

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**Title: **Friday, May 6, 1983 10:00 a.m.**

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the annual report of the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower for the year ended March 31, 1982.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table with the Legislative Assembly the 1982 annual report for Alberta Government Telephones.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table with the Assembly a summary of the Health Manpower Training Study, undertaken on behalf of the western Canadian premiers. A very large volume, which will be filed with the Clerk and the library, gives the full information. I think the summary will suffice for most members.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly a group of grade 5 students from the E.G. Wahlstrom school in the Lesser Slave Lake constituency. The students are here on a field trip, are enjoying their visit to the capital city, and this morning have the opportunity to watch their provincial Legislature in action. With the students are their principal Mr. Woodward; teachers Miss Johnston, Miss Dow, and Mr. Barath; as well as parents Mrs. Lingel, Mrs. Watts, Mrs. Gladue, Mrs. Beauregard, and Mr. Geiger. They are seated in the members gallery, and I ask them to stand and receive the cordial welcome of the members of the Assembly.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me today to introduce to you, and through you to members of this Assembly, a number of enthusiastic grades 8 and 9 students from the Erle Rivers high school in Milk River. The students are in the public gallery.

Mr. Speaker, this is a particular pleasure for me, in that not only is this the junior/senior high school I attended as a student; it was also my first assignment as a teacher.

MR. RUSSELL: It's an historic site now.

MR. BOGLE: As long as you assist with our new hospital renovations, Mr. Minister, we'll take those jobs.

The students are accompanied by parents Margaret Wensman, Margaret Thielen, Gail Hummel, and Esther Eros, and teachers Darryl Christensen and Audrey Vanson-Turner. As a further indication of how time marches on, I might mention that Audrey, a teacher, is married to one of my former students. I'd like to ask the

students from Erle Rivers high school to stand and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 14 special guests with us today. They are the students whose work has received special recognition in the province-wide student art exhibition that was held in honor of Education Week 1983. As I announced on Monday, this is Education Week across Alberta. There has been a great deal of activity in schools this week and, as members have seen, the art work done by our special guests is on display in the rotunda of the Legislature this week.

I'd like to have the indulgence of the House to introduce each of these students individually, because they certainly merit recognition, and I'd like to introduce their teachers as well. Nancy Van Straaten, representing the grade 1 class at St. Rose of Lima school in Calgary, is accompanied by her teacher Mrs. Van de Pol. Colleen Cameron and Alison Forster, representing the grade 2 classes that designed the class exhibit at Centennial elementary school in Wetaskiwin, are accompanied by their teachers Mrs. Mojelski and Mrs. Bristow. Shawn Calibabba represents the grade 3 class from St. Martin's Roman Catholic separate school in Vegreville and is accompanied by Mrs. Jenne Hnydyk.

Two grade 4 students tied for first place in the exhibition: Kevin Chilibeck, also from St. Martin's Roman Catholic school in Vegreville, and Maria Quesada, from Spruce Cliff school in Calgary. The teachers are Mrs. Kulak, from St. Martin's school in Vegreville, and Mrs. Payette, from Spruce Cliff school in Calgary. Tracy Brown, of Midway school in Didsbury, made the most outstanding exhibit in grade 5 and is accompanied by Mr. Boerger. Patrick Baska, from St. Thomas Aquinas school in Provost, had the most outstanding entry in grade 6 and is accompanied by Mrs. Stang. Sparrow Nystrom, from the grade 7 class at H.J. Cody school in Sylvan Lake, is the recipient of special recognition and is accompanied by his teacher, who also happens to be his mother. Delia Calvert, from Wainwright high school, made the outstanding grade 8 entry and is accompanied by Ms Kelch.

The grade 9 recipient was Leah Eliuk, of A.L. Horton junior high school in Vegreville, accompanied by Mrs. Jarrell. Andre Seow was the grade 10 student at Canmore composite high school and is accompanied by Mrs. Best. The grade 11 recipient is unable to be here. Mark Kohl is on an exchange with fellow students in Germany. Lynn Steinman, of Wainwright high school, created the outstanding exhibit in grade 12 and is also accompanied by Ms Kelch. And Sylvia Quintal is the recipient of the special education category award. Sylvia is from the Fort McMurray composite high school and is accompanied by Ms Rahn.

I congratulate all the students and teachers and the education students, teachers, and administrators throughout the province. Thank you.

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS****Department of Transportation**

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, since 1977, 4-H Clubs across the province have been involved annually in a united effort to clean up Alberta highways. This year's program will take place tomorrow, Saturday, May 7, with thousands of young Albertans taking to our high-

ways to help once again in keeping Alberta clean.

Over the last six years, the program has grown to the point where, in 1982, over 6,000 young Albertans participated. Although the majority of the groups are 4-H Clubs, Junior Forest Wardens and other youth organizations participate as well. In the one-day program last year, these youngsters collected over 50,000 bags of garbage and, in so doing, cleaned over 6,000 kilometres of highway throughout our province.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that all motorists be aware that the participants will be on the highways tomorrow, wearing bright clothing and safety vests and supervised closely by their parents and group leaders. Signs will be placed along the highways to indicate areas where the clean-up is occurring, and the vehicles accompanying the groups will also be marked. As well, both the RCMP and the highway patrol will be present on the highways to assist with traffic control.

These safety efforts have been effective over the years. In spite of these efforts, however, two years ago a youth was tragically struck and killed while participating in a clean-up campaign. No matter how many precautions the participants take, it is essential that all motorists be aware of the clean-up campaign. Motorists must exercise a great deal of care and caution while using our highways tomorrow.

In an effort to increase motorists' awareness of the clean-up campaign, our government has implemented a province-wide advertising campaign. Advertisements advising motorists of the clean-up and urging them to drive safely have been placed in newspapers across the province. Radio advertisements will run tomorrow, throughout the day, again reminding drivers to be extra mindful of the youngsters who are out there cleaning up our province. It is hoped that these additional efforts will add to the safety.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind everyone to do their part in exercising extra care and caution in driving safely on Saturday. Together, let's make sure that this is a safe and productive day.

#### head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

##### Day Care Centre

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my first question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Has the minister been able to ascertain why it took officials of his department eight days to act on allegations of child abuse at the Woodcroft Day Care Centre?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the sequence of events with respect to the Woodcroft Day Care Centre is not quite as the hon. member indicated. An oral complaint was made early in April to the licensing branch of the day care operations. A licensing inspector followed up by getting the complaints in writing. That didn't occur until toward the end of April. The licensing people then decided, at the end of April, to contact the child welfare area. On the same day the child welfare people were informed, the police laid charges.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister. Given the policy outlined on pages 16 and 17 of the child welfare manual, which calls for prompt investiga-

tion, why were written complaints asked for to begin with?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I would have to check as to why the licensing inspector required the complaints in writing. The process was one of wanting to be very sure that the people who were complaining were prepared to put it in writing. Once that occurred and, as I said, after discussions with other people in the licensing office, they decided to contact the child protection staff at the Westmount district office.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Can the minister confirm that children were hit . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would the hon. member address the Chair in asking his questions.

MR. MARTIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister confirm that children at the centre in question were hit again on Tuesday, the day after charges were laid?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, as far as I and the department are concerned, the utmost concern is the safety of the children at the day care centre.

In terms of follow-up, after the police laid the charges, we had the Edmonton regional director contact the director of the day care centre. After discussions, it was agreed that a person from the department would go into the day care centre and be there until the date of the trial. Also, all the parents of children in the day care centre were telephoned to make them aware of the facts relative to what had transpired. So in terms of protection of the children, we have taken the step of putting a person in there full-time until the date of the trial.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I'm asking about Tuesday. In view of the fact that the director did not go in until Wednesday, could the minister confirm that children at the Woodcroft Day Care Centre were hit again on Tuesday?

DR. WEBBER: I have heard no reports to that effect, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Labour. Given section 35 of the Child Welfare Act, which compels citizens to report incidents of physical ill treatment, will the Minister of Labour investigate whether the dismissal of the workers who complained constitutes an unfair labor practice?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood should be aware that under the Employment Standards Act, there is a provision for a service of notice requirement on an employer, unless in fact there is justified cause for dismissal. If there are complaints, then they should be filed in the ordinary course. I would expect that the parties would do so.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. If criminal charges of assault are not enough to warrant suspension of a day care centre licence, could the minister outline what would be necessary to warrant suspension?

DR. WEBBER: First of all, the action that can be taken by the minister or the department is outlined in the social

care facilities review Act. There are two processes. One is where a licence could be suspended by a licensing officer 30 days after notice is given. The second is a ministerial stop order, which could close the operation within 48 hours. In view of the fact that we were having a person in the day care operation on a full-time basis until the charges were laid — charges have only been laid, so we assume innocence until proven guilty. Therefore the operation was allowed to remain open, with the assurance on our part that the children would be protected.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the inspector the department has placed in the day care be keeping day care hours or government hours; that is, will there be an inspector in the centre all the time the day care centre is open?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, when I indicate that they'll be there full-time, I assume it will be the hours the centre is open. In any case, I don't know what the hon. member is referring to by the distinction between the two different kinds of hours.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister. I think you'd better check day care hours — there is a difference — and make sure this inspector is going to be there. That's what I'm asking.

DR. WEBBER: I suggest the hon. member do a little checking himself.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Perhaps we could go to the next question.

MR. MARTIN: The minister is in charge of the department. That's what he gets paid for.

#### Court Decision

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my next question to the hon. Attorney General. On April 13, 1983, the hon. Attorney General filed with the Assembly a copy of a letter dated October 20, 1980, from RCMP Chief Superintendent Whyte, purporting to answer the concerns of my colleague as to RCMP involvement in the actions of persons the courts have described as trespassers.

My question to the Attorney General is: why was no investigation carried out concerning the admission under oath at the preliminary inquiry on February 11, 1981, by one of the trespassers — a Crown witness — stating that he had informed the RCMP in advance of his group's intention to trespass?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the letter that was filed was part of a response to a question, indicating that the matter had indeed been looked into at the time in question. As I recall, I was asked at the time whether or not an investigation would be undertaken into certain of the circumstances. The letter was presented for the purpose of indicating that that had been done in a timely way right after the incidents in question.

As to the specific question about whether or not further consideration will be given based on evidence the hon. member refers to, given at the preliminary inquiry, that review of all that occurred is still taking place. We were presented with — I guess one would describe it in the form of an argument or making the case as to why

some further steps should be taken. That was presented by legal counsel who had acted for Mr. Neustaedter. It's that material and those observations of that particular legal counsel that are under consideration at the present time.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Did the Attorney General's inquiries into my colleague's concerns not include a review of evidence given at the preliminary inquiry before Judge McDonald in February 1981? I guess I'm asking: why must we be satisfied with a letter written four months earlier by the RCMP when we're investigating their own behavior?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in the first instance, the way in which complaints in respect of policing are done is by way of an internal investigation. That has been the case with the RCMP over the years. The letter that was filed was the substantial result of the RCMP investigation.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In his comments in *Hansard* of April 13, 1983, the Attorney General states: "The investigation did not show that a telephone call was made by Mr. Neustaedter's daughter."

In view of the testimony under oath by Constable Philip Anthony [McKerry] of the Gleichen department at the preliminary inquiry, that no record of calls is kept by the department, what records are the source of the hon. Attorney General's assurance?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, at the time I answered that question, I was summarizing the information in the letter which was filed at the same time.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. For the benefit of the Attorney General, I would like to file copies of Mr. Neustaedter's phone bill for September 1980, which very clearly shows calls to the Gleichen and other detachments of the RCMP. In view of that, will the Attorney General review the evidence given under oath at the preliminary inquiry and report back to the House his findings concerning both their foreknowledge of the events of September 20 and their failure to respond to calls for help?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that the review of all those circumstances was in fact still proceeding. That is the case.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary. In view of the fact that information has now been sworn by Mr. Neustaedter and summonses have been issued to the 12 persons termed vigilantes by the court, will the Attorney General reconsider the department's earlier assertion that it would enter a stay of proceedings in such an event, particularly in light of sworn testimony by those persons at the preliminary inquiry back on February 11, 1981, admitting, in the words of Judge McDonald, the commission of "six criminal offences"?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, as to the stay of proceedings, that's a decision that's taken at the appropriate time. I can't respond this morning to what the situation would be.

