

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Wednesday, May 25, 1983 2:30 p.m.**

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

## PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 62**

**Land Surface Conservation  
and Reclamation Amendment Act, 1983**

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a Bill, being the Land Surface Conservation and Reclamation Amendment Act, 1983.

The Bill basically provides for amendments in four areas. It provides for the removal and conservation of topsoil as a condition of a reclamation order, which is a follow-up to the select committee report on surface rights. It provides for the addition of contamination to the definition of a surface disturbance. It also provides for the addition of certain industrial, manufacturing, and processing operations, which may be designated as regulated surface operations by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. There are other administrative streamlining amendments.

[Leave granted; Bill 62 read a first time]

**Bill 63**

**Real Property Statutes  
Amendment Act, 1983 (No. 2)**

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to introduce Bill No. 63, the Real Property Statutes Amendment Act, 1983 (No.2).

This Bill would accomplish three objectives. One is to provide for payments under the sum of \$5,000 out of the assurance fund in respect of land titles matters, by way of ministerial order rather than by way of Executive Council order. The second one introduces the principle of a penalty for mortgagees who fail to provide statements of the amount owing or purport to charge for statements of the amount owing when requested by a mortgager. The third one would change the law with respect to the liability of individuals who would otherwise be subject to foreclosure procedures, in the relatively narrow circumstance where the reason for the liability is that a corporation from which an assignment of interest has been taken by the individual was itself previously liable.

[Leave granted; Bill 63 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: With leave of the House, I wonder if I might revert to Introduction of Visitors?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. SPEAKER: I'm pleased to draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the Speaker's gallery of a distinguished delegation from the Parliament of Queensland in Australia. They're led by the Hon. Mr. V.J. Bird, the Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs, and include Mr. R.E. Moore, Mr. Demetrios Fouras, and Mr. H.J. Harper. They're accompanied by Mr. R.E. Reid, the deputy director of protocol for Queensland. Might I ask our guests to stand for a moment and receive our welcome.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**  
(continued)

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 202, an Act to Amend the Blind Persons' Rights Act, be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly 60 students from Rundle school. They combine three grade 6 classes, one of them a bilingual class studying their courses in English and Ukrainian. They're accompanied by teachers Mrs. Ann Sadelain, Steffany Kyselitzia, and Mr. Jim Spivak. I would like to have them welcomed to this Assembly in the usual manner, and to the bilingual class I want to say *MEH VITAYUMO VAS TOOT NENEE* [as submitted]. Would they please rise in the public gallery and receive the usual welcome.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege today to introduce to you, and through you to the Assembly, 32 grades 7, 8, and 9 students from Lindale school in my constituency. They are accompanied by their teacher Jim Musson and by parents Tom Bijou, May Tryon, Joyce Sunderland, Pearl Tapio, and Ethal Graves.

These students are in Edmonton for three days. Today they've been at the Wildlife Park and the Legislature. They're going to the museum this afternoon and the wave pool this evening. Tomorrow they're going to the Muttart Conservatory, Fort Edmonton, and *Gandhi*. After a full day on Friday, the students are going in a walkathon on Saturday to replenish the funds they used for this trip and leave a ready supply of funding for next year's students. I trust they'll take good care of the chaperones, because I'm sure three days with 32 grade 7s, 8s, and 9s will wear them down. I ask that they rise now and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my seatmate, the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray, I'm pleased to introduce 46 grades 5, 6, 7, and 8 students from Wandering River school. They are accompanied by their teachers Melanie Hunter and Neil Ingram; parents Mrs. Maryanne Proulx, Mrs. Janice Hilligas, Mrs. Sandra Legare, and Mrs. Doreen Dakin; and bus driver Mr. Shapka. They are located in the members gallery, and I ask them to rise and receive the recognition of the Assembly.

## head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

**Western Electric Power Grid**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the hon. Minister of Utilities and Telecommunications, and ask if the minister can inform the Assembly whether the study with respect to a western power grid, which was tabled yesterday and filed with the library, was meant to fulfil the promise the minister made last March 14 to release the information on the western electric power grid.

MR. BOGLE: Following the request which was made in this Assembly, I contacted my colleagues in Saskatchewan and Manitoba and, further to joint concurrence, it was agreed that the four volumes as filed with the Legislature Library yesterday would be made public.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. So that we may assess whether this is a relevant study or a relic from the past, could the minister advise the Assembly whether there have been any other studies upon which negotiations have occurred prior to the decision to suspend discussions in July last year?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, as that matter relates to a period of time before I assumed this portfolio, I'll take the question as notice.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister advise the Assembly what discussions have taken place between the government of Alberta and other prairie governments with respect to power produced from the Limestone project, which even today I'm advised by Manitoba officials would produce power at a rate substantially less than the figures in the data the minister filed with the House yesterday?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, that subject was dealt with during my estimates on Tuesday, May 17.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I put to the minister whether or not this government has pursued, subsequent to last summer, information which has been made available by the Manitoba government that power from the Limestone project — and I underline Limestone project on the Nelson River, as opposed to the information tabled yesterday — would be more cost competitive than any of the options the Alberta government is now exploring.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, possibly the Manitoba government will keep those thoughts in mind when the discussions on this matter resume in the summer of 1984.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister, so commitments are not made in Alberta in the absence of information. In view of the fact that Manitoba is now prepared, as of today, to release information on the Limestone project and the cost competitiveness of that power, will the minister give an undertaking during the spring session to table this information in the House, so Albertans may have it to compare the options the government is now exploring, including the Slave dam?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, in the first question I responded to, I indicated that in the request I made of my colleagues in the other two provinces, I indicated that requests had been made for information to be made public. I'll be very pleased to table in this Legislative Assembly the response I received from the minister in Manitoba. If the hon. member is suggesting that the minister in Manitoba left out a study that should have been included, he should say so directly.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question to the minister is that I'm sure the minister should be as well aware as anyone that there have been a number of studies. My question is whether or not this minister, in pursuing information of relevance to the Alberta people, will ensure that the studies not only include relics from the past but relevant documents on the current project, the Limestone project, which the government of Manitoba is prepared to release.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the matter as notice from the hon. member.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, in that this report was tabled yesterday and due to the time restraints, I did not have the opportunity to review it. I would like to ask the minister: did the report address the subject of how many jobs would be available to people in Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba if the power grid went ahead?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, it seems to me that what he's asking is for the minister to give him a preview of the report, because he hasn't had time to read it himself. Perhaps he might read the report. Then if there are questions arising from it, they could be asked.

MR. STROMBERG: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There were four volumes that deep.

MRS. CRIPPS: How deep, Gordon?

MR. STROMBERG: Oh, it was ...

AN HON. MEMBER: Deeper than that.

MR. STROMBERG: I think it's quite crucial to know the impact on manpower in the three provinces.

MR. SPEAKER: But the hon. member, fortunately or unfortunately, has indicated that that may be in the report. May I suggest that he get in touch with the hon. minister privately and see which one has more time to summarize it for the other.

MR. NOTLEY: Perhaps I could put one last supplementary question to the minister, pursuant to the answers the minister gave in estimates.

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

MR. NOTLEY: Will the minister guarantee the Assembly that before additional commitments are made by this government with respect to the Slave project, either directly or indirectly with the power companies, there will be a complete disclosure of all the current relevant data

with respect to the power grid, but especially as it applies to the Limestone project?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, as indicated during the budget estimates on Tuesday, May 17, over the next two and a half to three years there will be a complete set of hearings by the ERCB, as well as environmental impact studies, on the Slave River project. The hon. member has previously asked if I would undertake to review the question of whether or not other studies were done with regard to the possible western electric grid, and I've undertaken to take that question as notice. I reaffirm that point.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that in addition to taking it as notice, we would have the information disclosed.

#### **Grande Cache Hospital Funding**

MR. NOTLEY: I'd like to direct my second question to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, and ask the minister what the government is proposing to do with respect to the appeal for extra funds for the 1983-1984 year by the board of the Grande Cache hospital.

