request for some way to identify the bad actor in Fort Saskatchewan. And that's a continuing problem, Mr. Chairman. I understand that the hydrocarbon levels are still a source of concern in Fort Saskatchewan and north Edmonton.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

Mr. Chairman, are there standards now for the regulation of sulphur dioxide emissions from coal-fired plants? Are there standards for emissions of ash particulate from coal-fired plants, and should there be?

I'd like to touch on enforcement now, Mr. Chairman. Could the minister make a policy statement for the Assembly on what our enforcement standards are? Again, I'd like to go back to the annual reports of the Department of the Environment for the last few years. Frankly, we do not prosecute in this province. Is there a reason for that? What is our policy on prosecution? What do we do in the various regulatory steps leading to those few prosecutions we have had? Could the minister trace for us in the Assembly the progress of a typical complaint for air or water quality? What happens at different stages, and what is required for the department to ultimately prosecute? It must be a very, very serious offence, because less than one-half of 1 per cent of all the complaints ever

receive the attention of the department in a way that would lead to prosecution. Why is that? Why is it that only one-half of 1 per cent would lead to prosecution?

How many personnel in the department are involved in environmental prosecutions or standards enforcement? What are their qualifications and skills? What investigative and evidence-gathering skills do they have? Does the department work with the Attorney General's office to try to develop their skills, so they can gather evidence in a routine way that is admissible in court? I understand that was a complaint made in the Suncor prosecution. As I understand it, the department does not have a routine way of gathering evidence. This goes back to the enforcement point I was trying to make earlier. We prosecute so rarely that we don't gather evidence for prosecution. We don't consider prosecution a very serious tool in our arsenal. Shouldn't we change that? Mr. Chairman, I know the Suncor decision is not going to be available until early June, but will the minister make a commitment to the Assembly today to act on any judicial recommendations that come out of that report, especially with regard to standards and enforcement?

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask another question. We have a lot of tailings ponds — and emissions or effluent being released into the river was the subject of the Suncor prosecution. Does the department regularly monitor all tailings ponds and sewage dumps in this province to make sure there is no seepage in the system, and how often is that done? Is that done over the phone? Is that done visually? Is that done by the company or by our inspectors? Is it done in a routine and organized way, or simply as required or on a complaint basis?

I think that will largely wrap up my questions, but I'd like to ask the minister two more questions. I requested a list of the bad actors in this province for air emissions. I'd also like that for water emissions. If he could, I'd like a report from the minister on the Shell plant in the Waterton area. CPR has been the subject of several control orders. I understand they have been burning railway ties in southern Alberta rights of way, with creosote and other problems. Domtar seems to be a problem. There seems to be an ongoing exchange of correspondence. From reading the press releases of the department, I note that Domtar has been the subject of several control orders. What's happening there?

What's happening in the Fort Saskatchewan area? From reading press releases from the department, I understand there is a very high level of ambient air pollutants there. I'd like to know if those ambient readings in Fort Saskatchewan are continuing to be a source of concern for the department? Has the department identified who was responsible for the air quality problems in June a year and a half ago, and is that company still a problem?

Finally, Mr. Chairman, about a month ago the Department of the Environment released a report called The Effects of Spring Runoff in the North Saskatchewan River, Edmonton, 1982. It points out that surface run-off contains high levels of lead and other items. In fact, sometimes the lead that goes into the North Saskatchewan River exceeds our standards, especially in the spring when all the lead that has been deposited on our roads because of the high lead component in our gasoline, washes off the street system and into the river. I'd like to ask the minister if he has considered identifying the industrial sources of pollutants in the sewage system, either for surface run-off or regular waste water processed by the city of Edmonton or Calgary, and do we try to



identify the industrial contaminants that go in at the source and, hopefully, eliminate them?

We had a problem in the city of Edmonton with mercury pollution from the large number of X-rays from the University hospital, I understand. A successful detective program identified that source of pollution and eliminated it. But do we do that on a routine basis, trying to find the sources of many of the heavy metals, for example, that are injected into the North Saskatchewan River in our waste water, because we do not process and eliminate them.

Finally, the Department of the Environment has asked the city of Calgary to eliminate the phosphate content in its sewage going into the Bow River. Is the minister considering having those same standards apply to the North Saskatchewan, and has the minister considered having other elements that might easily be eliminated in the same chemical process, picked up so we're not just picking up phosphates but other elements that are pollutants in the waste water? It would be very easily picked up with very minimal additional costs.