### Young Offenders Legislation

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Solicitor General is with regard to the implementation of the juvenile offenders Act. I wonder if the minister could indicate what policy will be implemented with regard to housing young offenders and adult offenders in remand centres or correctional facilities in the province. Has that policy been established by the minister at this time?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, the basic policy of the young offenders program is set out in the federal legislation and requires that young offenders must be kept separate from adult offenders.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question in light of the answer. Could the minister explain why, in the new facility planned for Red Deer, both the juvenile offenders aged 12 to 17 and the adult offenders will be housed in the same facility?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, we have had discussions with the federal Solicitor General's Department as to the interpretation to be applied to keeping such young offenders separate. The indication we have received is that as long as they are in a separate wing or separate housing, it is not necessary that they actually be located in a separate building.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate whether the persons processing the adult and juvenile offenders will be the same? Will there be one desk at the entrance of the facility that will process both the young and adult offenders? Will the same persons in the facility be dealing with both groups?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, there may be a certain amount of overlap of functions. I believe the general intention will be to maintain as much of a separate function, as applies to the young offenders, and keep it really quite separate from those in the adult system. On the community corrections side, however, there will in fact be a fair amount of overlap and use of community corrections people who will work with young offenders.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. On the basis of the design of Red Deer, are there other facilities in the planning stages for housing juvenile and adult offenders across the province, in terms of the remand centre? Are there other locations on stream in planning?

MR. HARLE: Not at this time.

### Crowsnest Pass Freight Rates

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Has the minister any indication from Mr. Pepin on his main reasons for changing the federal proposal on the Crow?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, it seems clear that the eastern lobby, coupled with actually no consensus in the west, was the contributing factor to any change.

MRS. CRIPPS: A supplementary. Have any Alberta businessmen been in contact with the minister, with re-

ference to the impact of these changes on their businesses?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a number of secondary processing industries in the province have contacted me. They are deeply concerned about political involvement in the market place, in that the consensus reached in the Gilson process wasn't accurately reflected in the legislation that's now forthcoming.

MRS. CRIPPS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister of Economic Development any information on the total jobs in Alberta that are related to secondary and agricultural processing?

MR. PLANCHE: I haven't got the precise number of jobs, Mr. Speaker, but it's clear that it's a very, very large number of people in one of our key sectoral industries. I'm happy to quantify that as best I can. But again, there is no question that a large number of people are involved.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to supplement the answer my colleague gave. I think it's fair to say that the majority of Albertans are somehow involved in the agricultural chain, right from producing the product to processing and transporting the product and even supplying the inputs into agriculture. So Albertans as a whole, generally, are somehow involved in agriculture. In fact, you can go so far as to say that if you eat, you're involved in agriculture. So it's hard to quantify the number of jobs. However, I think it's fair to say that the latest facts I have are that roughly one-third of Alberta's total manufacturing industry is involved in agricultural processing. Some 25 firms in Alberta are involved in manufacturing machinery and equipment.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, does the minister have any information — I don't know how to word this so that you don't rule me out of order. Maybe I'll go on to my next one. Last weekend, I was called by a member of the Alberta Cattle Commission. Has the Alberta Cattle Commission contacted the minister regarding their concerns?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Alberta Cattle Commission and the Pork Producers' Marketing Board have been in contact with me. We are presently working with them to try to accurately assess what the impact of the changes might be. I said yesterday in the House that it's difficult to get an accurate assessment at this point, because it's a little like shovelling fog.

### School Board Elections

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Education. Has the minister or his department considered the possibility of requiring the election of public school trustees in the city of Calgary — and possibly the city of Edmonton — to take place by ward, as opposed to the city at large?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, we don't have that matter under consideration in the department, although I expect it is probably correct to say that the suggestion is on record with the department in a register of possible amendments to legislation, which we maintain in the department. That is, any time a suggestion is made to us for amendments to the School Act, we put those in the

register, with the intention that we would consider them in the context of the review of the School Act or any necessary amendments to the School Act. So it is not under active consideration at the present time, it is probably correct that it is on record in the files of the department, and it is certainly a possibility we would be prepared to consider in the course of the review of the School Act.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Given the size of the Calgary public school district and the communication problems that have been evident there on certain issues over the past year, would the minister undertake to review that possibility more quickly, perhaps in time for the civic elections this fall?

MR. KING: If the member can persuade his colleagues that we should stay here until July 1, I'd be prepared to make that undertaking to him. At the moment, Mr. Speaker, I anticipate that the municipal and school board elections will be held before the fall sittings of the Legislature commence. Certainly I think it's correct to say that nomination day would have passed before the fall sittings of the Legislature. My point is obvious: unless the amendments were made this spring, they couldn't have effect in the fall. I don't think it is possible to consider them this spring.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Given those time difficulties, will the minister at least guarantee the House that such possible amendments will have a high priority in his review over the next year, in time for the 1986 civic elections?

MR. KING: On the basis of the submission, Mr. Speaker, I can make the undertaking that in the course of the review of the School Act, we will consider very carefully the possibility of prescribing the election of school trustees in large metropolitan districts by some kind of ward system. That is not to say that the end of our consideration will be agreement that that should be a part of the new School Act; I'm only making the undertaking that we will consider that possibility.

#### **Physically Handicapped Drivers**

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Solicitor General. Is consideration being given to special identification symbols being placed on the licence plates of cars driven by physically handicapped persons in the province?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, a fair amount of work has been done by officials in the department with the Alberta branch of the Canadian Paraplegic Association. As a result of discussions that were held over a considerable period of time, the Canadian Paraplegic Association issued a news release, I believe last December, indicating that as a voluntary organization, they would be developing a scheme whereby identification cards for handicapped people would be issued to identify vehicles. It would be a movable card that the handicapped person could place in the window, visible to law enforcement agencies, where they're using handicapped parking.

DR. CARTER: A supplementary to the Solicitor General, Mr. Speaker. Then does one assume that the purpose of having a portable sign that can be taken on and off the

dash is greater safety for the occupant of the car, so they're not perpetually designated as disabled and, therefore, more prone to assault or something of that nature?

MR. HARLE: That is correct.

DR. CARTER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In the major cities and in various communities throughout the province, parking areas are designated for the handicapped. To the Solicitor General: how does one go about trying to keep these spaces used only by handicapped people, instead of some other people who barge in and park?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, the enforcement of the by-laws in the municipalities is the responsibility of the local enforcement agencies. I've indicated to the Canadian Paraplegic Association that if they have any concerns in this regard, they are to let me know. So far, I've not heard that they have experienced any difficulty.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister or his department prepared to assist the Paraplegic Association in contacting all the cities, so the emblem they use may become a common and uniform emblem in all the towns and cities throughout Alberta?

MR. HARLE: I believe that is in fact the case now. The emblem used is universal. However, it would appear from the previous question that there may be some difficulty being experienced. But as I said, I have not had any indication so far.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could complement the response of my colleague to advise the House that there is a committee in relation to building codes and standards — it's a subcommittee involving representatives of the physically handicapped community — and they have come up with a number of suggestions. Some of those have in fact been communicated to the municipal authorities. One of those suggestions relates to this area. At this moment, I would have to refresh my memory as to the specifics of it. But I wanted to advise the House that there is some ongoing work in that respect.

MR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the Solicitor General's Department communicated directly with the municipalities and the law enforcement agencies regarding this new plan?

MR. HARLE: No, Mr. Speaker, but I understand the news release by the Alberta branch of the Canadian Paraplegic Association was extensively distributed.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. I raised this question about a year ago. A number of people with handicaps made presentations to me, indicating that a symbol should be placed on the licence plate. Is it my understanding that the department is not going to take the initiative in providing the symbol — or a symbol — on the licence plate at this time?

MR. HARLE: That is correct. We reviewed all the efforts made in all jurisdictions that we were able to contact on this topic of using identification on the licence plate. The general view was that there was concern expressed, certainly by a number of those people who are handicapped,

that putting it on the licence plates identifies them to anyone. They feel they could be disadvantaged as a result of that.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add, because this same matter has been discussed in part through the Human Rights Commission and that area of discussion. At the present time, the thrust is to integrate handicapped citizens into society in every possible respect. One way of not doing that is clearly identifying them when it's unnecessary to do so. I believe that is the major reason, on the part of some of the representations that were made to us, that they should go for a movable mark or identification — which is the placard — which clearly shows that when a car is parked in a designated parking area, it belongs to a handicapped person. Therefore the police or the parking officials don't disturb it. But it isn't necessary to carry that identification when a car is being driven. From a human rights point of view, the Individual's Rights Protection Act, I believe that is the thrust and direction that led to the decisions that have been made.

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, in that this entire area is very important and the general public should become knowledgeable about these procedures, I wonder if the Solicitor General's department or the Public Affairs department of the provincial government has considered a public relations campaign with the Canadian Paraplegic Association?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I've indicated that the Canadian Paraplegic Association issued a news release in December. I believe it was widely distributed, and I commend their efforts. If they in any way need some additional assistance, my understanding with them was that they should contact me.

#### **Correctional Institute — Red Deer**

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Solicitor General as well. In response to questions last Wednesday, the Solicitor General indicated that the remand centre in Red Deer would have a capacity of 16 beds for young offenders. If this proposal proceeds as planned, no doubt through consultation with members of city council and what have you, do you envision that the proposed facility would increase in size immediately? Would there be an expansion to accommodate young offenders on a province-wide basis?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I thought my response to the question the other day indicated 16 beds. I'm not sure what the implication of the member's question is.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Speaker, I just wonder if the Solicitor General can envision a large expansion of that facility in the future, to accommodate young offenders on a province-wide basis.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, the answer would be no.

#### **Unemployment**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Manpower. I know he'll be well briefed now. Given the unemployment figures released this morning, showing that Alberta has 136,000 unemployed in spring, when employment has peaked, will the

minister change his present policy and provide job opportunities for Albertans?

AN HON. MEMBER: Three more in B.C.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for raising the question and recognizing that an additional 10,000 people went to work in the province of Alberta last month.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary to the minister. It always goes down in the spring, as he's well aware. Does the minister accept the view of Mr. Lalonde, the federal Minister of Finance, that Canadians are going to have to learn to live with higher unemployment figures?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Ask Mr. Lalonde.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the hon. member, I repeat that I do believe the private sector is going to be the engine that turns our economy around and creates the permanent, long-lasting jobs. I think this government has made a significant number of job opportunities through short-term job creation, but that is not going to solve the problem. If the hon. member checks *Hansard* of yesterday, I believe I rather thoroughly outlined a number of those programs. But I do believe, and I reiterate, that the private sector is the area which is going to solve the problem on a permanent basis.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister. I guess he didn't hear my question; I'll say it again. In view of the conversations he's had with the federal government and their statements that Canadians are going to have to learn to live with higher unemployment figures, does this government share that view with the federal government?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Perhaps the Chair erred in the previous supplementary question, when an opinion or philosophy was expressed. We're getting into the same area right now, and I don't think the question is really in order at this time.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, then. What does the minister consider to be full employment or, at the very least, an acceptable rate of unemployment?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, economists tend to suggest that 4 to 5 per cent is probably full employment. I would say full employment is probably when everyone who desires to work has a job. As an unemployed person put it to me at a meeting not too long ago, there are only two figures: if I'm working, the employment rate is 100 per cent; if I'm not working, the unemployment rate is 100 per cent. [interjections]

#### **Computer Industry**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the member on the Alberta Research Council is with regard to the future of a computer and microchip industry in Alberta. I'm wondering if the member could indicate: where is the present study of the task force with regard to this matter?

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, the study hasn't been released to the board of directors of the Alberta Research Council yet, but we hope to have it in the near future.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, could the member indicate whether preliminary discussions have taken place between the board and the group doing the study?

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I didn't understand the question.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Have preliminary discussions gone on between the board and the task force with regard to the items that would be in the final report?

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, at this point it has not been discussed by the board at all.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Economic Development. Could the minister indicate whether the government has any specific plans for involvement in the microchip industry in Alberta?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, if the question is, is the government going to be involved in the microchip industry, the answer is no. If it's if we are taking representations from those who are interested in structuring a microchip industry in Alberta, the answer is yes.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I like that answer. Good.