MR. RUSSELL: We intend to improve their situation, bearing in mind the present status of the town, what the employment conditions are. There is very shortly going to be a meeting between the board of the hospital and officials of my department. We are going to treat the Grande Cache hospital as an exception to the hospital system this year, bearing in mind the community conditions and their desire to maintain a good community aspect there.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to hear that. A supplementary question. Can the minister advise the House what the rationale of the department was in the first place for budgetary cutbacks which led to the layoff of a number of employees at the hospital and a reduction in the number of beds, as well as the outpatient services?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, the Grande Cache hospital was treated several months ago, when they submitted their budget, the same way all other hospitals are in the province; that is, their volumes and utilizations were examined and staff ratios that were needed to run the programs that were required to service the community were determined, and on that basis a budget was developed.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Has any assessment been made of the cost to the overall health care system of transferring emergency cases from Grande Cache to Edmonton by air ambulance or road ambulance, where the province assumes all the costs — those instances where the Grande Cache hospital could have been able to provide services? Has there been any assessment of those costs?

MR. RUSSELL: Offhand, I'm not aware of any such studies, although some may have been done. Mr. Speaker, I should emphasize that in cases like this, the full-time staff equivalents needed to maintain a level of programs is what is used to determine the budgetary requirements of the hospitals. The utilization at the Grande Cache hospital was very, very low. The historic data was there.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The minister has indicated that Grande Cache is an exception. Could the minister advise whether Grande Cache will be the only exception, or will there be other hospitals in this province where significant alterations will be made in the budget?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, the budget appeal system, which has been in place over the last several years, is in place again for the current fiscal year. A number of hospital boards have indicated they intend to submit appeals. So if good arguments are made, there may be some response to those appeals. However, I want to emphasize that we had a task force of ministers visit Grande Cache. One of their most serious concerns was the situation with respect to the hospital. We're aware of what's happening to their economic base and are reacting. We tried to respond very positively to the requests and concerns of the hospital board. I gather the hon. Leader of the Opposition doesn't think we should have done that.

MR. NOTLEY: Nonsense, Mr. Speaker, absolute nonsense. As a matter of fact, the first question was to elicit whether or not the government was going to do something about it, so that kind of gratuitous comment is not in order.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. minister: in light of the precedent — for once a reasonable precedent by that unreasonable minister ... [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It's a remarkable performance, to hear an hon. member castigate another hon. member for something he said and then go on to say something worse himself.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think that's probably fair. In that case, I'll just put the question to the minister, and ask whether or not the process of appeals will look as favorably upon other hospitals in this province where there are similar circumstances and they are now having to cut back services as a result of the decisions of the department.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I know of no other similar circumstances. This is a special case in which the government is trying to respond on all the fronts possible. Hospital services and staffing, jobs, and the fact that there's a new correctional centre going in there, I think bode some hope for the future. We're trying to respond to that situation. I know the hon. member is a little churlish because he's got a seatmate that's after his job, so I don't mind the little jibes.

MR. MARTIN: I wouldn't want it.

MR. NOTLEY: I'd watch those backbenchers that are after your job, Dave, especially with the user fee issue.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the last supplementary.

MR. NOTLEY: If he gets past this user fee question, he'll be lucky to be around.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, in view of the comments which would indicate that potential for growth seems to be a criterion, I'd ask the minister whether that same criterion will be extended objectively to other areas where

there have in fact been temporary reductions in populations but now there may be a coming back to former population or an expansion.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I certainly didn't mean to infer that a temporary slowdown in growth was the only criterion. We know the town of Grande Cache is facing a major challenge in maintaining its community viability and its economic base. As I said earlier, I know of no such other situation within the province, but that doesn't stop any hospital board from appealing its budget on similar or any other grounds.

### Unemployment

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Manpower. It relates to recent unemployment insurance figures which indicate that many professionals in Alberta are presently on the unemployment insurance rolls. These are as of today: geologists have increased from 1982 to '83 by 13 times, to an absolute number of 134; accountants now are at 849, increased eight times in the last year.

MR. NOTLEY: Shocking.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Architects have increased 20 times.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I realize the hon. member is laying a basis for a question, but there is a basic rule that says that in the question period you seek information rather than give it. May I respectfully suggest that if the question is what I might anticipate — and it may not be — I think it could be asked directly, without all the statistics.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. I raise the information, which I will file with the Legislature for the minister's perusal and for other members' as well, because the statistics are very shocking, when we find so many professionals unemployed. My question to the Minister of Manpower is: what action is the minister taking, or what concern is the minister showing, with regard to these many professionals that are out of jobs and on unemployment insurance at the present time?

MR. NOTLEY: As a result of this government's policies.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, just for clarification, I'm somewhat curious as to where the hon. member is picking up labor stats as of today. I'd be interested in knowing whether he's quoting Stats Canada with these figures. Before I respond, what is his source? [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: I think we're going to get into an exchange of statistics and opinions about statistics. With respect to the hon. minister, it would seem to me that the substance of the question is: what is being done about unemployment among professionals.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, if it is the ruling of the Chair that we ignore the preamble, which I would question the accuracy of . . .

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The minister acts like a smart aleck in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. SPEAKER: He has a responsibility . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. There's nothing smart alecky about questioning statistics. We all know that they are selected and they may or may not be up to date. If the hon. minister wishes, would he proceed with his answer.

DR. BUCK: He has a job. He doesn't have to worry.

MR. ISLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A number of times in the House I've reviewed — and I'm sure that's not what the member is searching for — direct job creation activities this government has carried on. I've reviewed the impact of the \$1.9 billion capital budget on some of the professionals he has expressed concern about. I've had discussions with organizations such as the Engineering Institute of Canada. They're very receptive to a program being carried on by my colleague the Hon. Horst Schmid, dealing with exporting engineering technology. Some companies have had a fair degree of success at it.

There are a number of things going on, but the bottom line — and I would remind the hon. member that he indicates that he believes in the private sector — is that we're only going to get a healthy economy, where all these people are back working, once we get that private-sector engine moving again.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, it was this government, with its 1981 agreement, that destroyed it in the first place.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member wishes to debate that topic, would he kindly put it on the Order Paper in the usual way.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. minister is: what types of programs, plans, or initiatives are being taken at this time to prevent the brain drain away from this province that's going to occur? What assurance can the minister give that he's doing something about this loss of great potential of human resources in this province?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I just indicated one specific program, aimed at this recognized quality of brains and technical ability we have, that is being operated under one of my colleague's departments and is going very successfully. I've indicated the very extensive capital program this province is carrying on this year which provides work opportunities for a number of these professionals. I could review specific programs carried on by Alberta Manpower in assisting them in getting jobs and relocating and in getting job opportunities. But again, I repeat that to bring back a healthy employment environment, we've got to bring back health to the private sector, and our key role as government has to be creating the environment under which that develops.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has the hon. Minister of Manpower met with other groups besides just engineers, I believe the minister mentioned; for example, accountants, chemical engineers, architects, electrical engineers, a number of different petroleum engineers, and a number of other professional groups? Has the minister taken time to meet with other

groups besides just the one, to show there is a concern by this government for those professional people who are now on unemployment insurance?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, at this point in time I believe I can state that I have either met with or have a meeting set up with any group that has indicated a desire to meet with me to discuss manpower issues, and also a few groups I have taken the initiative to meet with.

MR. McPHERSON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, on a matter related to unemployment. My question is directed to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Has the minister had an opportunity to develop any kind of estimates in relation to the man-hours that will be prompted by the recent announcement of the development drilling incentive program and the oil and gas servicing incentive program?

MR. SPEAKER: A question that asks for statistics — I suppose that if by some outside chance the hon. minister has those statistics, he might give them briefly.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, while I am unable to provide the specific detail the hon. member's question suggests, I should indicate that the 1982 development drilling and well servicing program resulted in some 2,140 wells being drilled as a direct result of that \$250 million program. As members will be aware, the 1983 program is modified and in fact is a \$100 million program. We expect that a commensurate level of activity will be spurred on as a direct result of that program, which has been well received by industry. The applications are flowing into the department, and we look forward to it having a very beneficial effect on the drilling industry on this province.

#### **Calgary Day Care Centre**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Is the minister in a position to advise if an operating licence was provided by his department to the Calgary Montessori International Day Care, which is owned by members of an organization called the Church Universal and Triumphant?

DR. WEBBER: I have difficulty recalling whether or not an actual licence was issued for the particular centre the member is referring to. I'd have to take it as notice. I also recall that possibly that centre didn't get started but, again, I'd like to take it as notice.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister also find out if the day care was located in a motel in Calgary? And a supplementary question — I take it the nod is that he will do it. In looking into this, would the minister also find out whether his officials, in deciding to license this day care — if they did — assess whether or not the teachings of the church regarding a great white brotherhood of ascended masters, who include Christopher Columbus and Merlin the magician, were part of the program of instruction?