It goes back to our policy, Mr. Chairman. In this document I referred to earlier, we claim there is no pollution problem if the stream seems to clear itself in eight or 12 miles. So basically we can have an open sewer for eight or 12 miles and say that we have no problem. Perhaps that's the case with Procter & Gamble on the Wapiti River.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, my remarks would be more general. I ask for some assistance from the minister, and in particular I would like to address a few issues as well. I'm sure I won't be as long or in-depth of detail as the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry, but I'm sure his concerns are very real and valid. Later I'd like to refer to a couple of remarks he made, in particular with regard to the Suncor plant in the Lac La Biche region.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

My specific environmental concern with regard to the Lac La Biche region would be the lake. I have written to the department over the past years and have asked for assistance with regard to the algae and weed growth problem. I've had a number of constituents raise this concern with me in the past, and I believe it to be a very real concern. I ask the minister not just to review that specific lake as far as algae and weed growth are concerned, but to look at an overall program that might be implemented in Alberta. This problem is not specific to the Lac La Biche region. I'm sure I've heard other members raise it in the Assembly at times and bring it to the minister's attention. I'd also like to refer the minister to the specific program introduced in our neighboring province, British Columbia. Perhaps the minister would review and comment to the House whether a situation such as this could be implemented in the province of Alberta.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry has referred to the Suncor issue, which I certainly would concur in as far as the overall representation that was initially made. I have raised this concern with the Attorney General's Department. I would rather that the minister and I not go into too much depth with regard to that specific problem, because of course it is in litigation at this point. I certainly would not want to do anything that might endanger that suit.

I would extend an invitation to the Member for Edmonton Glengarry, though, to come and see the situation in the McMurray region first-hand. He talks about the monitoring program and the tailings ponds. I'd like to assure him that the tailings ponds in the plant at Suncor are of an unusual type, for which corrective measures have been taken by the Department of the Environment to overcome any future recurrence. Syncrude, of course, is a different type of plant. The tailings ponds will never have a problem such as occurred in flowing to the river.

I might emphasize to the member that the problem of contamination in the Athabasca River was a direct result of the department bringing it to the attention of the plant, and not the reverse. I can assure that the monitoring is going on. I emphasize this because I am concerned for our constituents, our community, and for the corporate structure, because they provide a vital link to our community and are very responsible corporate citizens. I feel they will try to do anything they can to address the problem and would work with the department in all aspects. If any recommendations are forthcoming from the department, I as the member for the area would welcome them to make that representation first-hand to the plant and through the minister's department to rectify any situations that may or may not be occurring. I can assure the minister that the plant officials would gladly communicate their full co-operation in that respect.

As far as the Athabasca River and the contaminants are concerned, I'm very glad to see that fishing has now been approved for 1983. All biological tests have been conducted, and the fish have received a clean bill of health. I look forward to the commercial and recreational fishing in the Athabasca this year. Come June, I personally will be on the river and will be making my annual trip visiting constituents along the way in Fort Chip and the Fort Fitzgerald region as well, and I look forward to the fishing in Richardson Lake.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the minister to address the flood problem in the Fort McMurray area in particular. When I say "address the flood problem", I have a commitment by his predecessor that where we had the problem of floods on April 13, 1977, and in May of '79, a flood abatement committee responsible for control or to make some recommendations, was set up to address this particular area. I believe the day should be coming when we will no longer have to say we have a committee and we're reviewing it. I believe we should have a positive, concrete, responsive direction to proceed with.

I say that because we've just come through a very tiring time again. I don't know if the minister is aware of the mental strain and anguish this creates for the people in that possible flood plain. We can't just keep saying, well, we're reviewing it, we're looking at it. I believe we must be more positive. When I say "more positive", I would like assurance from the minister that the 75:25 per cent funding will still be there. I refer to a 75 per cent commitment on behalf of the province of Alberta and 25 per cent to be undertaken by the community. I would like the minister to assure that that commitment is there and, if possible, to extend that in view of the possibility that the funding will amount to several million dollars to alleviate any problem that may or may not occur in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the minister review the overall assistance available through the department for future water development in small communities, specifically in the rural areas. What type of commitment? I happen to notice that in the minister's budget there is some \$42,410

allocated in '83-84 in the Metis water supply area. I suggest to the minister that that is not enough. It should be further reviewed, and perhaps in reviewing it the minister's department could develop an ongoing system that would be more usable and adaptable for the small rural communities. This would eliminate having to have an engineering firm go in and specifically relate to that area, where there are many hundreds of thousands of dollars spent in the engineering and development stages. I'm sure the department could come on stream with an overall developmental system that could be utilized throughout the regions, thus saving the government and communities many, many dollars. I'd like to expand on that if the minister has any problems with clarification.