A supplementary to the minister. The reason I raised the question is that there's some indication that the heritage fund may become involved in the development of the microchip industry. Could the minister confirm that that is not a proposal at the present time?

MR. PLANCHE: I don't know how to even answer that question, Mr. Speaker. To my knowledge, the heritage fund is not involved in the manufacturing of anything. I don't know where that rumor would be sourced. But to my knowledge, they don't have any intention of being involved in the manufacture of anything.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health wishes to supplement an answer.

#### **Social Allowance**

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, first I'd like to respond to a question raised by the Member for Edmonton Norwood last Monday, May 2. The question was with respect to the new shelter ceilings, the fact that they are not appealable and whether or not that conflicted with section 2(f) of the Canada Assistance Plan, and concern about loss of funds.

We've reviewed it and found that in the opinion of legal services, the shelter ceilings do not in any way conflict with that particular section. There have been ceilings in other areas in the past, and no concern whatsoever was expressed by the federal government with regard to the sharing of our programs. With respect to the question regarding the federal Court of Appeal decision of April 27, 1983, I have been advised that this case held that a person could challenge the Canada Assistance Plan payments in the federal court. But that has nothing to do

with the appealability of social allowance clients, related to shelter or anything else.

#### **Family and Community Support Services**

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to respond to a question raised yesterday by the hon. Member for Little Bow; not only respond to his question but to his news release as well. He asked me if I was reviewing the family and community support services program with a view to eliminating the deficit funding model. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to indicate that that model was eliminated years ago. It's true that when the former Social Credit government developed the preventive social services program in 1966 — and I believe the hon. member was minister then — the deficit funding model was used. But that particular model was changed in 1981 with a new Family and Community Support Services Act, which provides greater municipal autonomy in decision-making. So in terms of responding to that question, Mr. Speaker, I simply say that if the press release had been dated May 5, 1966, it would have been appropriate, but not 1983.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, the minister can say all he wants. But in checking with municipalities at the present time, a municipality that goes out to collect private funds deducts those private funds from the 20 per cent of their contribution, and that's a deficit. So some agencies are not given incentive to go out and collect private funds from other sources.

Can the minister indicate whether he has had discussions with municipalities with regard to incentive being provided to private agencies to collect funds from private sources?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I haven't had any discussions with them, because it was changed several years ago. No concern in terms of it has been brought to my attention. In terms of funding municipalities, it's an 80:20 funding model, 80 per cent by the provincial government and 20 per cent by the municipality. If any donations or moneys are raised locally, those go towards their 20 per cent. It doesn't affect our contribution at all. So why should they be concerned?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister review this particular policy with a view to determining whether private agencies are being provided with incentives to collect a greater amount of private funds that could be used over, above, and outside the 20 per cent contribution? At the present time, they can get 20 per cent from their local government. Why go out and collect from local, private sources? That is where the problem is, Mr. Minister. Could he review that specific concern?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I have no indication that there's a problem in that regard. If it is raised as a problem, I'll certainly look into it.

#### **Social Allowance (continued)**

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question in regard to the minister's statement. Could he indicate how the appealability does not violate section 2(f)?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I think I indicated — or if I didn't indicate it, I'll indicate it now — that section 2(f) provides that a procedure for appeals must be set up, and this is being done. However, the appeal board can only review discretionary decisions. The appeal committee does not have any jurisdiction in those areas where ceilings and other rulings are in regulations.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are out of time. This will be the final supplementary.

MR. MARTIN: Okay. I'll move over to another one, then.

In the other part, did the minister say that the Court of Appeal decision does not affect the appealability aspect of the Canada Pension Plan?

DR. WEBBER: I assume the hon. member is referring to the Canada Assistance Plan rather than the Canada Pension Plan. I simply indicated that I was advised by legal services that the case the hon. member referred to held that a person could challenge the Canada Assistance Plan payments in a federal court. But the question I have for him is: what does that have to do with appealability of social allowance clients to the provincial appeal boards? [interjections]

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree to revert to introduction of visitors in order that the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs may make an introduction?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. HORSMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my honor today to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 45 grade 6 students from the Southview Community school located in Medicine Hat, who are here to observe the latter part of the question period. This group is accompanied by their teachers Laura Miller, Bonnie Gilchrist, and Lowell Jackie, and parents Mrs. Ena Visser, Mrs. Patty Grant, and Mrs. Nell Tally. I know these students have been preparing very diligently for their time in the Assembly, and I ask that members accord them a very warm welcome.

#### head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

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

#### Department of Transportation

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We were on this vote on Wednesday, and I have a list of speakers.

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased to be able to participate in the debate on the estimates of the Department of Transportation. Before I begin, I'd like to congratulate the Minister of Transportation on his appointment. From past experience, I know he will do well in this portfolio. I wish him sincere best wishes in the next three or four years.

I have two specific questions. One deals with the Yellowhead Trail, which passes through the constituency of Edmonton Kingsway. I know many millions of dollars have been expended by our provincial government in completing this tremendous roadway in the city of Edmonton. Since its official opening a few months ago, I know it has been very beneficial for many citizens. However, some bottlenecks still exist on the Yellowhead Trail. I ask the minister to comment on what financial commitment, if any, he has made to the city of Edmonton to have the Yellowhead Trail completed, especially the eastern leg in the city of Edmonton.

My second question pertains to passing lanes on our highways. I ask the minister to comment on the feasibility, the practicability, and the possibility of adding more passing lanes to many of our highways, especially in the mountain corridors.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, I was just looking through *Hansard*; I wasn't able to be here for the first part. I know my colleague brought up public works, but I'd like to reinforce, make some points, and bring it back.

No matter how we applaud ourselves that there are 10,000 fewer unemployed in a time of high unemployment — and it naturally comes down in the spring — it seems to me that we still have a severe problem here. We should be looking at the whole area of public works, Mr. Chairman. I know there's some money in the budget, but most often it's cutbacks. The thing we keep saying — and we'll say it a number of times again — is that it makes good economic sense now to get on with some of the public works projects we need.

Specifically in transportation, I know we've talked about LRT. I think we should be moving ahead, especially with what they've asked for in Calgary, and looking at Edmonton. We know we're going to need LRT in the future, and it's clear that now is the cheapest time to do it. If we wait five years, possibly the price of oil and gas goes up, OPEC gets their act together and drives up the price. At the same time, we're going to be competing with these projects. Of course, it's going to be much more expensive to build these projects. I suppose the same case can be made in the rural areas, in terms of roads.

Surely now is the cheapest time to do it. For instance, contractors estimate that in Calgary, for example, prices are 15 to 30 per cent lower than anticipated. If that is the case, why don't we get on with the job, Mr. Chairman? We'd do two things: we'd put people back to work, but it makes good economic sense. We're going to need these projects in the future, and now is the cheapest time to do it.

On February 9, in Banff, a Canadian Construction Association official said: "Canadian roads, bridges, sewer and water systems are deteriorating and a repair program needs to be started immediately ..." And this line is very clear. He says: "We can pay for it now or pay a hell of a lot more later." He's talking about Canada, but that should apply to Alberta.

The point we're trying to make is that we could be providing two services. One, we could have a significant



impact here in Alberta. We're more fortunate than other places in Canada. We do have some money left in the heritage trust fund. We'll be putting people back to work. But in the long run, we'll be doing projects that will be cheaper. In the long run, we will save money, and that's the key thing.

I ask the minister — I know it's not going to occur in this budget, but surely in the next budget — if they would take a look at this. It's not the NDP saying this; it's the [past] chairman of the Canadian Construction Association, groups that would ordinarily be very favorable to the Conservative Party. If they're saying this, surely the government should be prepared to listen. It's not good enough just to say, we'll wait for the private sector. We in this province know that if oil stays down, the private sector is not going to invest. They have more sense than that. So we have to do something to stimulate our own economy. Certainly we could do it in transportation.

In conclusion, Mr. Minister, I ask if there will be any thought — perhaps not in this budget — to looking at going into some public works programs next year, especially if the unemployment rate and the recession stay with us.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would the minister like to conclude his remarks?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, hon. members asked a number of questions over the course of the previous day and some again today. I'll deal with them as they were asked, with the exception of some areas, such as urban transportation, that I want to deal with in my concluding remarks.

First of all, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview asked some questions with respect to LRT and made comments similar to the Member for Edmonton Norwood's this morning. I'll deal with that later. However, I would like to deal with specific questions asked by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview. One was with respect to the scheduling of the Highway 64 paving project. Again, all I can say is that it's not known at this time when that project will be tendered or if it will be completed in 1983. It depends entirely on the success we have in getting tenders in at a low price and whether this year's budget can accommodate that project.

The other matter raised by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, and briefly by others as well, had to do with the proposal I advanced to this Legislature during the throne speech debate, that we ought to have a single speed limit on our highways in Alberta for trucks and cars, day and night, with the exception of the 110 kilometre per hour speed limit presently in place on our divided four-lane highways. It's our view that there isn't any doubt at all that if we were to rigidly enforce the truck and car speed limit as it presently exists on two-lane highways, we would have a passing situation that would result in significantly increased accidents. One can only imagine, when you have a mixture of, say, 40 per cent trucks and 60 per cent cars, such as we do on some highways at certain times of the day, if all the cars were travelling 10 kilometres per hour faster than the trucks and passing them, we would have that very considerable risk to contend with — either that or we would have traffic backed up in line-ups. Again, that creates an unsafe situation.

As I indicated in correspondence and in other remarks I've made in the last couple of months, the facts of the

matter are that trucks are presently moving on the basis of about the same speed as cars. Eighty-five per cent of the truck traffic on two-lane highways in this province travels at a rate that's between 98 and 102 or 103 kilometres per hour in 90 kilometre per hour speed zones. I just conclude on that subject by saying that it is my intention very shortly to effect those changes I have talked about and to bring about a situation where there will be a single speed limit on most of our highways in this province for trucks and cars, day and night.

The other matters brought forward by members involve the Member for Ponoka, who asked an important question with respect to whether paved roads are less costly to maintain than gravelled roads. Over the long haul, when one considers the requirement to overlay paved roads and the extra amount of winter maintenance that's usually required, the cost of maintaining paved roads is in fact higher. In addition to that, one has to recognize that even at today's rather reduced interest rates, the capital cost of the paved road is an annual cost that is, generally speaking, much greater than the cost of maintaining a gravelled road. So paved roads do cost money; no question about that. It's a little difficult for us to accurately reflect the differences, because most of our paved roads carry a heavier volume of traffic than the gravelled ones.

The hon. Member for Ponoka asked as well about the matter of the development of the Rimbey airport. I can only say this: the Department of Transportation is working with the Rimbey airport commission in an effort to try to locate a suitable site. Once that site has been located and we've been able to acquire the land, a schedule will then have to be laid on to permit construction. At this time, I can't say whether that will be in 1984, but certainly the representation of the hon. member will be considered if and when a site for that airport is found.

The hon. member also made some comments with respect to the need for some improvements on Highway 53, particularly west of Ponoka into the Rimbey area. In that regard, that particular highway has traffic volumes that run up to a maximum at any one point of about 1,500 or 1,600 vehicles per day. The situation is that we have a good many highways with that many vehicles per day, which are presently not paved, not even to a narrow standard. We have 1,500 miles of gravelled primary highway throughout the province in the position that people in the area, or people who use them, could reasonably ask that we place some priority on for paving. It is just not possible to consider widening some existing structures when the traffic counts are as low as they are on that particular road.

Mr. Chairman, that doesn't underestimate the need for some improvements to the road and the possibility of perhaps constructing some passing lanes. I just say to the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway, who just spoke, that I made some extensive comments in my opening remarks on passing lanes, and I would refer hon. members to those.

The hon. Member for Drayton Valley asked about the Elk River road. A grading project, estimated to cost \$700,000, is scheduled for 1983 on that road. The hon. Member for Barrhead asked about paving secondary road 918. Again, it has just not been possible at this time to put any priority on paving that particular road. All I can say is the same as the previous Minister of Transportation said; that is, it will be done; when, we don't know. It may be in my term of office or it may be in someone else's. But there is assuredly enough future potential there

that some enterprising MLA will convince some minister that it ought to be paved.

The hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray asked about the Conklin airstrip and whether that would continue in operation. I have some information on that — it's rather extensive in terms of the involvement of various companies and individuals — that I'd be pleased to discuss further with the hon. member.

Perhaps equally important, the hon. member wanted to know what was happening with respect to the Fort McMurray airport terminal construction. We made a commitment three years ago to develop a new terminal in Fort McMurray. One has to be reminded that that is a federal airport, and we were prepared to fund the cost of it under some arrangements with the federal government in terms of paying back the capital costs or paying lease fees or whatever. We entered into those discussions with a view to doing just that, and have had very little success in reaching any agreement with the federal government. One can only surmise that either they are not interested in a new terminal in Fort McMurray or they consider it more advisable to construct it with their own dollars. One would hope that the latter is the case, and we would give every encouragement to the federal government to proceed with that project with their own funds under the new federal make-work construction program announced during the course of the federal budget a few weeks ago. One would hope that that would occur.

The member also asked about experimental research and new technology for road construction. All I can say there is that the department is still experimenting with the use of sulphur and asphalt mixes. That's been going on for several years, both here and in other parts of Canada. It does have some good technology, and one could be hopeful that that concept will result in some improvements in terms of the lifetime of asphalt mixes.

In addition to that, and perhaps more importantly, over the course of the last couple of years we've been involved in some trial projects with respect to recycling asphalt, where we grind the top off and recycle it through an asphalt plant, add some asphalt, and put it back on the road. In years to come, I expect that one will see recycling plants actually moving down the highway and doing the entire job of laying down a new layer of asphalt right there. Indeed, that's not a matter that needs any technical feasibility; it's a matter of engineering. I think one will likely see that concept working quite well in this province when we get into the area where we're overlaying our pavement for the second or perhaps third time and we really don't need any more strength or thickness, it just needs to be resurfaced.

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall talked about poor paving on Highway 2. That was a contract job, as most are, and there is no cost to the taxpayer. It really isn't as bad as it looks. What occurred was that the highway was quite rutted, and before a lift of pavement was laid, it was necessary to fill the ruts with asphalt. The contractor undertook to do that work late in the fall. Even if it's done properly, it doesn't look very good. But what occurred was that it was done and didn't stick very well. Some of it peeled off during the winter. It's the contractor's responsibility to replace that when he starts to work again this spring. So there's no cost to us. It's some inconvenience with respect to the condition of the road in the interim. That's one of the things that occurs when you're trying to push the season, and most contractors want to do that, to get as much work done as they can during the course of the year.

The member asked as well about concrete pavements. My information is that they are substantially more expensive than asphalt in this province, and that is the reason we don't utilize concrete on a greater basis. The member also asked about out-of-province truckers. Last winter we hired roughly 4,000 trucks on a special winter works program in Alberta. The requirement then and now is that they all must have been residents of Alberta. The Alberta Motor Transport Board doesn't allow an individual to obtain a licence and a permit to haul gravel outside the urban centres in Alberta unless he'd been a resident of Alberta for at least six months. While from time to time we hear stories about people coming from other provinces and taking our work, when we track them down, for the most part, we find they have lived here for some time or the truck is owned by someone who lives here and perhaps driven by someone from outside. It's a difficult area for us to police, and I'm not sure we want to police it any more than we already are. We use various ways to encourage both our contractors and of course our own department to utilize Alberta labor and equipment. By and large, I think we're highly successful in that regard.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud asked some questions about the southwest ring road, and I want to deal with those when I finalize my comments with respect to LRT and urban transportation. I can say that Highway 60, which the hon. member raised as the southwest by-pass to Edmonton, will be signed within the next very short while — perhaps two or three weeks.

The hon. Member for Drumheller asked about the department utilizing private land-buying firms. We do that in a few cases. Although when we're widening a highway, there is every evidence to believe that private land buyers are no more successful than we are, because everybody knows who's buying the land. The major reason for utilizing private land buyers in some cases where you are assembling large blocks of land, is to protect the identity of the buyer until you've got all you want. That doesn't work in highways. When somebody comes along and wants a strip of land 100 feet wide and a mile long, adjacent to a highway, there isn't much doubt about who is buying it. We have to experience some extra costs in that regard, particularly in the case of twinning, where a very large amount of land is required.

Those are generally some of the comments made that I wanted to answer. The hon. Member for Calgary McCall also asked about the revolving fund of the department being increased by something like \$18 million over the previous year. The revolving fund is required to be paid back by the department budget. The major reason for the increase is that our entire operational fleet of highway maintenance vehicles, motor graders, et cetera, is in that revolving fund. The cost of salaries, fuel, tires, tubes, snowplough blades, et cetera, is all in there. That increased by \$14 million over last year.

Perhaps I can conclude with some comments about urban transportation, Mr. Chairman. As I indicated in my opening remarks, the cities of Edmonton and Calgary have been receiving both operational and capital funds under an urban transportation program which is now in the fifth year of a six-year program. On the capital side of that program, they receive funds for light rail transit, arterial roadways, and major continuous corridors. There is a great deal of latitude provided to the city council and administration to choose the area in which they want most of the funds expended. Indeed, consultations along those lines went on before we finalized that program.

I think it's reasonable to assume that the amount of funds we are expending there will be continued over the longer term, perhaps with some inflationary increases but not much more. I can't see substantial increases in capital construction grants to rural municipalities, towns, villages, cities, or the two metropolitan areas, over the next while. Bear in mind that there is perhaps some scope for changing the formula that relates to the percentage the province provides, as opposed to the percentage the municipality is required to provide.

The best advice I can give to Edmonton and Calgary city councils is that they ought to be planning their next five-year program, in terms of urban transportation, on the basis of assuming similar funding coming from the province as has been provided in the past, and no more. They can then make a decision as to whether they believe the tax dollars from those municipalities can accommodate any more. To do otherwise, to have some grand scheme or idea that would be different from that, would only delay the progress of coming to grips with reality in terms of the expenditures required.

So hon. members have some understanding of the problem of the government and of the municipality in this area, might I just say that the cheapest form of transportation in terms of a municipal government's expenditure is the private automobile. The municipality provides the street, and the individual who wants to get from point A to point B provides 100 per cent of the cost of the gasoline, the wheels, the rubber, et cetera. The next cheapest form is the city bus system. Perhaps the most expensive form for a municipality is some kind of rapid transit system, particularly when you're dealing with municipalities the size of the Edmonton and Calgary.

No doubt hon. members know that rapid transit is the most effective means of moving hundreds of thousands of people very, very quickly. But if you don't have hundreds of thousands of people and you only have a rush hour that lasts two and a half hours a day, you have another twenty-one and a half hours a day, twenty and a half hours a day, or whatever, when the system is rather non-productive. I think everybody has to take that into consideration.

My most recent information from the city of Edmonton is that the engineering and roadway planning department has presented to the mayor and the Board of Commissioners a new transportation program for this city which covers several years. That will be presented to council very shortly. Incidentally, I have had the opportunity to see it and, in my view, it is quite realistic in terms of its approach to the problem and a fairly responsible look at the prospect of available provincial and municipal dollars to do what needs to be done with respect to traffic in the city of Edmonton.

I conclude by encouraging the city of Calgary administration and council to do the same. I know it's not going to be possible for vast amounts of money to be channelled directly to LRT without excluding from our budget some existing contributions to those municipalities in other areas. In other words, over the short term, there are not going to be any large additional sums of money.

Mr. Chairman, I think that concludes all the remarks I want to make. If members have any further questions on constituency matters relative to roads, I hope that they will feel free at any time throughout the year to call my office, myself, my executive assistant, or members of the department staff. We would be only too pleased to assist in outlining what is being done and looking at any

problems a Member of the Legislative Assembly might have.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Chairman, could the minister advise whether tenders coming in for projects are considerably lower than what was expected or budgeted for? Looking at the economics of the country, I guess there are many contractors looking for work. If these tenders are considerably lower, at least of any significance, is the minister considering expanding the program later in the year?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, that's a very good question. I think it's fair to say — with the exception of the cost of asphalt — that in 1982, contractors in the road construction business were very hard pressed in terms of the work available outside of government. We got some excellent cost cutting and some very good bids from the industry last year. I don't expect it to be any better in 1983. In fact, one of my major concerns is ensuring that the people doing work for us get paid a reasonable sum, so they are still in business in 1984. The answer to the hon. member's question is that we can't expect to see bids coming in at substantially less than they were last year, because the pencil was pretty sharp in 1982.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, there are three areas I would like some clarification from the minister on. The first has to do with speed limits. I understand from the statements that trucks and cars will have the same speed limit. I haven't been able to pick up on my question. It goes back to some discussions we had before dealing with seat belts. Generally, when provinces and states brought in seat belt legislation, they lowered the speed limit at the same time. I am not clear — I will get him to clarify this after I make all my comments — whether, with a uniform speed, the minister is thinking about lowering the speed, or will it be the same? Just what is he looking at there?

I would make a pitch that perhaps we look at what is happening in British Columbia and Washington state, where seat belts tie into lowering speed limits. In fact, with lower speed limits, there are not as many deaths and injuries; and of course we save money for the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care at the same time. There is also a conservation element. Maybe the minister has some up-to-date figures. But from talking to people in Washington state, I understand that there was a significant conservation element there, that they saved a lot of their non-renewable resources. I just ask him to comment on tying it to the speed limit.

The second area I'd like to come back to is — first, I understand what the minister is saying. What they're going to be giving the cities in terms of either road construction or LRT is basically going to be about the same, and they make their decisions. I would like to ask the minister, though: from my comments about the fact that there's a lot of work that needs to be done in public works generally, does he not feel, in a philosophical sense, that now is the time to do it? As I pointed out, the president of the Canadian Construction Association does. I'd like to hear his comments about that. Is now not the time, generally, to get on with some public works? Certainly the Department of Transportation would flow into that.

I was interested in his comments about LRT, and generally I agree. We all know it is expensive. I've tried to make the economic case for getting on. I gather from the minister that he feels that our cities of Calgary and Edmonton are really too small to be moving much more

into LRT. My question to the minister would be, does he have figures that would indicate what these cities' growth is going to be 20 or 30 years down the line? If he would reflect on the experience of Houston, Texas: for many years they took the same stand; they didn't need LRT. Now that they're a major metropolitan city growing very fast, they've had to go into it. I think the minister would agree that it's much more expensive to build the system after the city has grown up. I wonder what figures he has to indicate — and if there are figures, I would suggest to the minister that if the figures indicate there will continue to be significant growth in our two major cities of Calgary and Edmonton, LRT at this time, and more money for LRT, in co-operation with our city governments, might still be a good deal. I would ask the minister about that.

The third area — and I'm sure the minister would just love to have this on public record in the Legislature, because it has to do with government restraint, Mr. Chairman. I'm sure he recalls some criticism of the minister — and I'd like him to comment on this — when we're talking about restraint. Back in December, I understand the minister ordered himself a fancy, new, four-wheel-drive vehicle complete with \$5,000 worth of options and CB equipment. I wonder about the need for this. I'm sure the minister will find riding in it very enjoyable. But I'm sure he would agree that the government has told us we're following government restraint and trying to set an example. I'm sure he would like to justify in the Legislature why it was necessary at this time of restraint to buy this particular four-wheel-drive vehicle.

So with that, for the time being, Mr. Chairman, I would like some answers from the minister in the three general areas that I brought up.

Thank you.

MR. M. MOORE: Just in response to those comments on the speed limit issue, Mr. Chairman, I thought I was fairly clear on several occasions. The thing we propose to do is remove the nighttime speed limit and the truck speed limit. That will result in a speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on most of our two-lane highways, day and night, car and truck. The present situation is 100 kilometres per hour for cars, 90 at night for cars and trucks, and 90 in the daytime for trucks. So there would be an increase in the speed limit for trucks, both day and night, from what is presently allowed and an increase in the car limit during the night.

That doesn't mean that responsible trucking companies that have purchased equipment and have fleets designed to operate at 90 kilometres per hour shouldn't continue to maintain that policy for their drivers, and I expect they will. Our job is to try to establish a speed limit which is safe for the highway system. While we do have to be concerned about the conservation of fuel, one would expect that the trucking industry itself would be even more concerned than we are because they are the ones that have to pay the bill.