DR. WEBBER: The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood — it's baffling how he comes up with these things. But certainly I'll check into it. [interjections]

MR. MARTIN: I think you'll find it's true. Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Flowing from this, will the minister reassess a recommendation of the 1977 ministerial task force on day care — I believe it's on pages 44 and 45 — which called for a day care staff licensing board and a minimum number of trained and licensed staff at each day care in the province?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I don't respond anxiously to review everything the hon. member puts forth, but I'll make a reference to that and see what's there.

MR. MARTIN: I really do appreciate the co-operation today, and I'll ask one other supplementary question on this. Can the minister advise as to the current status of the September 1980 announcement regarding a trained staff registry, and is any consideration being given to reinstating such a registry in the regulations? It was an announcement made by the previous minister in 1980.

DR. WEBBER: No, there is no intention to move forward with that registry in the short term.

#### **Postsecondary Financing**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Advanced Education has to do with the increased enrolment at all our postsecondary educational institutions. Can the minister indicate if the special grant of \$10.4 million will be incorporated into the institutions' base operating grants, or is it just a one-shot deal that the institutions will not look forward to as part of their general operating base?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister: yes, what? [interjections]

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes to the first part of the question. It will be incorporated into their annual grant but not under the base grant.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that our institutions are for all intents and purposes filled to capacity, can the minister indicate if the department is giving consideration to the implementation of policies to use the institutions year-round or possibly on a 24-hour basis, using the physical plants on an around-the-clock basis?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, certainly most of the boards of governors who have the responsibility for accommodating the growth, in terms of the internal allocation of resources and manpower and the systems they are using, have examined several options for dealing with both the experienced number of students who have shown up in institutions and the anticipated increase which we expect in the September intake. As to a series of options, I don't think we've gone to the extent of contemplating 24-hour operations in all aspects of advanced education institutions. I should note that it is normal for such things as computer facilities and other systems which are essentially on-line or not dependent upon human input or function to be used on a 24-hour basis. However, it is to be expected that as the continued number of students show up this September, as we antic-

ipate and forecast and as we have funded, I would imagine additional use of facilities would be expected.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, has the minister had any discussions with the universities as to using the physical plant and instructors on a year-round basis, rather than having them basically vacant the four months during the summer?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I think it's safe to say that certainly in the case of universities, they consider they work on a year-round basis. I think most academics believe they have a routine which provides for a regular holiday schedule. In fact, most educational institutions, such as the University of Alberta, operate not just a winter program but a spring and summer program, which essentially uses the full year which is available to academics and students.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In light of the fact that many people who are presently unemployed have gone back to universities and other postsecondary institutions, can the minister indicate that he and the institutions will look at a program, albeit a short program, where they will use the facilities on a 24-hour and year-round basis, as a short-term, interim basis?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, first of all we have in fact investigated that possibility. Not only have we investigated it, we have reinforced the position of increased students by providing special assistance to universities to allow them to accommodate this higher intake of students. Secondly, we have made it easier for the increased number of students to return to universities by expanding, on behalf of the province of Alberta, our student assistance programs.

So in that sense we first recognize the joint responsibility which the government, the universities, and the advanced educational institutions have. We recognize our responsibility to students to ensure that they have an opportunity, in this hiatus, to advance their education and to update their skills. Finally, I am sure — and I can speak with some degree of certainty — that the boards of governors themselves are attempting to accommodate this growth internally in a series of ways, such as the allocation of time and the reallocation of space, and are in fact accommodating the growth in that fashion. If the member is suggesting that we should be working 24 hours a day in all faculties, including dentistry, I'd be glad to recommend that to his dean.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the flippant Minister of Advanced Education. In light of the fact that many students cannot get summer jobs, can the minister indicate if he has had discussion with any, or at least some, of the professional faculties, to look at their going on a year-round basis rather than taking four months off, because these students can't get jobs anyway? Has he had any consultation with these professional groups to see if that would be a suggestion from them, or would the minister make a suggestion?

MR. JOHNSTON: As usual, Mr. Speaker, it's easier to identify the problem than to make serious recommendations, and that's what the member has done. I've already attempted to answer it as seriously as I can. We are

looking at ways in which we can accommodate that growth, and we will continue to do so.

#### **Water Wells**

MR. ALGER: Mr. Speaker, you never miss the water till the well goes dry. [interjections] Can the Minister of the Environment inform the Assembly if there are legal limits to the amount of water that can be extracted from any given water well, particularly in farming and ranching territory?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member's position at the bottom of the well was unassailable, but his position in asking for a legal opinion is not quite that sound.

MR. ALGER: Mr. Speaker, if I repeat the question without the word "legal" in it, will I get my point across? [laughter]

MR. SPEAKER: It isn't everything that lacks the word "legal" that is respectable.

MR. ALGER: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of the Environment: are there limits of water that can be extracted from a given water well, particularly in farming and ranching territory?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, the ground water Act of the province provides for the licensing of withdrawal from aquifers.

MR. ALGER: Mr. Speaker, if the water is to be used for recreational rather than domestic use, should not that well be given a very limited allowable production?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, there are priorities with regard to the withdrawal of water, and recreational withdrawal doesn't have as high a priority as domestic.

MR. ALGER: A supplemental question, Mr. Speaker. At what point does the water resources department of this province feel that one is infringing on the production from one of your neighbor's wells? I shouldn't think they would wait for a neighbor's well to go dry before they would stop the production of water from a given well.

MR. SPEAKER: I assume the hon. member to be asking on a matter of government policy.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I guess I have some difficulty with the question, but I will attempt to answer it. There are provisions in the ground water Act with regard to withdrawals, and each licence source has a limit on the rate at which it can withdraw. If the department receives complaints with regard to a certain withdrawal, they will take action and investigate.

#### **Calgary Board of Education Meeting**

MR. LEE: Mr. Speaker, I too have a very deep subject. However, my question is for the Minister of Education. Did the hon. minister meet with elected representatives of the Calgary Board of Education on April 27, and was the meeting a secret gathering?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I met with the chairman, the past chairman, and the superintendent of the Calgary

Board of Education on that date. The meeting was held at their request. I don't consider it to have been a secret meeting. My position is that I will meet with the chairman of any board at any time that is mutually convenient.

MR. LEE: Mr. Speaker, at that meeting, did the minister negotiate any trade-offs to protect the Sunalta or Chief Crowfoot schools from possible changes in provincial school closure guidelines?

MR. KING: No, Mr. Speaker. As I said, I was asked by the chairman of the board if I would meet with him, and we had the meeting. There was discussion about school closure situations in Calgary. I might add that there was discussion as well about the urban transportation funding program as it applies to Calgary. But as far as I am concerned, there was nothing more than discussion. There were no negotiations. To anticipate what might be a supplementary question, there was certainly no agreement reached on any matter whatsoever.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Camrose, followed by the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask another question of the Minister of Utilities and Telecommunications. But after 15 minutes of trying to draft a question that would meet with your approval, I've given up; I'll pass. [laughter]

MR. SPEAKER: If it will make the hon. member feel better, may I suggest that his very kindly observation has duly subdued me.

MR. NOTLEY: I'm glad to hear that, Mr. Speaker.

#### **Infant Death Investigation**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question, if I may, to the hon. Attorney General. It is with respect to the tragic death of a baby by morphine injection. Could the Attorney General advise the Assembly when the department was made aware of the circumstances surrounding this death?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in February of this year.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the hon. minister advise the Assembly on what basis that information was made available, who made it available, and what steps have been taken subsequent to that information being made available?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the information was made available to the Medical Examiner's office in Edmonton in the usual way, to my knowledge, by way of the hospital providing that information. The course of investigation procedure following that is the one that's always followed. The Medical Examiner took the matter in hand and completed an investigation.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to outline to the Assembly whether any charges are being considered at this time?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, it's a little too soon to say whether charges are being considered. The information that's available as a result of the investigation is being very carefully examined and assessed.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. What consultation, if any, has there been between the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the Attorney General's Department on this matter?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the word "complication" arises here.

MR. NOTLEY: Consultation.

MR. CRAWFORD: It was consultation? The investigating agency, the police, would have spoken to persons who are members of the college, in the sense of having spoken to medical practitioners. At this time I'm not aware of whether or not they have spoken in an official way to staff persons at the college.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I think the minister has indicated that he wasn't surprised that a four-month delay occurred in the reporting and that these things happen in large institutions. I wonder if the minister could confirm that kind of comment that has been made. Are there other situations in large institutions where things like this have been brought to the minister's attention that we're not aware of in this Legislature?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, it often happens that when information that is of such value as it results in an investigation of some alleged misconduct taking place, it is some time before it reaches the proper authorities. I indicated earlier — not in the House, but I'm pleased to add it to the answer in response to the hon. member's question — that I'm not saying that no errors or mistakes have been made or anything like that when something like that happens. What I'm saying is that in large institutions, it can and does happen.