I certainly would like to thank the minister and his department for the black fly assistance that has been given to our communities. That might sound very unique — an insignificant problem to some in the urban constituencies. But I can assure you, Mr. Chairman — I believe you too are affected by this specific problem, because the program takes place around Athabasca Landing, where the solution is put into the Athabasca River and, of course, has effects down through the Athabasca River. I hope this program will be continued. I look forward to the ongoing assistance. At the same time, I certainly appreciate the funding that's been available for our communities with regard to the mosquito problem. This year I notice the city of Edmonton in particular embarking on a very ambitious program. I encourage all rural communities to work on overall control in this area as well.

My last point, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask the minister, through his department, to expand a bit on the Alberta oil sands environmental research and specific research projects as they pertain to the Lac La Biche-McMurray constituency — and a vote of confidence and encouragement on my behalf to continue with these programs. I'm sure an awful lot of hon. members aren't aware of how it affects all Alberta. I believe there are some firm commitments, specifically in the area of research, that will have some ongoing, long-term benefits to all Albertans.

I don't think it's all negative out there, Mr. Chairman. I think we have a lot to learn, and learn from. I appreciate the minister's taking on that responsibility. I look forward to working with him in those areas. I certainly hope he can address some of the concerns that I, as well as other members, have raised. I'm sure we'll look forward to some good clean air and water in the years to come.

At this time, I would also like to express to members from southern constituencies not to overlook the north in holidays they might be planning. Our Lac La Biche-McMurray region provides beautiful recreation areas, good clean air, and good clean hunting and fishing. Let's keep it that way. As responsible citizens, I would encourage everybody to stop polluting and get on with the job we have to do.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in the discussion on the Department of the Environment today. First of all, I'd like to congratulate the Minister of the Environment on his appointment. I know that his youth and enthusiasm will serve him well in this most challenging portfolio. I would also like to congratulate and thank the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry for his in-depth research and very

serious questions about a very serious issue, the environment of our province.

I do not intend to be redundant, Mr. Chairman. I have two specific questions. My comments will remain in these two areas. First of all, it is my belief — and my views may be substantiated by many studies — that this portfolio, Environment, and all it entails is of paramount importance to a growing number of Albertans. I say this to advise the minister that I think the public feels a strong need to maintain clean air, water, and land in our beautiful province. I ask the minister to continue to maintain a high profile with the public on (a) what our government is indeed doing to maintain clean air and a clean Alberta; (b) to continue to welcome concerns and comments about ways to improve our environment; (c) to advise the public on improved ways to prevent pollution in their homes, on vacations, on their farms and, indeed, throughout the province; and (d) to press and punish those who say they don't care and pollute our lands, lakes, rivers and, indeed, our province. I believe that the fines and punishment must be increased.

My second major question pertains to recycling. I understand the recycling of bottles and cans in this province has been working tremendously well. I ask the minister to comment if he intends to alter the licensing procedure for bottle depots. I also ask the minister if he has considered expanding the role of these depots to take more products for recycling, such as oil, other fluids, and other products. My belief is that the licensing for depots now is good and is fair and equitable to the depots. I trust the Minister of the Environment will maintain his present involvement in this area without major changes in the licensing of bottle depots.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to cover just a couple of areas. First of all, some general remarks. I know the minister is new in the job. I certainly would not want to blame all the environmental problems of Alberta on the minister. But I think we have to be honest here. I'm sure the minister has noticed various press reports. One thing the government is not known for right now is its care of the environment. The minister may say that they're doing an excellent job and it's just a matter of trying to get to the press and straightening the people around. But I suggest to the minister that we do have some serious environmental problems. My colleague has talked about a number of them, so I will go into basically two areas.