The capital works program of the department is indeed important. All one has to do is look at the figures. In 1978-79 we spent \$382 million on highways in Alberta. This year we'll spend \$854 million. We have the highest per capita expenditure on construction of any province in Canada. We're running at a record pace. So all I can say in that regard is, yes, we regard capital expenditure on highways as healthy for the economic sector involved in that area, and we need the highways. We're putting an awful lot of our total budget into that area.

Finally, whether or not we should be building LRT systems now: I'd have to say that the hon. member is not correct in assuming that it's cheaper to build something now, even though we don't need it for 20 years. It's more cost efficient to plan for it now. That's exactly what is going on in the city of Edmonton: planning for future transportation systems. But the old saying, to bury pipe in the ground that you don't need is a pretty expensive exercise, holds true for transportation systems as well. To build roads, LRT, bridges, or anything else you don't need, way ahead of time, is very cost inefficient. The planning is what's important. I have no doubt that any reasonable transportation engineer who is knowledgeable about the situation would support the proper planning in both cities of Edmonton and Calgary for rapid transit systems. That's what I think is going on right now, and we certainly support that.

Mr. Chairman, a good example of that is the development of the utility and transportation corridor around the cities of Edmonton and Calgary and the gradual purchase of land there. We've never made a commitment to build either of the so-called ring roads around Edmonton or Calgary. But we have made a commitment to develop the corridor — protect it and gradually purchase it. Then the cost of building the road is only a small amount compared to what it would be if you never had that in place.

Finally, the member's mention of some information he came by — which isn't entirely correct — with respect to vehicles in the department, needs to be responded to. If the member will look at the vote under the minister's office in Transportation, he will see that there's a 65.8 per cent decrease in the minister's office expenditures for the fiscal year we're in. Most of that, I have to say, is a decrease in the travel portion of the minister's budget. That's because I intend to do most of my travelling in Alberta.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

I can say that it was the practice in the past for the minister and senior staff to rent or lease vehicles from time to time that might be utilized for various road inspection trips and so on. I was advised by the deputy minister that after they'd considered it, they thought it would be much cheaper and more cost effective to purchase one. A vehicle was purchased. It's utilized by myself and other senior staff. It doesn't have all the frills the hon. member talked about. In fact, the only thing it has in it is a telephone, which is appropriate for my use and senior officials' use. The only thing that's different from any previous practice is that that is owned by the fleet of the department rather than leased or rented on a daily basis. I have no apologies whatsoever to make for that. It's my intention to utilize that vehicle and other means of transporting myself around this province, as Minister of Transportation, to make sure that the road system we're undertaking to build and maintain is kept up and that I become as knowledgeable as possible about it.

Mr. Chairman, I don't think there are any other comments.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, my arrival is timely. I'm able to ask hon. members if they'll allow me to revert to Introduction of Special Guests.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. CRAWFORD: I want to do it at once, because they've been in the gallery for a few minutes and may shortly leave on a tour. I just had my picture taken with two groups of fine young people from Edmonton and Edmunston — how do you like that? — almost equally divided between students at Strathcona high school and their guests from Edmunston, New Brunswick.

I want to acknowledge Miss Simmonds, the group leader. I particularly want to thank Andrea Dzenick, the daughter of one of our provincial court judges, who was in touch with my office to conclude the arrangements, as well as the additional leaders and people travelling with the students: Ms Nina Bartels and Mrs. Douglas Bradford and, from New Brunswick, Mr. and Mrs. Jacques Carrier and Mr. Gilbert Michaud. Maybe they would rise, and we'll give them a very warm welcome.

head: **COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY**

**Department of Transportation**  
(*continued*)

MR. MARTIN: I just want to refer a couple of matters back to the hon. minister. I understand what he's saying about the speed limits. My question was: is there any thought to lowering them as other provinces have done? Have the minister and his department thought about lowering the speed limit because of the obvious thought that that saves lives, along with the seat belt discussion. What sort of consultation and thoughts have gone into that?

The other question: I was giving the minister an opportunity, because I know he wanted me to, to clear up the matter about the car. I accept what he's saying.

I'm still not clear — I agree with you about needs and about putting pipes where we don't need them and all the rest of it. I think we all agree with that. I think the minister would agree, though, that it comes back to how we assess need. I think he would also agree that there's some debate about this now. That's why I was trying to look at the population figures that are going to happen in Calgary and Edmonton. I know the minister can't predict; he doesn't exactly have a crystal ball. But I'm sure that he and his department have been looking at this. Has recession slowed down the growth so there is not a need for an extension of LRT in the foreseeable future? What figures have brought him to the idea that the need is not there, specifically when he referred to Calgary? I'd refer those two questions to the minister, Mr. Chairman.

MR. M. MOORE: The answer to the first one is no. We've not considered lowering the speed limits. On the second question, with respect to need, what I've said is: I believe the existing funding levels for urban transportation, with some inflationary increases, are what we're going to have to live with. It could well be that there is a greater need, but the need has to be matched with our ability to fund. My observations are that we're doing better than any other province at the present time, and it isn't possible for us to increase those dollars much beyond what they are. So my urging to municipalities, particularly Edmonton and Calgary, is to make sure that we see whether we can design a system that is least costly.

A good example — and the hon. Member for Edmon-

ton Whitemud asked me the other day about the ring road and what the cost of that might be. I've seen two figures. One is the grand design, if you like, the cost of which is so high that we won't be able to do it. The other is an initial two-lane roadway with provisions for expansion to the grand design, something that might well be accommodated over the next few years. The kind of thing that engineers, and politicians as well, have to do, is see what we can do with the dollars that are available.

As I said in my opening remarks, things like the addition of passing lanes on many of our two-lane rural highways will increase the traffic flow by 30 per cent at a fraction the cost of twinning. I know some of those same kinds of ideas are available to transportation engineers in the cities. I have to say to the hon. member that I think he'll be surprised by the fact that he will see, over the course of the next year or two, that there's a lot of rethinking about transportation systems in the cities. Even if we had the funds, I think it's too early to jump in and say that we know exactly what to do, particularly in Edmonton.

MR. MARTIN: One final supplementary on this. I ask specifically about population projections in the two major cities. Does your department have those projections?

MR. M. MOORE: We take what's provided by the Edmonton Regional Planning Commission, in the case of Edmonton, or by the Calgary Regional Planning Commission, and the city staff from Municipal Affairs. I have to say to the hon. member that it's a bit like predicting interest rates. Three years ago, the projections we had were going up pretty fantastically over the course of the next 10 years. Now they're substantially different. The same growth isn't predicted. It's the times we're in, I guess. I believe what we're projecting now is more realistic than what we were projecting three years ago, but three years ago I didn't think what we were projecting was high enough. I think it's probably fair to say, though, that the existing situation is that the reduction in the rate of population growth in both Edmonton and Calgary gives us a lot of breathing time that we didn't have a year or two ago.

Agreed to:

1.11 — Minister's Office	\$ 189,540
1.12 — Deputy Minister's Office	\$257,115
1.13 — Assistant Deputy Minister — Engineering	\$209,343
1.14 — Assistant Deputy Minister — Regional Transportation	\$262,010
1.15 — Assistant Deputy Minister — Administration	\$109,162
1.16 — Assistant Deputy Minister — Urban Transportation and Planning	\$123,274
1.17 — Legal Services	\$49,079
1.18 — Special Projects	\$190,020
1.21 — Computer Services	\$7,693,843
1.22 — Equipment and Supply Administration	\$1,606,849
1.23 — Finance and Administrative Services	\$3,019,828
1.24 — Personnel and Management Services	\$1,091,953
1.25 — Public Communications	\$351,313
1.26 — Purchasing Administration	\$271,251
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$15,424,580

2.1 — Program Support	\$31,212,797
2.2 — Improvement of Primary Highway Systems	\$240,621,402
2.3 — Improvement of Rural-Local Highways	\$147,813,350
2.4 — Financial Assistance for Rural-Local Highways	\$32,938,600
2.5 — Maintenance of Primary Highway Systems	\$69,928,790
2.6 — Maintenance of Rural-Local Highways	\$18,097,938
2.7 — Apprenticeship Training	\$2,819,875
2.8 — Rural Resource Roads	\$41,166,800
2.9 — Pavement Rehabilitation	\$49,723,120
Total Vote 2 — Construction and Maintenance of Highways	\$634,322,672
 Total Vote 3 — Construction and Operation of Rail Systems	 \$9,800,000
4.1 — Program Support	\$709,179
4.2 — Construction of Airports	\$9,728,000
4.3 — Airport Maintenance Operations	\$2,151,443
Total Vote 4 — Construction and Maintenance of Airport Facilities	\$12,588,622
 5.1 — Transportation Planning and Research	 \$6,296,101
5.2 — Highway System User Services	\$9,588,302
Total Vote 5 — Specialized Transportation Services	\$15,884,403
 6.1 — Program Support	 \$751,935
6.2 — Financial Assistance — Capital	\$144,765,000
6.3 — Financial Assistance — Operating	\$20,761,754
Total Vote 6 — Urban Transportation Financial Assistance	\$166,278,689
 Department Total	 \$854,298,966

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I move that the vote be reported.

[Motion carried]

#### Department of the Environment

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, a number of questions were asked on the last opportunity that the department estimates were before the Assembly, and I think I should spend some time today responding to some of those questions. I'm going to attempt to be as brief as I can, but the length and number of the questions asked may require some time to answer.

When I finished last, we were discussing the question of Chem-Security. The only thing I'd like to add to my comments on Chem-Security is that after the review which was done last fall, department officials met with Chem-Security top management. With regard to the takeover of Chem-Nuclear and Chem-Security by Waste Management Inc., we were assured that the existing management structure of Chem-Security would remain, as well as a commitment to all parts of the proposal Chem-Security made to the province. So those commitments were there and were deemed to be satisfactory from the fact that Chem-Security would be a company operating in Canada under Canadian laws and complying with the regulations we would put forward to them. I've

also mentioned that our current negotiations with Chem-Security have been suspended, awaiting the review of the Attorney General. I think that adequately deals with the question of Chem-Security.

In the hon. Leader of the Opposition's questions, he relayed, in a fashion, a number of different items and questions with regard to the sour gas processing industry in the province of Alberta. I would like to respond to some of those, and I will be responding to some later through my remarks. He brought forward the question of Pincher Creek, which always seems to come up in any question which prefaces any remarks with regard to the sour gas processing industry: what has the province done in Pincher Creek? Mr. Chairman, over a long period of time, the province has attempted to do a number of things, to find any causal relationship whatsoever with regard to health effects alleged in the Pincher Creek area and the operation of the gas plants there. I think it should be put on public record that these efforts have been made. It has been a sincere effort by the government over a period of time, by a number of different departments and by industry itself.

I've looked through the number of water quality surveys that have been done in the area in a period of time, and they have been considerable with regard to Drywood Creek. I dare say the number of industrial water effluent surveys have numbered in the hundreds. Similarly with air quality: continuous sampling done by the company over a long period of time and surveys conducted by the department with regard to emissions by those plants. Those studies have been done. In the early '70s, Shell itself had McKinnon Allen & Associates do a very comprehensive soils/agriculture/animal study, which reviewed a number of factors and came to the conclusion that the operations of the gas plants and the emissions from them were not having an effect on soils, plant life, or animal life, with regard to the agricultural community there. That was an extensive study, and I understand the plot surveys, et cetera, which were initiated at that time, are ongoing with regard to Shell's study.

In the mid-70s, Shell Canada brought on stream what they call the Shell off-gas tail clean-up process, and significantly reduced emissions from their gas plant. In 1974 the average emissions at Shell were around 149.8 tons of sulphur dioxide per day, and in '81 the average was 35.8. So there has been a significant reduction in emissions due to Shell bringing on the Scott plant there. Shell's history of removal of sulphur is very impressive, in terms of a province-wide record, I suppose. At this point in time, I believe they're removing over 99 per cent of the sulphur from their stack.

Toward the latter part of the '70s and the early '80s, a number of other studies have been undertaken. The Kananaskis environmental centre at the University of Calgary was asked to do some selenium studies, because there was a question of whether sulphur and selenium ratios were a problem in the area. These selenium studies were done by the Kananaskis environmental centre. Dr. McCoy of the Environment Council of Alberta did a review in terms of health in the area. At the present time, there are a number of things taking place with regard to those two plants.