#### **Calgary Day Care Centre** (continued)

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to provide the answer to the earlier question from the Member for Edmonton Norwood. With regard to the day care centre in Calgary, they met all the criteria required, so a licence was issued. They were operating in a motel, but the motel operator has since asked them to vacate. Third, the department has indicated to the operators that their licence is null and void as a result of their move, which is standard procedure. The officials in the department did assess whether the teachings of the church were to be part of their day care program. They assured the department that they would be using the Montessori teaching method — perfectly acceptable — and would not be using their church teachings.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister. If he doesn't know the answer, I'd like him to get back on it. Is the Pan-American degree of Montessori, based in Mexico City, an acceptable Montessori training program for the provincial government?

DR. WEBBER: I can check it, Mr. Speaker. I indicated that the Montessori method was acceptable. I wasn't aware that there was a Pan-American branch to it.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, again on behalf of the Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray, I'm pleased to introduce 21 grade 5 students from the Dr. Clark school in Fort McMurray. They are located in the public gallery and are accompanied by teachers Earl Choldin and Miss Lois Hill; parents Mrs. Evelyn Jesson, Mrs. Faye Rose, and Mrs. Elaine Pike; and bus driver Jake Mijic. I ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the House.

#### head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

17. Moved by Mr. Hyndman:

Be it resolved that the messages of His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, the Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure, 1983/84, and all matters connected therewith, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

[Motion carried]

18. Moved by Mr. Hyndman:

Be it resolved that the Assembly do resolve itself into Committee of Supply, when called, to consider the 1983/84 Estimates of Proposed Investments (II) of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division.

[Motion carried]

#### head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

#### Department of the Environment

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, I had asked . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if we could have a little bit less noise in the background, so we can hear the proceedings.

MR. MARTIN: . . . the minister some questions. I'm sure he still remembers them. He was going to reply when we were cut off. I would like the minister to do that. If he can't recall them, I will go back over them.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe the hon. member concluded last night with a couple of questions, one with regard to the enforcement strategy of the province and the other related to his perception of activities of certain members of the department. Both those questions

were repeats of questions asked by the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry, and I believe I dealt with them in my remarks on May 6.

MR. MARTIN: I'd like to just follow up on that point, if I can, and get some comments from the minister. As I was saying, I think I saw the minister nodding his head last night. Maybe he was just falling asleep; I'm not sure. But I thought he was agreeing with me at the time. [interjection] That's right. He'd even live through your speeches, Mr. Adair.

The point I was trying to make last night was that in the province of Alberta, there seems to be a credibility problem in this department. I'm not blaming it all on this minister. I think there were some rather strange comments made by the previous minister. In a study I've looked at, Mr. Chairman, one of the things they believe is that the government is just not measuring up. The average public does not believe that the Department of the Environment is really serious about protecting the environment. It goes back through a number of cases, some that the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry made, about the department's failure to enforce its regulations. I think the statement made was: we prefer to work with the polluters.

The point I was trying to make — and I'll ask it directly in a minute — is that surely it is the Department of the Environment's responsibility to actually enforce the law. I believe that the department's credibility would improve immensely if they would just enforce the law. There's nothing wrong with the standards, generally, that we have in the province, Mr. Chairman, but there is a failure to enforce the law. As a result, there is a credibility gap throughout the environmental groups, certainly, and I believe throughout the public at large.

It affects us in many ways. First of all, the public doesn't believe that we're serious about the environment. You're not going to get the best people wanting to work with the Department of the Environment, because they figure their talents would be wasted. The third aspect of it is how do you expect the companies — if they know that the Department of the Environment is not serious about it, then surely they're not going to bother obeying the law, because it costs them money. I think the Member for Edmonton Glengarry made that, and I was hoping he would make it again. Obviously he's been talking to some of the same groups that we have. One of the questions I would then ask the minister is: will it be this minister's policy to actually enforce the law, instead of working with the polluters?

The other question I asked last night had to do with parts of his department. I asked the question, when will the dam builders in the department be shifted to a construction-oriented department? I made the point that it seems to me that that makes the department a little schizophrenic, because people that are oriented to dam building are not going to have the same orientation as people whose background is to protect the environment. It seems to me that it would be appropriate that the dam builders, if you like — that that part of it be shifted over to another construction-oriented department. I ask the minister directly if they've had some discussion, if they're looking at moving that part of it over to another department.

The other thing I noticed from the first day of estimates — I believe it's on page 752 of *Hansard*, where the Member for Edmonton Glengarry also asked the minister to name the bad actors for air quality in the province. I



suggest that this is not an unreasonable request. If at the very least we're not going to enforce the law, surely some embarrassment of people who deliberately break the law, day in and day out, month in and month out, year in and year out ... As the previous minister said, we prefer to work with them. If we're not going to enforce the law, perhaps at least letting people know and making it public would have some effect. That would be a minimum step.

The other point the hon. Member for Edmonton Glenarry made and that I think is correct is that companies should not be responsible for monitoring themselves. That's an unreasonable thing to ask of the companies. Obviously they're going to see what they want to see, if it's going to cost them money. Their role is to make a buck. They're certainly not going to monitor themselves in a fair way. We couldn't expect them to. I think that comes back to the Department of the Environment doing this and doing it more effectively. I believe we do have some of the answers.

Going back then, I could put three questions directly to the minister. One, are we going to start enforcing the law in terms of pollution standards? Number two, if not, if we prefer to still work with the polluters, would the minister publicly name the so-called bad actors for air quality in the province, which may have an effect and make them obey the law? Thirdly, is the minister taking a look at shifting some of the dam-building aspects out of his department into another more construction-oriented department?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe I responded to the nature of the questions on May 6, and I refer the member to pages 851 and 852 of *Hansard*.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, while my colleague reviews *Hansard*—we have the *Hansards* here, Mr. Minister. If there are certain areas that were not covered, my colleague may come back. However, in addressing a few thoughts to the committee, I'd like to move into a slightly different area of the Department of the Environment, one that is somewhat related when my colleague mentioned the dam builders. It seems to me that one of the matters—and I'm glad the hon. Member for Chinook is in his place, because there are really two places where one can talk about water management. One is under Executive Council, because of our new water commission, but the other is when we assess the estimates of the Department of the Environment.

I'd frankly have to say to members of the committee and in arguing this case I'd be less than honest if I didn't tell you, Mr. Chairman, and other members of the committee, that I am mirroring the views of people in northwestern Alberta on the issue of water diversion. I think I mentioned last night during estimates that I had occasion several weeks ago to speak in Grande Prairie to a meeting of engineers and geophysicists. There may have been some difference over what the department should or should not be doing in handling water control procedures as far as the Wapiti River was concerned. But there was no serious difference on the prime topic of the evening, which was whether there should be significant interbasin transfer of water.

For a long time, we've known that there are those within the department who have been quite upfront about their position in favor of massive interbasin transfer of water. We had the PRIME project, which in the late '60s and the first months of 1970-71 still seemed to have the blessing of the government—a massive project which

would transfer water from the northern river basins to the southern part of Alberta and Saskatchewan. Two years ago, in 1981, when this matter became the subject of a good deal of controversy in the House, the Premier indicated that massive interbasin transfer was still not government policy.

Mr. Chairman, as we review the estimates of the Department of the Environment, especially now that we have the chairman of the water commission here with us, it seems to me that we are looking at an issue which is perhaps as important as any other in the province of Alberta. We can talk all we like about oil and gas, but the proper utilization of our water is one of the most fundamental and important responsibilities that this committee, this government, and this Legislature have to handle.

The long-standing demand—and I've met with the association of irrigation districts in Brooks—of people in the irrigation areas of the province has been for more water. I'm very proud of what we've been able to do in the irrigation districts in Alberta. I think most Albertans would be proud of the work of our irrigation districts and of people in those regions. But I feel very strongly that the best way to deal with this important part of the provincial economy is to recognize that irrigation must expand on the basis of proper utilization of water within the basins as opposed to interbasin transfer.