One is the Lodgepole incident. I'm sure all MLAs from Edmonton know that that was a major concern of Edmontonians. Very soon after the November 2 election, we were getting a number of — at least my office was, and I expect it was true for most other Edmonton members and probably other members also. But I'm dealing specifically with Edmonton concerns. It seems to us — and I know it's not totally in the minister's area — that the assessment studies of what type of hearings we should have are not going to be held in Edmonton. I think they should. Because of the concern, he should talk to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources and see if something can be done to set up the assessment studies. A lot of people in the Edmonton area were extremely concerned about it, Mr. Chairman. I think it's only right that they have some input to that. You can say that they can have input by travelling out to Drayton Valley. But for people who are working during the day, that becomes very difficult, as I'm sure the minister is aware. So I hope

that, with the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, he would look at the assessment and the types of studies they're going to run on the Lodgepole incident and make sure there is an Edmonton hearing on this.

The other area that I want to discuss very briefly is the whole idea of the PCB leakage in the Nisku industrial park. First of all, there have been some comments that there is an overreaction about PCBs. Mr. Chairman, this is just not the case if people look into some of the research. For instance, it is impossible to know just how toxic PCBs may be to humans, because scientists cannot find a level of exposure in test animals that does not produce adverse health effects. That has to say something about the human condition. They can't find a low enough level in animals where it doesn't produce adverse health effects. If we want to talk about figures — and we've traded figures here about levels — carcinogenic effects have occurred at doses as low as one-half part per million and even 25 parts per billion.

Dr. James Allen, an American who is an expert in the area, has conducted extensive research on these chemicals. He concluded by saying, "there's no question that PCBs are a carcinogenic agent." The World Health Organization's International Agency for Research on Cancer issued a monograph in 1978 on the carcinogenic risk of PCBs to humans. While stating that research evidence was not conclusive because of the reasons I've already alluded to — they can't find a safe level — they say that "for practical purposes . . . PCB's should be regarded as if they were carcinogenic to humans".

I could go on and on about the research on PCBs. But very recently the Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc, the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife, said — and I'm wondering if this is government policy; I'm going to ask the minister this. I quote from a report:

"You can go and do the same tests underneath any TransAlta pole in this province and find higher amounts of PCBs."

He's talking about the Nisku area.

"Most of the PCBs have been around for years. They've been working with it for the last 30 years . . .

"I've worked myself as an electrician — right up to my armpits in the stuff . . .

"We tend to over-dramatize the harmful effects. You've got to see the other side of the coin.

"The stuff used to go down the sewer, and it used to go into the garbage dumps."

In all fairness, I am going to take the word of the experts in the area rather than this minister of the Crown.

I want to ask the minister: is Mr. Sparrow dictating government policy about PCBs? Because if he is, in all due respect to the minister, he's absolutely wrong, if he looks at the research. I'd like to hear what the minister has to say about that. The other thing about PCBs — sure, he may have been working close to them; they're around. But they can be stored in the human body for years and years. There's a cumulative effect. We're saying that if PCBs are being leaked in this area — and I'll come to that question — certainly it should be a health concern for all people around this area, especially the people working there.

I would like to ask the minister a couple of questions in regard to this, because during question period I haven't been able to determine the answers to this, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I would ask why, when his department's earliest samples were advertised, when they were trying to contradict what both my colleague and I were saying — a lot of advertising, a lot of publicity stating that our

figures were wrong. But later on we find that their earliest samples, and the minister has alluded to this, proved to be out by a factor of up to 100 — no publicity about that. Lots of publicity when they thought they had figures proving ours wrong; no publicity when they went back and checked on their own. I'd like to ask the minister why.

There are some other questions dealing with Kinetic, though, that I don't think have been answered, and I'd like to put three of them to the minister, Mr. Chairman. Number one: one of Kinetic's warehouses floods on a regular basis, and holding tanks beneath the warehouse have been pumped out onto the site to run off into the ditches, a possible source of contamination. On at least one occasion, and possibly more, contaminated water was trucked away for disposal. Where was it disposed of? Dealing with that one area, why is the problem of this flooding not being corrected?