The Energy Resources Conservation Board has initiated a health inquiry. I believe the hearing will be in the latter part of this fall. As a follow-up to their '82-D report, the ERCB has engaged the University of Windsor to do a number of things with regard to gas plants in the province, and they have done stack surveys on both the

Gulf and Shell plants in Pincher Creek, plus some other items. With regard to the ERCB health inquiry, although they will be looking at the question of the gas plants and their effect on health, they are not precluding their health inquiry to the gas plants themselves. They're taking a fairly broad look at the question in Pincher Creek. They've engaged the Sage Institute to do a review, a fault tree analysis, of the processes of the plant there, and this will be part of the information which is available to the health inquiry by the ERCB.

Also last year we had the Department of Social Services and Community Health, through the Provincial Board of Health, launch their Twin Butte health study, which had a number of components: a review of all the information which the Department of Social Services and Community Health had at that point in time; a review of historic information, looking at cancer rates, looking at a number of things. Also included in this study by the Department of Social Services and Community Health was the Snider study — we do not have the results at this time — which may provide some further information with regard to the problems in the area and possible solutions to them. Earlier this session, I inaugurated the Twin Butte soils and water evaluation task force, to look at the question of whether any contaminants of the two gas plants in the area have migrated off those gas plants and have in any way contributed to contamination of ground water supplies or soils in the area.

Those are a number of studies which are under way. I wouldn't want anyone to have the impression that the province isn't concerned about the allegations in the Twin Butte area. They certainly are — just the review by the province of the number of things which are taking place, which may come to some conclusion. I would suspect that if any recommendations come forward from the Provincial Board of Health, they will be acting on those. Similarly, the ERCB will be coming forward with conclusions and recommendations.

I think we should take the time for those investigations and inquiries to conclude prior to prejudging or launching into any further investigations with regard to the problems in the Twin Butte area. As I have mentioned, a very intensive review in a number of different areas is taking place through the Department of Social Services and Community Health, the Provincial Board of Health, and the Energy Resources Conservation Board. I suspect they will come to some conclusions, some recommendations, and we can move forward from that point in regard to some facts and directions.

The next question from the hon. Leader of the Opposition was with regard to Lodgepole. His question was: "What would happen if we had a Lodgepole blowout in one of these plants in the Quirk Creek area west of Calgary?" Later on, toward his conclusion, he asked: what if we had a sour gas well blowout in the vicinity of the city of Calgary? What would we do? I've heard the hon. Leader of the Opposition make both these statements on TV and in the Assembly.

There are many safety devices built into sour gas processing plants. I don't want to elaborate on those in detail, but there is automatic flaring equipment. There are a number of things that ensure safety in these plants. These are reviewed with local authorities so they are assured of exactly what is taking place in these plants and what emergency procedures there are. I assure hon. members that if there were an industrial accident at one of the sour gas processing plants, there would not be a problem to residents in the surrounding area. There are

adequate emergency flare measures, flare stacks, shut-down valves, flame arresters, and other equipment to ensure that these plants will automatically shut down and, in terms of residents of the surrounding area, there will not be a problem with regard to emissions.

The next question the hon. leader asked was: what if we had a sour gas well blowout in the vicinity of the city of Calgary? I believe the answer is very simple and straightforward. If there was any indication whatsoever that we had a sour gas well blowout that was going to be a problem with regard to human health and safety, the first thing we'd do is flare the gas well — a very simple response. It would be put on fire. The resulting flame and heat takes the  $\text{SO}_2$  into the atmosphere and does not cause any problems for citizens in the area. The heat generated by the ignition of the well would take those emissions up into the atmosphere and wouldn't create a problem, and it resolves the problem with  $\text{H}_2\text{S}$ . That's the simple answer to that question. I'm surprised the hon. leader didn't think that was the approach and solution. It's a very simple one that we'd proceed with.

Because the hon. leader seems to be relating things in different parts of the province to a request to have a full-scale inquiry throughout the province with regard to the sour gas processing industry, I'd like to deal with that in the context of my two earlier remarks about Lodgepole and Pincher Creek, and the very extensive programs under way in those areas. With regard to Lodgepole, yes, we had a blowout there. I'm sure hon. members are aware that the Energy Resources Conservation Board is going to be conducting an inquiry into the Lodgepole incident. It's a technical matter as to what took place in terms of the procedures on that well. Those will be thoroughly investigated.

In discussing Lodgepole, I should bring some further facts to members' attention. Perhaps there hasn't been enough communication of  $\text{H}_2\text{S}$  standards and what they mean. With regard to ambient levels of hydrogen sulphide in the atmosphere, our standard has been set at .01 parts per million. That's a very low standard. In fact that is the level at which the human nose can detect  $\text{H}_2\text{S}$ . If we look at an industrial health standard in which workers in a gas processing facility or any facility in the province are exposed to levels of hydrogen sulphide, that limit is set at a maximum exposure of 10 parts per million, which is 1,000 times greater than our ambient air quality standard in the province. For workers in industrial plants it's 10 parts per million for up to eight hours of exposure per day, but our ambient air standard is .01. In terms of effects on humans, I think that's a very important fact to bring out. The standard for people working in sour gas processing plants, working with  $\text{H}_2\text{S}$  anywhere in the province, is much higher, 1,000 times higher, than what we allow industry in terms of its emissions in the ambient air in the province.

The reason we have such a low-level standard for  $\text{H}_2\text{S}$  is that we are soon able to detect and smell it. We know that people do not like the smell of rotten eggs, which  $\text{H}_2\text{S}$  has, and it's an early warning in terms of what the industrial operation is doing. The plants can take immediate steps to reduce their input and take measures to bring the levels down. Usually when you smell the  $\text{H}_2\text{S}$ , it's due to an industrial upset in the plant or meteorological conditions which create an inversion. But plants take immediate steps to reduce it. So the level is .01 in terms of ambient air, but we allow workers to work in this substance at much higher concentrations. I might also bring forward that the highest level the city of Edmonton

experienced during the Lodgepole blowout was .55 parts per million, which is still 20 times lower than the level workers are exposed to in the industrial area.

I mentioned that the ERCB will be having an inquiry into that incident. There will be medical specialists, but in determining the facts they will be looking at the technical aspects of what took place. I've reviewed extensively what the province is doing in Pincher Creek to try to identify if there is some substance we should be taking some special care with. Surely those inquiries and the investigation by Social Services and Community Health will point out further directions, if necessary.

On Monday I elaborated on an extensive research program the province has been undertaking for some time, and alluded to the fact that perhaps we haven't communicated to the citizens of Alberta the extent of ongoing research programs and new ones we've initiated, in particular the inhalation toxicology research with regard to  $H_2S$  and  $SO_2$ , which has been planned for some time. I mentioned in my estimates the construction of a laboratory at a cost of some \$965,000, with an annual operating budget of some \$.5 million. That research on inhalation toxicology, looking at the effects of  $H_2S$  and  $SO_2$  on animals and the extrapolation to humans, is ongoing. Of course it will take some time to get the results.

I mentioned other areas of research, and I don't intend to repeat that. With regard to this, in their report '82-D, the ERCB looked at a number of matters with regard to the sour gas processing industry. They identified a number of very important facts there. I think all hon. members should take the time to look at '82-D. They also identified some areas for follow-up. I mentioned the University of Windsor flare stack study, which the ERCB is doing.

The other thing we should look at in this whole question is the standards we have for sulphur emissions in the province of Alberta. For sulphur dioxide, our standard is set at .17 parts per million. That is the lowest allowable amount of  $SO_2$  of any province in Canada. Other provinces that have have adopted this very strict standard in most instances don't have any sources of industrial emissions of  $SO_2$  to speak of. We've adopted the strictest standard in Canada. That standard was adopted after the National Research Council and other bodies spent a long time reviewing what standards for  $SO_2$  should be. I don't think we should go back and second judge the extensive work done by the NRC, given the fact that of the provinces we have the strictest standard.

On Monday I alluded to the amount of sulphur that comes into the processing industry in this province, compared to other provinces, and the amount of sulphur emissions coming out of the stacks. Perhaps it would be useful to review that. Although Alberta takes in and puts through its processing industry four times the amount of sulphur of Ontario, Quebec, and Manitoba, the amount that comes out is one-quarter of the emissions of those provinces combined. So although we process twice as much, the amount that comes out is one-quarter. It should be noted that in terms of  $SO_2$  emissions — and these are just some further statistics — Alberta processes 16 times the amount of sulphur of Quebec and Manitoba, three times that of Ontario, and has the second lowest  $SO_2$  emission level of any province in the country, the lowest being British Columbia. So the other three emit more  $SO_2$  than we do.

On Monday I also alluded to the fact that in terms of the sour gas processing industry, approximately 97 per

cent of the sulphur going into the plants is cleaned up. So in Alberta only 3 per cent of sulphur let into the processing industry actually gets into the air. I think that is a very important thing we should keep in mind when requesting an inquiry into the sour gas processing industry in Alberta. I believe we have a record in terms of this whole industry which cannot be compared to any other jurisdiction. I don't think any other jurisdiction comes close in standards, performance, or compliance. I believe we have a good record, and at this point in time I don't see the necessity to launch a full-scale inquiry, given the fact that we are looking at separate, specific incidents: the problems with regard to Lodgepole and the extensive attention and inquiry taking place with regard to Pincher Creek.

I'd like to move fairly quickly to a number of other questions which were asked. The hon. leader asked about the Bocket and Three Rivers dam sites and where the province is at this point in time. I dealt quite extensively with both those items in my Heritage Savings Trust Fund estimates, so I don't have much more to add at this point. We have not yet received the proposal we're awaiting from the Peigans, and the status is the same as I indicated at the time the estimates for the capital projects division of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund came before me.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

The hon. leader also asked about some of the latest figures in terms of cost benefits at the Three Rivers and Bocket sites. We discussed that extensively, too, in the earlier estimates of the capital projects division. I don't have much more to add. We certainly had cost/benefit analyses done. I explained that there are differences in methods. I think one of the specific questions the Leader of the Opposition asked was, what were the updated costs with regard to these projects? I'll have that answer for him a little further on in my estimates. Those cost/benefit analyses were done and, as I say, I don't think I have much more to comment on at this time, given my extensive comments at the time of the capital projects division.

The hon. leader asked about the Wright-Mansell report. It is being used by the Department of the Environment with regard to guidelines for the cost/benefit analysis. It certainly is being considered. The hon. leader asked about the South Saskatchewan River basin planning program. I can only further reiterate the commitment given by the former minister that there will be an opportunity for public review with regard to the program. The exact nature and detail of that public input and review has not been determined at this point in time.

The hon. leader asked about the 86:14 cost-sharing formula in the irrigation districts. That formula is in the Department of Agriculture, not the Department of the Environment. I should note that the 75:25 formula we have in the Department of the Environment relates to water management projects that were cost-shared with municipalities, and we have extended that same principle with regard to the drainage cost-sharing projects with municipalities in the northern part of the province. The programs in the Department of the Environment are consistent: 75:25. The 86:14 formula has been discussed here before and, as I recollect, is based on some historical studies which [relate] the benefits to the total provincial economy and to the irrigation districts themselves. The benefits were 86:14. I'm sure that's a question which should be raised further with regard to the Department of Agriculture. I personally have a point of view with regard



to that matter, but it's within the other department's estimates.

There was a question about an application for a portable plant to process sour gas in the Claresholm area. No conclusions have been made with regard to that application to the ERCB, and I think it's premature at this time to say whether or not the project will be approved. It's before the ERCB in the application stage.

The hon. leader asked what the procedures of the Twin Butte soils and water evaluation task force would be with regard to public input and holding public meetings. I can only say that when I announced that I was going to have an independent study done, that's what I intended to have, an independent study. I believe it's up to the task force to set its own rules for procedure, et cetera. I'm not going to give them directions as to what they should do in terms of how they are to perform their tasks.

I've dealt with the question of the blowout. The hon. leader also asked about the nature of the inquiry at Lodgepole, and I think I've dealt with that adequately.