I know there are dreamers who have hopes of what we could do in southern Alberta if we simply shifted water from the north to the south. Those of us who are northern MLAs have to frankly admit that we have a certain bias. I would be less than honest if I didn't say that the feeling of Peace River residents, regardless of party, is very strongly opposed to interbasin transfer. The position is that rather than shipping water south, rather than seeing this major region of the province becoming, if you like, the hewers of wood and the drawers of water in a literal sense, it's important to bring people and industry north. It's important to expand agricultural development in northern Alberta. The costly proposition of shipping water south, from any cost/benefit analysis that you may want to seek, just simply doesn't make sense.

Mr. Chairman, that doesn't mean that we shouldn't properly utilize the South Saskatchewan River system, the Red Deer and the North Saskatchewan systems. What it does say is that northerners at least—and as a representative MLA from northern Alberta, northern MLAs are not in favor of any long-term resurrection, in whatever form, of the PRIME project. I just simply want to underscore that, because it is a matter which is not only strongly felt but passionately felt in northern regions.

Having made those comments, Mr. Chairman, let's look at what is possible within the river basins. I suppose one option, as we look at the Oldman system, is to follow the advice of those who would argue that a dam should be built either on the reserve or at the Three Rivers site. As I recollect, Mr. Chairman, the burden of the Environment Council of Alberta recommendations was that we should upgrade the irrigation system, particularly the Lethbridge Northern system, and make better use of the water within southern Alberta rather than getting ourselves trapped into the concept of a massive physical structure to dam water.

All one has to do is look at some of the memos of two years ago, one of which from Mr. Melnychuk indicated that the site of the Dickson dam, which the hon. Member for Little Bow raised last night in this committee, was

chosen at least in part so it could fit in with the province's eventual objective of water diversion. Here is a responsible member of the civil service writing that kind of memo. The information that was tabled in this House in 1981, even the final recommendation of — I believe it was — the water committee, was that the Dunvegan dam should be reviewed from the perspective of how it would fit into water transfer, how the high dam, the medium dam, or the low dam would fit in. The observation in the report was that the low dam wouldn't fit because it would take too much power to raise the water into the lift. The high dam would make more sense because there would be less of a distance to raise the water. It wouldn't take quite as much power to get the water into the ditch to transfer it to the Smoky, then from the Smoky to the Athabasca, from the Athabasca to the North Saskatchewan, and down to southern Alberta.

Mr. Chairman, the reason my colleague raises the question of whether the dam builders are still in charge of the department is that we have at least some considerable evidence that if they're not in charge of the department, they at least have an awful lot to say. We have the Paddle River dam which defies all common sense, notwithstanding the representation from the hon. Member for Barrhead. We have the Red Deer dam — and I've travelled out and looked at the Dickson site, a very questionable place to put a dam. Without resurrecting the debate that occurred in this House in 1977 and '78, certainly that construction site is clear evidence that the dam builders are still very powerful in the department.

Now we have what appears to be a predisposition to pursue the construction of a dam on the Oldman system, either at Three Rivers or Brocket. I'd like the minister to perhaps be a little more definitive than he was. I have *Hansard*. There were certain observations he made in *Hansard* in May. He indicated he'd get back to us. I'd like to know the updated cost of the Three Rivers site. I'm sure the minister would have that information. What in fact would be the cost if we get into a major dam project at Three Rivers?

Secondly, the minister also suggested that he'd get back to us with respect to the public information and public hearing processes on the entire South Saskatchewan River system. What are we going to do on that, Mr. Chairman? I realize that we have an apportionment agreement with the province of Saskatchewan, so it's not just a question of what we do in Alberta. There are interprovincial implications that have to be kept in mind as well. But as a member who has never failed to vote for appropriations for irrigation rehabilitation and for the heritage trust fund investment in improving the irrigation system, I simply say to members of the committee that from all the evidence I've been able to see, I still argue that that system must be strengthened and refurbished so that we utilize the precious water resource we have in southern Alberta in the most efficient way possible, not get ourselves short-circuited into the tempting alternative of just simply shipping water south.

The other observation I'd like to make when we discuss the estimates of the Department of the Environment, Mr. Chairman, is that we have these interesting formulas which develop over the years in government programs. I've never been able to really quite appreciate how it is possible that we have an 86:14 formula — I believe it is — not for main projects but subsidiary canals and this kind of thing in the irrigation districts; yet when it comes to water resource projects, we used to have a 50:50 formula. Members in this House thought we had

achieved a great step forward when we changed it from 50:50 to 75:25. I don't know; unless there's some important distinction I've missed, it seems to me ... If we can pick up 86 per cent of the cost to transfer water to an area of land, plus all the costs associated with the management of a river system so we even have water for irrigation, why are we in a position where we're saying to northern farmers who need drainage — we've got land that could be brought into production. But the minister well knows when he looks over his department that we've got scores of projects left in limbo. Where are we going to get the 25 per cent at the local level in order to get these water resource projects under way?

I would argue to the minister in committee that there has to be some reconciliation of these policies. We've been saying it now for a long time. I remember members on both sides of the House raising this issue back in the mid-70s, shortly after the heritage trust fund was established. We still haven't made any progress. We still have a totally different formula for draining water than we have for bringing water to a parcel of land. I simply say to the minister that surely if we can have a buck-is-a-buck approach in international trade regardless of who we're trading with — send oil to Chile so it can be used in tanks. If that's our policy, then surely we can at least make sure the same conditions apply to drainage in the north as to irrigation in the south.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

As I consider the estimates this year, Mr. Chairman, I would argue to the minister that that's one of the areas we've allowed to slide over in the past. But I think it's high time we saw some changes. With a new minister, now is the time to look at where we can make changes in policy direction. As my colleague pointed out, the present minister's predecessor didn't have the strongest record in the world. With a new minister, we now have an opportunity to turn over a new leaf. I hope we can do so.

So I would like the minister to outline what he proposes to do to reconcile the difference in formulas between 86:14 and 75:25. I would like the minister to publicly rule out any interbasin transfer. I'd like the minister to update the now projected costs of a dam at Three Rivers and to follow up on the commitment he made a few weeks ago to give us some indication of what process, if any, there will be for public participation in the South Saskatchewan River hearings.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

MR. MARTIN: I'll hear the answers.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, it seems that every time the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview wishes to discuss the matter of water resources, he brings out this old document called PRIME and tries to attach it to the policy of the Conservative government of this province. This matter with regard to PRIME, massive interbasin transfer, was dealt with in the House on November 27, 1981, and the current policy of the government — this has been stressed many times, and I stress it again so the hon. member will perhaps hear this time — is not to look at massive interbasin transfer of waters. Our policy is to manage our water resources within the basin in which they originate, and that is the policy direction with which the government is proceeding.

However, that does not rule out that there would be transfers within river basins. There are a number of what we would describe as interbasin transfers. The Vegreville corridor water line, for example, would be an interbasin transfer of water which I think one would justify. But in terms of the historical document which the member raises, PRIME, there is no consideration of that policy direction at this point in time in terms of directions I or the government has given. I think those questions were answered on November 27.

The hon. member requested some other information, particularly with the Oldman River project and the over-all irrigation project. I'm sure the hon. member is aware that in 1980 the government announced a \$334 million Heritage Savings Trust Fund project with regard to irrigation rehabilitation. The priority of that program was directed at efficiency of use of water, rehabilitation of existing systems, improvement of canals, et cetera. That is the funding which has been allocated through the Heritage Savings Trust Fund and, I believe, was discussed at great length during the estimates of the capital projects division of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund earlier this spring. That was the commitment. I've also discussed the status of the Oldman project in terms of the site of a reservoir and explained that process during the trust fund capital projects division estimates and again with regard to a question from the Member for Little Bow.

Specifically, the hon. member requested updated costs. We do not have updated costs with regard to that project at this time. With regard to the Oldman River dam site at Three Rivers, there are updated costs with regard to the Brocket site, which were done by PFRA as part of the Peigan development area proposal.

MR. NOTLEY: What are they?

MR. BRADLEY: For the Brocket site, \$186 million.

With regard to the South Saskatchewan, I can't provide the hon. member with any further information than that which I provided at the last opportunity. The public participation aspect of that basin study has not yet been determined, but the commitment has been made that there would be opportunity for public input and review prior to policy options being decided.

With regard to the 86:14 formula, that is used by the Department of Agriculture, not by the Department of the Environment. I believe that question was also raised at the time the capital projects division estimates came forward. I don't believe I can make any further comment. The formula is up for review in 1985, I believe, but that matter would have to be asked directly of the Minister of Agriculture. The Department of the Environment does have a 75:25 formula with regard to drainage and other river engineering projects. Water projects in the province are cost-shared 75:25 with municipalities. In other areas, if there is a major undertaking, the province will fund up to 100 per cent of such costs in some of these projects.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, just to follow that along for a moment or two. It's interesting that the Minister of Agriculture just entered the House. What we really have is one department with one formula and the other department with another. But the net result is that instead of being left high and dry, we in northern Alberta are left low and wet, because we're caught with a formula that I think is inequitable.