The second question, Mr. Chairman. In first-class storage facilities, off-site contamination is impossible because of the requirement for a perimeter dam. Why is no such dam required at Kinetic, given the evidence of off-site contamination that even his officials agreed was there? Why no perimeter dam? The third question: is proper disposal of dangerous chemicals such as PCBs a costly process? Given Kinetic's well-publicized financial problems, which I'm sure the minister is aware of, why is the provincial government permitting that company to continue hauling PCBs from as far away as Newfoundland to Nisku, where they represent a potential liability for the taxpayer? It's my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that hazardous wastes are still coming in from all over Canada, which gets us into a whole new problem, the transportation of hazardous wastes, which I won't go into for the time being, while I'm trying to stay specifically on the PCB issue. I would like the minister to answer those questions and, as Minister of the Environment, to indicate to us his analysis of PCBs. Does he agree with the Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc, or does the minister see PCBs as a legitimate health threat? Then those other four questions.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the government may feel that people think environmental matters aren't important. I would disagree. The latest studies people have been talking about indicate that the environment is very high in people's priorities. I think the minister would agree, if he looked at that study that was advertised about people's priorities, that the government is not coming off very well in people's perceptions about the environment.

Again, I do not blame the minister. He's just a new minister, just learning the job, and he's got to pick up a lot of things from the previous minister that were done wrong. But I think he has to be very concerned. I think we have to look into public hearings on environmental matters right across this province. My colleague has talked about some of the other ones already, but I am interested specifically in these two areas, especially as they affect Edmonton. Being an Edmonton MLA, I would appreciate his comments on this.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Chairman, first of all, I'd like to congratulate the minister on his appointment. My remarks are going to be very brief. I have only a couple of areas I would be interested in receiving comment on from the minister. They relate, sir, to the application of sludge to land. As you may know, the city of Red Deer was fortunate to recently have a new sewage treatment

plant completed. There was some discussion as to the possibility and advisability of the application of sludge to land. I wonder if the minister could comment on those kinds of studies: if they're still being done, and whether the feasibility of this aspect continues to have merit.

I have one other brief comment. It probably isn't the place, Mr. Chairman, but while I'm on my feet I would like to ask the minister: there is a local situation developing in Red Deer right now where a trailer court just outside the city is applying sewage to the Red Deer River about four kilometres upstream from the sewage treatment plant. It's raised some concern, and I wonder if the minister would be prepared to comment on that situation as well.

Thank you.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say a few words. I've listened with interest today, to the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry, my partner beside me, and several other members from the city of Edmonton, on the pollution we have in this province. In my estimation, one of the major pollution problems we have comes from our major urban centres, the cities of Calgary and Edmonton, where maybe they should be spending a little more of their budgets cleaning up their sewage systems that are putting sewage back into the rivers. Of all the pollution we have today in our water systems and our rivers in this province, it mainly goes back to sewage from our large urban centres and their inability to cope with that.

I have one question, Mr. Minister, while I'm up. Is it permissible for a large urban centre, or any city or municipality, to dump raw sewage into the rivers if there's an emergency at a lift station? I'm talking about a little thing that happened in Drumheller, in ID 7, where there was an emergency. Some of the sewage did get into the Red Deer River, and some people got sick from it. So I would like to know whether this is under the legislation we now have. Is this permissible through your department, and is there any conflict between your department and the Social Services and Community Health Department? That's all.

Thank you very much.

MR. FISCHER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the minister for accepting the challenge of operating this Environment Department. It takes a brave man with a thick hide to take on such an important yet thankless job. I would like to thank the minister for his support on our new \$1.3 million experimental incinerator project. We are looking forward to further co-operation in monitoring the results over the next three years, and we are convinced that the Department of the Environment has taken a big step in the right direction with this incinerator.

I would like to ask the minister what role the Environment Department plays in regard to the many chemicals we are using in agriculture. With the ever-increasing use of air application that sprays many of the trees and bushes along the roadsides, are they monitoring the effects of these farm chemicals on wildlife, game birds, and fish ponds?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the minister wish to make some remarks now?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, a number of questions have been put forward this afternoon, and I suspect it's going to take some time to respond to them. Perhaps we

should deal with them in the order in which they were asked.

The first question, from the Leader of the Opposition, was with regard to the Inverness approval and the process it went through. I appreciate the concern the hon. leader has expressed in terms of the approval process, but one must take into consideration that there was a particular application before the Energy Resources Conservation Board, and whether or not the alternative proposal which the hon. leader alludes to in fact received the co-operation of the much smaller operator with regard to the application Inverness had. If they had been in favor of the option of having their gas field processed by Shell, I'm sure they would have withdrawn their application and joined with Shell in a joint-venture effort to have the gas processed. I don't believe that was the case. I'm advised that in terms of the specific project, it was a fairly small gas field in terms of the amount of gas that was going to be processed, and there were specific conditions attached to the environmental approvals for that project, which took into consideration a number of the issues and concerns expressed by citizens in the area, particularly with regard to monitoring of the plant facility and the specific question of acid deposition on soils. A process of very regular monitoring of that was included in the approvals, to check the impact on soils and specifically to check, over the initial operating period of the plant, to see if in fact the operation of that plant caused any changes in soil conditions. I believe a commitment was also made that if additional sour gas proposals came from the area, there would be an intensive scrutiny of the overall impact on the region in terms of the ERCB review process. Those would be my initial comments with regard to that, recognizing that the hon. Leader of the Opposition expressed some concerns about the Inverness approval.