I'd now like to turn to the remarks of my colleague from Edmonton Glengarry. He asked a number of questions, and I hope I'm able to adequately respond to some of them. Perhaps we will have to discuss some of them at a later opportunity. I notice that he has established for himself quite an advisory board of individuals with regard to bringing his concerns forward. I wonder if the concerns he brings forward are really his, or are they on behalf of other individuals and organizations in the province. I sometimes wonder how they relate to his constituency of Edmonton Glengarry, and I'm sure Edmonton city council would be very interested in some of his observations.

The first question the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry asked was about enforcement. He didn't feel we were doing very much about enforcement. I guess that's a judgment decision. The hon. member says there were 746 complaints and there should have been 746 prosecutions. Well, there are several different ways the department approaches enforcement. Certainly prosecution is a very important part of our program, but it's not the first resort, and our approach is not to make work for the legal system. Our approach is to look quite seriously at improving the quality of the environment in the province. That's the direction the department takes.

We look at a number of different steps. A number of the complaints we receive are resolved fairly quickly. Thirty per cent of the complaints involve areas over which the department has no jurisdiction whatsoever. In a small percentage, no identifiable source for the complaint is found. In about 20 per cent of the complaints, we're working towards resolution of the nature of the complaint. I would say we spend quite a bit of time in our process to attempt to resolve those kinds of complaints. So our real goal in enforcement is to improve the quality of the environment.

I think I mentioned earlier our SO<sub>2</sub> standards compared to other jurisdictions. I think that alone speaks well for the process the province of Alberta has used. Just the quality of the environment in terms of sources of emissions and the percentage clean-up of those emissions compared to other provinces in Canada is most impressive. We continue to work with that sort of approach to improve the environment. We're going to prosecute if there is a company that is blatantly breaking the law of the province, that has no intention whatsoever to clean up its act, so to say, that disregards the laws of the province, emits all sorts of things and makes no attempt

to clean them up on a regular basis or even after a specific incident, breaks a tailing pond and lets things flow into there, doesn't put in the proper equipment, breaks its licences, or isn't doing its job. That's basically the approach we take there.

I know the hon. member comes back to that. He wants to know whether we monitor stack emissions. Certainly we monitor stack emissions in the province. The industry itself is required in most of their licences to monitor on a daily basis all their sources of emissions, whether it be water or air. There's quite an extensive monitoring system there.

We in the department do source emission surveys. We also do stack surveys to check up on the industry and make sure the type of information they are reporting to us is accurate. We have a monitoring quality assurance program, where we check out the monitoring equipment of the industry to ensure that it's meeting our standards and is properly calibrated. We would consider it a very serious offence if an industry failed to report to us the types of emissions from their plants. They are required to report to us every single violation of our standards. If their equipment is faulty, we would consider that a very serious matter. Those are the areas we look at. All this is getting us to the point to improve the quality of the environment. Those are very important aspects of how the department approaches these matters.

If the department itself were involved in all this monitoring, we would probably require a substantial increase in the number of civil servants in the province. We'd require a massive injection of capital to perform this work. At the present time, I believe the industry is generally doing a responsible job. If there are specific incidents where industry is not following up on the responsibilities in their licence, we will take the necessary corrective action to ensure that this information is accurately reported to us and that proper monitoring is taking place. So there is not only monitoring by the industry but check-up monitoring done by the department. If there are specific incidents where a plant is a problem, we set up our air quality monitoring trailers, sit in the area for some time to see what the source of the specific problem is, and find out exactly what the industry is doing.

The hon. member asked for a list of the "bad actors". Mr. Chairman, I can only say that we issue a number of directives, also control orders. If that is the information the hon. member wishes, it is public information. He asked about odors from municipal dumps. I can only relay that the responsibility for sanitary landfills, in terms of licensing and operation, lies with the Department of Social Services and Community Health. It isn't within the Department of the Environment.

The hon. member offers the interesting suggestion of what he calls an environmental resources board. I believe Alberta Environment probably has in place more enforcement control over industry than most other jurisdictions in the country. The reporting they have to do on a monthly basis in terms of any violations — it's like any of us driving in our automobiles, and every time we infringe the speed limit on the highway we have to turn ourselves in. That's basically what industry does in terms of the monitoring we have them do in this province. Every time they exceed the speed limit — in this case, the air quality — they have monitoring equipment which reports it, and they have to report to us. Although we have reports of violations for half an hour, one hour, or whatever they may be, it's an indication that the system is working and the overall quality of the environment of the province is

benefiting from this type of approach.

The member asked whether there was a conflict of interest between the agency which sets the limits and also is involved in the prosecution of those limits. I think the legislation is pretty clear that the standards and approval division set up in the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act is separate and distinct from our enforcement division. Those were clearly set out in the legislation.

The hon. member suggested Edmontonians would be more than willing to pay a lot more than they are to — I can only conclude that the hon. member is suggesting tertiary treatment of their wastes. He quotes that it only costs \$7 per person per year in the city of Edmonton to operate their sewage system. That may be a correct figure in terms of the cost of operation. But if the hon. member looked at his utility bill from the city of Edmonton, I'm sure he'd find that the charge for sewage is much higher than that. That includes all the capital costs of collection and the construction of these plants, which comes to 14 or maybe 15 times greater — I'm not sure what the figure is — than the \$7 on an annual basis the hon. member refers to. You'd have to look at a household. I'm sure the city of Edmonton will be very interested in the remarks of the hon. member, suggesting the taxpayers of the city have all this excess capacity they'd be willing to pay on their tax bill for tertiary treatment of sewage. As desirable as that may be, I'm sure the city fathers will be interested in the hon. member's observation.

The hon. member mentioned fecal coliforms and standards there. With regard to that, there are different types of standards. There is a standard for fecal coliforms in terms of raw water before it is treated, and I believe that is what the member was referring to. Certainly if there was any problem with fecal coliforms and total coliforms in terms of treatment, that is recognized by our guidelines. The water is treated to remove those substances prior to ingestion by humans. Similarly, I believe our standards compare well with other Canadian standards with regard to effluent on the other side. I'm not going to spend a great deal of time on that.

With regard to the Water Resource Management Principles for Alberta, the hon. member mentioned our preferential uses for water. I can only respond that in terms of the Water Resources Act, it's fairly clear what the priorities for water use are in the province of Alberta. The first priority is for domestic purposes, the second is for municipal purposes, the third is for irrigation and other agricultural purposes, the fourth is for industrial purposes, the fifth is for water power purposes, and the sixth is for other like purposes. Also the Water Resources Act has in it the ability to licence and impound water for other purposes such as flood control, erosion control, flow regulation, conservation, recreation, the propagation of fish or wildlife, or any other purposes. The question of recreation and our fisheries resource is addressed in the Water Resources Act.

I don't believe we should change that listing of priorities in terms of what the Act has dedicated the uses of water to. I don't think we want recreation to displace domestic and municipal consumption. I'm sure the priority accorded to agriculture — food production to sustain ourselves — is in the right place. We require the water for industrial purposes. I'm sure it must have a higher priority than recreation. Hydro power is the fifth. Surely when we look at the concerns we have, the production of electricity by hydro power is something that should have priority over recreation, because in the longer run hydro generation, in terms of its effect on the environment, et

cetera, is probably a much better way to produce electricity than coal-fired generation and some of the others. I believe one part of the debate over the Slave project is the trade-off between increased coal-fired generation versus hydro generation.

So I wouldn't reorder the priorities. But we do a number of things, and we do recognize recreation. We have a policy with regard to site development around our reservoirs to enhance their recreational use, recognizing the management necessary to properly operate those reservoirs. The hon. Member talked about TransAlta, the Bighorn dam, and the historic site at Rocky Mountain House. On Wednesday I was able to announce that TransAlta has abandoned its program to increase discharges in the winter ice-forming period and will be going back to its traditional practice. There are a number of other measures on that regime of river which I believe are well accepted by the population.

The hon. member talked about the priorities of the department and suggested that in terms of one of the mandates of the department, water resource management was really a euphemism for diversion and dam building. I guess that may be an impression some of the hon. member's advisers have given him. He would like me to comment on the relevant importance of dam building versus water quality. I think we have to look at this question. I am going to take a little bit of time — I hope not too much — to address this.

I would just like to assure the hon. member that most of the activities the department is involved in with regard to the construction of a reservoir — one of the basic reasons that reservoir was constructed was to improve water quality. Most of the reservoirs in place in the province of Alberta today have had a direct impact on the quality of life in this province by being able to assure improved water quality.

If we look at the question of the dam on the Red Deer River, surely one of the reasons for the construction of that dam was to ensure minimum winter flows, to assure cities like Red Deer of an adequate supply and of water quality further downstream. Looking at the city of Edmonton, for example, if we didn't have reservoirs on the Bighorn and the Brazeau, would the city of Edmonton have been able to grow to the population size it has today without assured flows of water? Arrangements have been made with the major power companies to provide those winter flows of water. There are a number of other communities. [interjection] The hon. Member for Barrhead says, where would our water quality be? I think the Paddle is having an effect and will have an effect on the assured quality of water in that area.

We go down to the southern part of the province. If we didn't have the reservoirs there and weren't able to dedicate some of the flows from the St. Mary to augment flows in the Oldman River system, where would the city of Lethbridge be in terms of assured water and water quality? These reservoirs that were built in the province have played a major part in improving water quality and assuring water supply to communities. In terms of the irrigation reservoirs, surely those reservoirs play an important part in benefits to citizens of the area in terms of assuring water supply.

So in terms of priorities, water quality has been a priority, and dam building has assisted the assurance of high-quality water in the province. The member talked about the number of dollars spent on water diversion. I'm not entirely sure what he means by that. I'm not sure if he means storage. Again, on the water quality side, in terms

of the commitment by this province since 1979, approximately \$471 million has been allocated by the government to assist communities with regard to upgrading water supplies and sewage treatment. That is a significant commitment which far exceeds the dollars allocated for building dams, although, as I say, the building of dams is important in terms of water quality.

We have \$300 million in the municipal water supply and sewage treatment grant program, approximately \$100 million in a regional water and sewage treatment program, approximately \$12 million in the northern supplementary fund, \$13 million in the phosphorous removal grant for the city of Calgary, and the major debt reduction program in 1979 wiped out a debt of approximately \$40 million associated with municipal water supply and sewage treatment programs. That comes to a total of some \$470 million spent in that important area. I should mention that the regional water waste treatment plant the province is constructing in the Edmonton area does have the capacity to remove phosphorous.

I had better speed up here, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. MARTIN: Take your time, Fred.

MR. BRADLEY: I have to engage in a little bit of water transfer here.

The hon. member talked about protecting ground water supplies. I would like to assure him that we have the necessary requirements in the ground water Act to assure ground water supplies. He asked about fish in the North Saskatchewan [at the] border. I would just like to say that some mercury in the North Saskatchewan River has been sourced in Saskatchewan. Consequently some levels of mercury have been found in the fish. I believe it's a Saskatchewan problem, not an Alberta problem.

The hon. member asked about the number of water quality biologists the department has. We have nine biologists in the water quality control branch of the department. That is unchanged from last year. In total, there are 31 biologists in the Department of the Environment.

The hon. member discussed our sulphur control program. I think I have stated enough about the control of sulphur in the province — almost a 97 per cent reduction in emissions. The hon. member asked about hydrocarbons in the air. Hydrocarbon monitoring is done in the United States, due to the smog problems they have in some of their cities. It is not really a problem here in the province of Alberta.

The hon. member asked about emissions from coal-fired plants. We have adopted a fairly important national standard with regard to emission guidelines for fossil fuel fired thermal power plants. These will apply to new coal-fired power plants in the province.

The hon. member asked about enforcement standards. I think we've gone over some of those parameters today. Perhaps he and I should discuss that at some length sometime. He asked about the Suncor decision. I don't wish to comment on that at this point, because the decision hasn't been made. But certainly we'll be looking at the judge's decision when it comes down.

The hon. member asked about a system for monitoring tailings ponds in the province. I assure him that we do have a system in place. He asked about the burning of railway ties. We license the burning of ties by railway companies. Sometimes they haven't had the proper li-

cences, and we have proceeded with prosecutions or issuing emission control orders. He asked about the Shell Waterton gas plant. I think I have responded to that. The hon. member asked about Fort Saskatchewan. We have had a program to monitor the ambient air in Fort Saskatchewan. Recently I was congratulated on that program by the mayor of Fort Saskatchewan. I think it's been fairly successful.