I say to the minister that it isn't good enough to argue that that's the Minister of Agriculture's responsibility.

This is government. I hear tell that it's a team. I hear tell we even have a little review committee to deal with federal Conservative candidates. So because it's all part of a team, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of the Environment, since they're not only seatmates but represent ridings adjacent to one another, could attempt to reconcile the difference between the funding for irrigation districts, 86:14, and the 75:25 split. I think the Minister of Agriculture has a not bad formula, and that what is necessary is for the Minister of the Environment to upgrade the formula for water resource management and drainage in northern Alberta. I might say that I suspect — we'd never hear it in this House; it's so partisan — that the same sentiments are lurking in the heart of the odd northern Tory backbencher.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move to a slightly different area. The minister mentioned, when he responded to my remarks, that there are certainly types of diversion. I think he mentioned the trunk line that takes water from the North Saskatchewan to a number of communities east of Edmonton. We have, I believe, the utilization of the Red Deer so that water can be taken south to places like Innisfail, Olds, and other communities.

Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to share with members of the committee — I think this is the appropriate place to do it — some of the problems of communities in the Peace when it comes to a potable drinking water. It's rather strange and ironic that in an area of the province where — I believe in the Peace River system we have as much water going down the Peace as all the other river systems in the province combined. The irony is that we do not have adequate supplies of drinking water. In most places, the communities have to get their water from surface run-off and, if there isn't sufficient run-off, we have very serious water problems. For example, there is some real concern in the town of Fairview this summer. If it's a dry summer, we're not at all sure that there will be sufficient water. Believe it or not, Mr. Chairman, at this time there has already been water rationing in Fairview. Last year in the community of Spirit River, we had to raid 27 dugouts in order to maintain the water system for the town of Spirit River.

So, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that one of the things we might look at, bearing in mind the experiences of Red Deer and also the line east of Edmonton — I'd like the minister to perhaps outline for the committee whatever information he has about the relative success of these projects — would be a similar project for the north and central Peace, drawing water from the Peace River. If we're going to do that, Mr. Chairman, we should do it relatively quickly, because all these communities are now in the process of scouting around, desperately searching for alternative water sources. We have various engineering firms making proposals. We have the town of Fairview looking at going to the Hines Creek. That might be all right for the town of Fairview, but it still leaves Hines Creek, Bluesky, Whitelaw, Brownvale, Grimshaw, and Berwyn without adequate water services.

It seems to me, Mr. Minister, that this year it might be well worth while for the department to commission a fairly serious study of whether it wouldn't make sense to do in that region of the province the same sort of thing that has been done in the Vegreville area east of Edmonton. I wonder if the minister could report to the House. I know we had some questions in the House the other day about the system and the water rate. I've contacted the department myself because of interest in the issue. But it

seems to me that the system is working quite well if it's working quite well in an area where you have substantial ground water, at least by comparison to the Peace.

Members from other parts of the province are probably not aware of the fact we have virtually no water wells in the entire Peace River region. I remember with some degree of humor, being out in a place called Bear Canyon a couple of years back. A lady came up with great excitement and said, we found a well, and we only had to dig 800 feet. To somebody born and raised in central Alberta where you dig 30 or 40 feet and get good water, the idea of somebody being excited about digging a well 800 feet and finally having well water is really quite remarkable. So I would say to the minister, and I make this in the form of a representation, that one of the areas where I think we could usefully expand the concept of the water board east of Edmonton — the same system, as I understand it, as in the central Alberta region — would be in the Peace.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'll take the hon. member's representation under consideration. I would indicate, however, that the Department of Utilities and Telecommunications now has involvement and responsibility with regard to regional water and sewer lines.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, I have reviewed *Hansard* and will admit there are some answers there. I would say that they're not acceptable, but I guess that's as good as I'm going to get in that area.

Also in reviewing *Hansard*, a couple of questions, if I can move the minister back to Kinetic. There still seem to be some questions that were not answered. Specifically, I mentioned the middle warehouse. Mr. Chairman, it floods periodically and has been pumped out — these are our facts, and we've confirmed them — at least once or twice, probably more. It's been pumped out onto the pavement where it runs off-site. That's probably what we're picking up in terms of off-site contamination. Of course, that ties into the perimeter dam we discussed yesterday. One question I asked the minister, and did not get a reply to, had to do with where these contaminants are going. Apparently they've been trucked off again, at least once or twice. My question directly to the minister once again is what effort has the department made to track this trucking of contaminated water? Could the minister bring us up to date if they do know where it was trucked to, if they know how many times it was trucked out? I guess I'd have to ask questions from there if the minister knows that.

The other thing comes back to financial capabilities. I know the minister said it looked like they were doing some revitalization, that they were re-forming their company, but he wasn't very clear about it. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that if they are unable to provide the facilities that they now need — a perimeter dam and some awning to prevent water from collecting in the small warehouse where it becomes contaminated; that's a known fact also — I suggest that we're having problems there right now.

The second question I direct to the minister is, why is the department so lax in investigating Kinetic and insisting that the repairs be made right now? Mr. Chairman, the only assumption I can come to is that the company can't afford it at this point. If they can't afford to upgrade what they have right now and we're talking about them being involved in a much more massive way later on, I think we have serious difficulties. That's the second ques-

tion I'd ask the minister directly.

I think the other area to come back to is the whole sour gas development. I know the minister has said that our record is good compared to other provinces and that we don't need a full-scale inquiry, if I read what the minister is saying correctly. But I think we have to look at the fact that there is a lot of gas in this province. We've had discussions with the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Mr. Chairman, and he says there is a lot of surplus gas here. If the gas markets improve, as the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources is hoping and saying they will in the future — we had the big sell-out to the United States a while ago, because we were going to improve the markets — it says something to us about the environment and sour gas development again. The fact is that if the gas markets improve, we're again going to have a boom in sour gas development, much more than we have right now. It would be too late for an inquiry to look into the health effects.

If I can put it this way, I think the one advantage we had with Lodgepole is that we could begin to find out what is happening, in terms of both environment and health standards. It seems to me that we are fairly lax here in not looking into it. This is the next question I would direct to the minister. There have been reports — and I'm sure the minister has heard them — of changes in characteristics of the placenta in babies now being born in Edmonton, that were conceived before the Lodgepole blowout. These are medical doctors saying that. Whether or not this is true, I don't know. But when medical doctors are saying this, surely it's worth looking into. I know the member from Delburne knows more than medical doctors. He's saying b.s., but that's typical of backbenchers when they don't know anything.

I ask if the government is taking steps to record any evidence in the city's obstetrics units, and if not why not? These people are not saying this frivolously. I ask that question, but it brings me back to the overall point. Because of the tragedy of Lodgepole, Mr. Minister, we have an opportunity to find out what's going on. If we wait until we're into massive development of the gas industry again, it's going to be too late. If some tragedy strikes later on around Calgary, as my colleague has talked about, then it's going to be too late. We're all going to be held responsible in this Legislature and certainly the Minister of the Environment at this particular time.

With those few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I would like the minister's answers on the three or four questions I posed.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think I have attempted to answer a number of questions with regard to Kinetic. I don't have any further comments to make with regard to that subject, except to say that Kinetic has been under very close scrutiny by the Department of the Environment in terms of its operation, and there has been ongoing monitoring. I think public servants in the department who are doing a job to the best of their abilities, would be disturbed by the remarks of the hon. member referring to laxness on their part.

Similarly, with regard to Lodgepole, I spent some time on May 2 outlining the very extensive research programs which will be undertaken by the Department of the Environment with regard to the effects of hydrogen sulphide and sulphur dioxide. Further, on May 6, I believe I presented a very comprehensive outline in a number of areas in the department's activities. Further with regard

to Lodgepole, the Department of Social Services and Community Health has undertaken a number of studies through the Provincial Board of Health, some through the College of Physicians and Surgeons, et cetera. I don't have the precise studies before me. The ERCB has commissioned further studies with regard to the inquiry they are holding. I find it difficult to accept remarks that there has been some laxness with follow-up in that area, given the very extensive amount of work that has started with regard to the inquiry and, with regard to my earlier remarks, the extensive amount of work which has been ongoing for some time with investigations and follow-up on a number of matters related to the sour gas industry.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, it's not only Kinetic, not only in terms of our figures, which we were accused of hoking up at the time. I went through this. Later on the department made a big effort through the media to dispute our figures and then came back with figures that were higher than ours. So it's clear there is off-site contamination. The minister may not term that laxness, but there is off-site contamination. We know clearly some of it's being dumped. I come back specifically to that question: is the minister aware that some of the waste has been transported out by truck? If he knows, I come back to the specific question: where is it going?