The hon. leader raised a number of questions about concerns he had in terms of incidents in the past. I'm not sure I can respond to some of those this afternoon, but certainly I will when I continue tomorrow evening. He mentioned that in terms of the gas processing industry, particularly south of Pincher Creek in the Twin Butte area, he felt there had been lax administration by the department. If the hon. leader has some specific information he could bring forward to me, I would certainly review that charge against the department.

The hon. leader raised a number of questions in terms of special wastes. I think I responded that the first time the department was aware of the purchase of Chem-Nuclear by Waste Management Inc. was a telex from an official in Chem-Nuclear to the department on July 30. That was the first information the department had, and at that time a number of reviews took place, which the Attorney General has elaborated on in question period. When one looks at the process we went through in terms of selection of proponents, I think there was a very high-powered committee of individuals that reviewed the 19 original applications. You have to look at this on the basis that the review procedures by the department were involved with regard to the initial review of the proponents' applications, and as I say, there was a technical committee which looked into a number of parameters — a very extensive review, including looking at some of the matters which the hon. leader mentioned. First, I would like to mention some of the individuals who were on that selection committee. There certainly was representation from the department. Mr. Kupchanko, the assistant deputy minister of Environment, was on it. We had some very special expertise. From the University of Stuttgart in

Germany, we had a professor for hazardous waste, a noted expert, Dr. W. Hamel. Mr. Finnecy, a chemist with the hazardous materials service of the Harwell Laboratory in the United Kingdom, was part of our review. We also had John McGlennon, a former regional administrator for the Environmental Protection Agency in the United States. These were the experts, familiar with these types of plants and processes, from outside Canada who were part of the team. We also had Dr. Walter Harris on the selection committee. He's a chemist and a former chairman of chemistry at the University of Alberta. We had a citizen representative from the county of Beaver, and Dr. Wood, a chemist with the Research Council of Alberta. He was a representative of the Public Advisory Committee of the Environment Council of Alberta. There were other people from the private sector in the province: Mr. Al Schoening, a chemical engineer with RTM Engineering in Calgary and a former member of the hazardous waste team which the province has put together; Mr. Lorne Mick, who has a financial background in oil companies and was a member of the hazardous waste team; plus Mr. Lupul and Mr. Ken Simpson from the department.

So I believe there was a very good team which reviewed the applications that came forward. In the context we're looking at, we have to remember very specifically that this selection procedure looked at the applications of the companies and the corporate organization of the companies at the point in time when the applications came forward. The areas they looked at were: corporate structure, management, emission clean-up, landfills and transportation, chemistry and technology, research and development, and something called exotics operational experience. They certainly looked at health and emergency response, community concerns, and public relations, to name a few. So the question of operational experience was certainly addressed in terms of a review of the proponents.

It was on that basis that a recommendation came forward on Chem-Security with regard to its record in the field. A number of factors were looked at — compared to the 19, a short list of four — and finally Chem-Security was selected. So on that basis, in terms of the initial selection process, I believe there was an excellent review

of Chem-Security and its parent company, Chem-Nuclear. These things were certainly looked at in terms of the operation of that specific company.

I think the other thing we have to look at in this matter is that the proponent — although we've suspended negotiations with that corporation at this time — will be operating under Canadian law, Canadian regulatory experience, and specifically under the regulations here in the province of Alberta. I think that's an important factor to put out.

I stated that I have asked the Attorney General, and he is undertaking a review of the most recent charges against Waste Management Inc. I will await the results of the review by the Attorney General prior to proceeding any further with regard to Chem-Security as a proponent for our plant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In view of the time, would the minister like to move that we rise and report.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I move that we rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is not proposed that the Assembly sit this evening. It is intended that we sit tomorrow night. We will be in Committee of Supply, beginning with the Department of Culture and, if there is additional time, the Department of Transportation.

[At 5:31 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]