The hon. member talked about sources of pollutants in sewage systems, et cetera. I could respond that our licences refer to the quality of what comes from the sewage effluent. If there are particular problems, it's the responsibility of the municipality to trace back to the source of the specific substance they're having a problem with. On some occasions, we've assisted the municipalities in doing that. That was what happened with the University hospital here. The city was able to trace back to where the mercury came from. It was coming from the University of Alberta hospital, I believe. The hon. member talked about phosphorous removal. We have a program with the city of Calgary. I alluded that the new Edmonton plant will include phosphorous removal. The processes which are used for phosphorous removal also improve the overall quality of the effluent. The question of Procter & Gamble has been brought up in the House. I'm not sure that I should comment further on that at this point in time.

I'd now like to turn to the remarks of the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray. He has some concerns with regard to algae and weed growth in Lac La Biche itself. We have a problem in a number of lakes in Alberta because of the nature of our soils. Nutrients in our soils run off into the lakes and create a weed problem. We have an advisory committee looking at the Lake Wabamun situation and recommending a number of different options there, which perhaps we can apply to other lakes in the province. I don't think our weed problem is going to be solved. It's been with these lakes for a number of years. However, we have a program that is directed toward the Eurasian milfoil problem which British Columbia has — a check stop program to attempt to stop this weed spreading into Alberta.

I appreciate the remarks the hon. member made with regard to our methoxychlor program on the Athabasca. He mentioned the Fort McMurray flood problem. It certainly is a significant problem. I'm not sure what the resolution to that problem is. There was a study which suggested that if we were to construct some sort of ice weir — which I believe was estimated at some \$52 million in cost — that might assist in alleviating some of those problems. It also would cause some other environmental problems. The member wanted assurance about our 75:25 formula for funding. It certainly is available to municipalities and could be applied to Fort McMurray concerns with regard to any action taken there. That commitment would continue to be there.

The hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray wished to have some further information with regard to AO-SERP. We're continuing that project. With regard to that project, perhaps I could get back to the hon. member and outline to him in detail the nature of the different programs there.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway asked a number of questions. I'd say to him that I believe the department supports the three or four areas the hon. member outlined as being priorities. With regard to his question about fines and punishments, recently the Clean Air Act was amended and the fines were increased signifi-

cantly. I believe that took place in 1982. The hon. member asked about procedures for bottle depots. Currently we are reviewing the question of bottle depot licensing in the province to see whether there's not a better system for us to proceed with, looking at whether it may be better to return this area to the private sector rather than have government involved. But that is still at the review stage, and no decision has been made on that.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood asked some questions with regard to Lodgepole. I think I generally answered those questions in my earlier remarks about Lodgepole. The inquiry has been set by the Energy Resources Conservation Board. I don't think I can add much to the question as to where the ERCB will be holding their sittings with regard to the hearing, other than what the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources said in the House: that the ERCB is a quasi-judicial body and they will make that decision by themselves. Representation should be made to them.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood discussed PCBs. I suppose he and I could get into a lengthy debate. I don't wish to do that. I just repeat that the standards we use here in the province are ones which Environment Canada and the Environmental Protection Agency in the United States have. We looked at the state of California, which has some fairly stringent guidelines with regard to disposal of waste containing PCBs. The debate about whether or not PCBs are — the level of hazard, et cetera, in the environment. I think there have been a number of studies on that.

The initial concern with PCBs came because of ingestion of cooking oils in Japan. The cooking oils had become contaminated with PCBs in their production. The concern with PCBs has been with direct human ingestion of PCBs. When you look at those incidents in Japan, the PCBs themselves were contaminated with other substances, being chlorinated dibenzophenones and quadriphenols. The concern seems to be with regard to those substances in PCBs causing the problem, versus PCBs themselves. When you look at the occupational experience with regard to PCBs for people who have worked with them in the field — not ingesting them directly in food, but working with them on their hands, et cetera — there haven't really been adverse health effects reported from that type of activity.

In response to the hon. member, I would say, yes, there will be and is concern about ingestion of PCBs into the human system through food. That should be a concern, and that's where the concern should be directed. But in terms of standards we have adopted, the standards recommended by other jurisdictions, that should be adequate for us.

The hon. member asked about the Nisku storage site of Kinetic Contaminants and the question of the department's sampling. There were not any samples the department took which were inaccurate, which the hon. member is suggesting. All the samples taken by the department were accurate. The question as to where the samples were taken: there are different levels found in different sampling points, and I agree with the hon. member that in terms of the second set of samples the department took in a different area, there were higher levels. But they were below the levels of concern I alluded to earlier in terms of the standards of other jurisdictions.

The hon. Member for Red Deer asked about sewage sludge application to land. It is being done in the province today. It is an interesting way to handle sewage sludge. As I say, there are some programs in the province.

If the city of Red Deer is looking at it, it is certainly something that could be proceeded with and looked at. He also asked about an incident with regard to effluent from a trailer court in the Red Deer area. It certainly is a serious matter. There have been some improvements with regard to how that trailer court is handling its sewage effluent. But the matter is still under investigation.

The hon. Member for Drumheller had some interesting comments, and particularly wanted to know whether or not sewage lift stations were permitted to discharge into the river system. It is built into licences that in emergencies these lift stations can discharge into a receiving stream. This happens on rare occasions. It's certainly not desirable, but if there is a failure in a lift station, the alternative would be that the sewage would back up into residences in a community. So one has to look at the alternatives there: whether it's more desirable to have the sewage flowing back into homes or whether it should be permitted to discharge into receiving streams. I am having the department review this whole question of lift stations in terms of these procedures, particularly where they're upstream from a water treatment intake. I think it's important to do that.

I appreciate the hon. Member for Wainwright's comments with regard to the incinerator project for Wainwright, which the department is proceeding with. He asked some questions about application of chemicals and what the role of the department is. There is one Act with regard to that, the Agricultural Chemicals Act. I assure the hon. member that there are procedures in place with regard to the application of pesticides and chemicals in the province — what the requirements for training and licensing of people doing the work are, et cetera. So I believe there is sufficient legislation and regulation in that area.

I've tried to answer most of the questions which were raised on Monday, and I'm willing to hear from other hon. members. If they have specific questions in their constituencies which I can help them with, I certainly would attempt to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. MARTIN: Just relax. I'm sure the minister wouldn't be totally surprised if there are some answers I did not find totally acceptable. I have a number of pages here, so I think we can sit down and relax for a while. First of all, I wish the minister could have been with me the other day when I had a group of students from Medicine Hat — very bright, able young people. One of the major concerns they have — they're breaking up into classes — is the environment. I'm sure the minister would have enjoyed sitting there to see their concerns, because they have actually been checking into a lot of areas. For instance, obviously one of the things that concerned them was the cadmium in Medicine Hat, which I know you've discussed in the House. When they looked at the minister's answers, they were not assured by that at all. I hope they will take the time to meet with the minister at some time, because they are doing a lot of research in the area.

But there are a number of areas. I go back, first of all, to the PCBs. I'm going to make some comments, then ask some questions that I'm sure the minister will pick up on. Is the minister saying to us that the only way PCBs are dangerous is through food? If that's what he's saying, then in all due respect to the minister, I think he should take a look at some of the research. I mentioned some of that research in *Hansard*. He can begin to look at it.

Because in dealing with animals, they have found that there is no safe level. Even being around PCBs is dangerous, and the fact that it can be stored in the body for years and years and years — they're not sure of the health effects. To just reject it is very, very dangerous. I think the minister should start looking at the research.

When I asked the questions about when his department took the first and second tests, of course they said our figures were totally wrong. Big splash in the press about it. Of course we hung in there and said ours were right. In fact our lab said they were probably a little low. The minister now agrees that the second one is even higher than ours. But originally the department said there was no leaking off site. They said there was no leaking, and that's the point. Obviously, by the second set of tests, there was a lot of leakage. The minister would have to agree on that. When the department is wrong the first time, I think it has an obligation to come clean the next time. You may not agree that it's a dangerous level of PCBs. I do. But surely, when you make a splash in terms of the news the first time, you should come back and qualify that information the second time.

I put down the things you haven't answered in terms of other questions. I mentioned why an off-site perimeter dam is not there, why that is not in Kinetic. It's supposed to be, in all environmental standards. I asked about Kinetic's financial problems, and the fact that we're still shipping hazardous wastes from all over Canada — it's my understanding, unless the minister can clarify this — to a company that has financial problems. It's going to cost a lot of money to get rid of these hazardous wastes. Why are we continuing to do it if there's doubt at all about the company's ability to eventually dispose of the wastes? Those questions were not answered. That's just the start, Mr. Minister.

I have some other concerns with the resources commission. I ask the minister — I do not have the information on this — if there are any representatives of environmental organizations on the commission. If not, I want to know why not. Because if we're going to be looking at dam building and water diversion, certainly Mr. Kroeger — and I read *The Hanna Herald* all the time, because it's my home area — raises very well the pro arguments, but I never see anything about the con arguments there. Surely if we're looking at water diversion, environmental concerns on that would be very important. There certainly should be representatives, either from the Fish & Game Association or the Alberta Wilderness Association. I'd like the minister to comment on that.

I have three other questions that have to do with monitoring. I ask if the minister would be prepared to table this information in the House this session. Because the previous minister assured the Legislature that that information would be publicly available, and we're still getting representations from a number of members of the public who've tried to get the type of information I'm going to ask for and have failed. For this reason, I ask the minister if he would table in the Legislature this session the following monitoring reports: one, all air and water monitoring reports from both Shell and Gulf Pincher Creek gas plants over the past five years; two, all air and liquid emission monitoring agents from Syncrude and Suncor over the past two years; three, all air emission monitoring reports from Dow Chemical and Diamond Shamrock plants in Fort Saskatchewan during the past two years. It's my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that the public has not been able to get that information. I ask the minister if he could provide that information.

I see we're running out of time. I still have a number of questions that I found unsatisfactory in terms of the minister's answers, but I know we're not going to have time. So perhaps I can just ask the minister to comment on the aspects I've brought up now.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, with regard to PCBs and the specific question the hon. member has raised, there has been a lot of research on PCBs. The main concern is human consumption. I talked about the food chain and consumption in terms of human activity. The literature search I've done has not shown PCBs as a cancer causing agent in humans. If the hon. member is talking about PCBs contaminated with some other substances, there may be some relationships there. But PCBs by themselves — and there's been a lot of work done by different agencies and groups looking at that particular question and, as I say, a lot of literature review.

In terms of our standards, I don't make any apology for following what I think are some of the strictest standards applied in North America. We've been following the Canadian standards, the EPA in the United States, and the state of California. With regard to a perimeter dike around the site at Nisku, as the hon. member suggests, I understand there is a berm within the storage facility itself, which I am led to believe fulfills the storage requirements for inside the warehouse itself.

With regard to different levels: whether or not one can conclude that the PCBs that had been found outside the Nisku site came from Kinetic — I'm not sure how one can determine that, except if one had been able to be there at the time and photograph and have a witness that said that in fact it took place. There are some levels out of the site. Those have been well publicized. They're below the level of concern and below the levels of concern the state of California has. If I might quote from their regulations. In terms of spill clean-up, they say . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. The time for the committee has now lapsed.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and request leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration the following resolutions and reports as follows:

Be it resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, sums not exceeding the following for the Department of Transportation: [\$15,424,580] for departmental support services, \$634,322,672 for construction and maintenance of highways, \$9,800,000 for construction and operation of rail systems, \$12,588,622 for construction and maintenance of airport facilities, \$15,884,403 for specialized transportation services, and \$166,278,689 for urban transportation financial assistance.

The Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions, reports progress thereon, and requests leave to sit again.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, before adjourning the Assembly, I want to advise the Assembly that next Monday, May 9, after question period, we will be in Committee of Supply considering the Department of Energy and Natural Resources. Secondly, we will not be sitting on Monday evening, to allow the Committee on

Privileges and Elections to consider the very important white paper on the Legislative Assembly Act. I know that all members of the committee will be in attendance to participate in that important discussion.

[At 1:03 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Monday at 2:30 p.m.]