I'd like to move from there. In terms of the Lodgepole incident, I know the minister has answered. But he may not be surprised if we and most environmental groups in the province do not find the terms of reference acceptable at this time. Certainly it's legitimate to bring it up. The minister should know that people, and certainly the Official Opposition, are not satisfied with it. I mentioned it was a tragedy at the time; it's now an opportunity to run a much more comprehensive study than we're doing. I don't know why we're not. My point is — and I make it very clearly to the minister — if the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources is right and there is going to be a big increase in gas development in four years, then we are into a massive program again. It's much better to take a look into all aspects of Lodgepole now, while there's a slowdown, so we can avert that mistake later on if we get into it. I don't think there's any need to be defensive about it. It just makes good common sense at this particular time.

The other question, besides the one dealing with Kinetic, that the minister hasn't responded to was just brought to my attention. I should have brought it up before, and I apologize for that. I want to know the philosophical answer about the dam-building part of the department. Does it make sense to the minister to have dam building in his department, or would the minister bring it to the government that that should be moved into a more construction-oriented department? The minister did not refer directly to that question.

So with those remarks and a couple of direct questions to the minister, Mr. Chairman, I would like those answers. [interjection] Do you want the two specific questions? Is moving the dam builders out of the department being looked at? That should be part of a construction-oriented department rather than the Department of the Environment — what the minister feels about that or if the government is looking into it. The second specific question I asked was about trucking waste out of Kinetic. Is the minister aware of that? If he is aware of it, where did they take those wastes?

MR. BRADLEY: In responding to the questions, first of all I'd like to deal with Lodgepole. The ERCB inquiry has terms of reference which I believe are quite broad. The inquiry is being held to investigate a number of matters relating to that incident: what occurred and what other measures could be taken in the future to prevent a recurrence. That's part of the terms of reference and will be addressed by that inquiry. As I already related, there are a number of studies and investigations being done by various departments of government and commissioned by the ERCB following up that incident. Because he has made some definite statements with regard to Kinetic, if the hon. member could provide me with dates as to when these occurrences took place, I'd be pleased to follow them up and provide him with that information.

With regard to his final question, under the Water Resources Act the department has responsibility for water resources. Any projects the department has been involved with which required the construction of a reservoir or dam were related to water quality, water improvements, and environmental situations. Those are the types of dam construction the department has been involved with. If one looks at other projects with regard to the construction of reservoirs, for example hydro-electric, those are being pursued more appropriately by the Department of Utilities and Telecommunications.

MR. MARTIN: Just one supplementary question to follow-up so I'm clear. In regard to Kinetic, is the minister saying that he is not aware of any wastes that were transported out by truck?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, what I said was that if the member would provide me with the dates he suggests this occurred, I will have that reviewed and check whether the department has that information.

MR. MARTIN: Let me try to make it simple. I will do that for you. You have still evaded the question. Does the minister personally or his department — and I guess his department tell him — know of any wastes that were transported out by truck in the Kinetic situation?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I've heard the hon. member suggest it so often that I can't recollect whether I've heard this from him or from some other source. So if he could provide me with the dates and information, I'll have it reviewed and investigated, and find out whether the department has that information and how in fact they've responded to it.

MR. MARTIN: Just to follow up on that, the minister is saying he has heard it, but he's not sure from where. [interjection] I recognize that, and I'm always glad to fill the minister in what's happening in his department. Saying the minister has heard of it, did he not think this was rather a serious matter and have some of his department officials look into it? Obviously not; I guess I know the answer. Regardless of where the minister heard it — he's not sure whether it was from his department or from me from before — did he not have his officials look into it?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I asked the hon. member to provide me with the information. I'll have it looked into and respond.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I understand that one of the questions we haven't covered

is with regard to the Bow River clean-up. That's a matter I've raised in this Legislature a number of times a year ago and a year prior to that. I understand that the minister has indicated to the city of Calgary that there's no further financial assistance to help clean up the Bow River. The money committed is the extent of any moneys that will be committed by the province to the city. I understand as well that the Minister of Utilities and Telecommunications has indicated not to expect funding from the government for several years.

The cost of doing something with the Bow River is significant in terms of an upgraded sewage treatment system, somewhere around \$211 million with an annual operating cost of \$41 million. A new system for using sewage for irrigation is anywhere from a half a billion to a billion dollars, with significant operating costs each year, or a land disposal site could be anywhere from \$55 million to \$108 million, with operating costs from \$2 million to \$3 million. I understand the city of Calgary has offered to put a surcharge on sewer bills if the province would match the dollars. I wonder if that has been advanced to the minister and how the minister has responded to that suggestion.

Some of the environmental problems we have at the present time — our own Sam Livingston [Hatchery], for example, that has taken water out of the Bow. I understand that \$2.4 million is going to be spent this year to provide clean water for the fry. Some \$600,000 will be spent for a pipeline connecting the hatcheries to wells, and another \$1.8 million will be spent on ultraviolet filters to kill bacteria. At the same time, communities downstream are going to be faced with using the water that's in the Bow River. I'd like the minister to comment on the different treatment that is given to different groups. Just because this is a provincial government responsibility, does it receive preference, say, to some of the towns downstream?

We note that there are 10,000 people living within 180 kilometres downstream, 40,000 in Medicine Hat. They are quite concerned. About three weeks ago, I had a group of school students in from Medicine Hat, and they had two issues of concern. One was the pollution in the Bow River and the condition of the water when it reached Medicine Hat. They were faced with drinking and utilizing it, and felt that it certainly wasn't up to standards. I would certainly appreciate comments with regard to future plans. Is this an issue that will just sit in place because of the economic downturn? Is the cost of cleaning up the water beyond the capability of not only the province but the city? Certainly the city, as well as the province, is under financial restraints and boundaries at the present time, so we have this pollution problem.

Two or three years ago when we had more funds available, we didn't deal with it. The former minister was doing studies, looking at the dead fish count, going down the river in a row boat. But we've never come to grips with the problem. Now we're faced with economic difficulties which make the problem even more difficult for the present minister, and I have some sympathy in that sense. Even in light of these factors, what does the minister foresee happening with regard to the condition of that river? What will be done?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'll attempt not to give a lengthy response, but the question may require a few remarks. With regard to funding assistance to the city of Calgary, there is no longer an appropriation within the Department of the Environment to provide funds. That

has been transferred to Utilities and Telecommunications. With regard to any requests for funding coming to me, I have referred the city to the appropriate department to review it.

The province has provided the city of Calgary with assistance on a fifty-fifty basis with regard to phosphorous removal, some \$18 million shared with the city to remove phosphorous from their wastewater effluent. We believe that the phosphorous removal program should have a significant effect on improving the quality of water in the Bow River, but it's too early to determine that assessment. So I would have to say that in terms of any further improvements which may be considered, I think we have to await the results to see how successful phosphorous removal from the city of Calgary's effluent is, prior to looking at further expenditures in that particular area. Part of the South Saskatchewan River basin study addresses water quality in the basin, particularly in the Bow River.

The member mentioned the Sam Livingston Hatchery in Calgary. I can only relay that because of the nature and the importance of that hatchery to improving the fishery resource of the province, regardless of where that hatchery was located, the question of water quality for it would be paramount. Even water from a pristine mountain stream would be treated accordingly with ultraviolet rays. I am aware of this in terms of the Allison Creek brood trout farm in my constituency, which is on the east slopes of a spring-fed mountain reservoir. That water also has to receive ultraviolet treatment to ensure that no diseased or contaminated water gets into the fish rearing station — or in this case the fish hatchery in Calgary — that could in any way cause the fish to become diseased. So those measures would be taken regardless of the location. Although they have been raised with regard to water quality in the Bow River, I think they are extraneous and really have nothing to do with that issue. That type of treatment would take place regardless of where that facility was located.

With regard to Medicine Hat, as far as I am aware, the water which the people and citizens of Medicine Hat consume meets the Canadian water quality drinking standards.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. What type of monitoring goes on in the department with regard to the condition of the Bow River? Two or three years ago, I believe, when I wanted to check the condition of the Bow River, I had to go to the director or the doctor responsible for public health out of the Medicine Hat office. The doctor went to the various communities and did water samplings at that time. But there weren't any consistent or routine checks going on in terms of the river water. If I hadn't initiated it, I am not sure whether it would have been done or not. Since that time, interest has grown with regard to the condition of the Bow River. Is there a regular and consistent process or checking, and who does it?

MR. BRADLEY: The Department of Social Services and Community Health does, let's say, the micro-organism type of monitoring with regard to water supply. They have a provincial laboratory here in Edmonton, which looks at that end of things. In terms of other parameters, the Department of the Environment does that monitoring. In terms of the river itself, there are two permanent monitoring stations on the Bow River, which look at some 50 different parameters in terms of the chemical

analysis, and there are five other robot stations, downstream of Calgary I believe, which do some continuous monitoring of some other chemical parameters.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to follow along a little different attack. I'm sure the minister would be glad to answer a different sort of question. Does the government have any policy at all in terms of hiring former employees of waste management firms? It is my understanding — and if I'm not correct, I'm sure the minister will give me the facts — that two former Kinetic employees now work in the waste management section of the pollution control division. This does not make a lot of sense to me, in terms of the Department of the Environment. It might make good sense for Kinetic. These people will be making decisions affecting the fortunes of their former employers and probably their former friends. I guess my question is twofold. Is it in fact the case that there are two former members of Kinetic working in the waste management section of the pollution control division? Secondly, is there a policy about this, as far as the minister is aware?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe there are employees in the Department of the Environment who have come from various backgrounds, have worked for various corporations or have been in the private sector, and now work for the Department of the Environment. I see no reason, in terms of the personnel administration Act, why a person's former employment may preclude them from applying for a competitive position which the government of Alberta would advertise.

MR. MARTIN: Just to follow up, I'll try to make it fairly clear for the minister. In my understanding then, I would take it there are two former members — he didn't answer that — and there is no government policy on it, even though he didn't say it that way.

But let me explain why I think it could be a problem. If I'm working in the waste management section of the pollution control division, one of my jobs would be to make sure that certain companies are indeed following the guidelines and not making mistakes. There's certainly a punitive part to that job. They have to make sure standards are being enforced. It's not that easy to go out to a former employer where your friends more than likely are, unless they were fired. Maybe they'd want to do the job more zealously then; I don't know. But it certainly puts them in an uneasy position when they're going out to deal with friends and former employers they've set up a relationship with. The chances are that by human nature it would be easy to let something slide here and there. Does the minister not agree that that could be a problem?

MR. BRADLEY: If the hon. member has any evidence of lack of performance in terms of responsibilities of members of the public service, I would be pleased to hear it.

MR. MARTIN: The minister seems to be very defensive. I'm talking about policy. I'm not blaming the two members I know of. They're probably very able people. We're dealing with this government's guidelines, if there are any. I just put the case to the minister that, all things being equal, human beings act this way. We're bringing it back not to the employees but to a policy, if there is a policy. It's clear from the minister's answer that there isn't.

I suggest to the minister that they should take a look at

the possibility of this happening. If it did, it could be disastrous for all of us. Again, we're not shuffling it off on the employees. We're talking about government policy which the minister is in charge of in this department.

MR. BRADLEY: I think the hon. member is suggesting some very serious allegations against members of the public service. Surely anyone who is hired, regardless of their former background, et cetera, in terms of their previous employment record, should not be barred from seeking employment, if they are qualified, in any branch or agency of the provincial government. If the hon. member can come forward with some examples where members, regardless of their former employment background, are not carrying out their duties, I'll be pleased to investigate. But I believe the line of questioning is such that it suggests some people are not performing properly. If the member has some evidence of that, I'd be pleased to investigate it. [interjection] I have answered the question.

MR. MARTIN: Let me make it clear for the minister. He's getting all flustered here. He knows very well that I did not lay charges against any former member. He is well aware of that. I was talking about government policy — who they hire. Before the minister gets flustered and accuses me of all sorts of things, what we're dealing with is government policy. I threw out the thing that could happen. The minister knows full well I did. So before getting carried away, the minister should listen to the question. I was talking about a policy and I said, if this could happen. We were talking about human nature. I'm certainly not maligning any member of the public service. The minister is well aware of that.

MR. BRADLEY: Following the hon. member's logic, I suppose a teacher should not be employed by the Department of Education in any matter, because he may have to become involved in a matter which would deal directly with former colleagues he had associated with while he was a teacher. He shouldn't have a background in teaching to be in the Department of Education.

MR. MARTIN: If we want to continue this, we can go on forever. That's certainly not the point at all. There is a difference in roles here. In terms of school boards I worked for in the county of Strathcona, they have a person hired at the local board who does that. The Department of Education doesn't do that. So maybe the minister had better check out who does that. It's a very different role. We're talking about one where you're enforcing the actual departmental guidelines.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to add one comment before we finish the estimates. I'm a little surprised at the minister's response. The government may or may not like the idea of a policy on this matter, but let's not get so exercised about it that we become silly. It's a debatable proposition. The federal government has post-employment guidelines for civil servants, for example, so that for a period of two years they are not able to go into private-sector companies in the area where they had responsibility.

As far as ex-cabinet ministers at least, this government has chosen not to bring in any set of guidelines that can be argued. It can be argued on both sides. But as I see it, there is at least some argument, Mr. Chairman. Especially now that we're changing the Public Service Act, this

government has to bear responsibility for what we're doing to that Act. In more and more cases now, we're by-passing the competition route to reach into companies which may be supervised or regulated in some way by the government. I think this is a very, very dangerous precedent. My colleague and I are simply stating a concern — a concern held by many people, I think. If it's not held by this government, so be it. Perhaps that will become one of the many issues of difference between that side of the House and this side as we discuss public issues in Alberta over the next three years. But it's certainly a relevant matter to raise.

Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with one further item before we finish these estimates. We do want to have some opportunity to get back to our friend the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care before the guillotine is brought down at 5:15 this afternoon. [interjections] No, that's certainly not true, hon. member.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

Yesterday the minister indicated that:

A corporation, particularly in terms of these . . . ventures, requires some assurance that there won't be any changes to the rules of the game between them making a commitment to proceed with a project and the construction of that project, and the return which they envision for a risk investment.

Mr. Chairman, I simply say that Suncor's licence to operate is up for renewal. Just in response to the minister's answer last night, we've had a totally different situation piecewise and profitwise. It seems to me that under those circumstances, attaching more stringent conditions with respect to emission control is not unreasonable. Without repeating the arguments last night, I simply reassert that [in] the public interest, given the company's improved situation beyond any reasonable expectation at the time the plant was expanded, it's not unreasonable to insist on stronger emission control procedures when we renew the licence.

Agreed to:

1.01 — Minister's Office	\$174,536
1.02 — Deputy Minister's Office	\$442,282
1.03 — Finance and Office Services	\$2,037,748
1.04 — Systems and Computing	\$1,851,948
1.05 — Communications	[\$368,851]
1.06 — Library	\$313,677
1.07 — Personnel and Organization Development	\$515,024
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$5,704,066

2.1 — Program Support	\$639,900
2.2 — Air Quality Management	\$2,585,924
2.3 — Water Quality Management	\$2,199,546
2.4 — Municipal Water and Sewerage Management	\$2,337,579
2.5 — Earth Contamination Prevention	\$2,593,993
2.6 — Waste Management	\$6,096,471
2.7 — Chemical and Pesticide Management	\$2,175,816
Total Vote 2 — Pollution Prevention and Control	\$18,629,229

3.1 — Program Support	\$100,796
3.2 — Land Conservation and Reclamation	\$2,861,388

3.3 — Environmental Assessment	\$1,561,791
Total Vote 3 — Land Conservation	\$4,523,975

4.1 — Program Support	\$103,256
4.2 — Surface Water Development and Control	\$16,342,319
4.3 — Water Resources Administration	\$11,503,868
4.4 — Operation and Maintenance of Water Resources Systems	\$7,727,717
4.5 — Data Collection and Inventory	\$6,591,840
4.6 — Water Resources Planning and Co-ordination	\$5,740,343
4.7 — Groundwater Development	\$1,740,376
Total Vote 4 — Water Resources Management	\$49,749,719

5.1 — Environmental Research Co-ordination	\$1,665,295
5.2 — Alberta Oil Sands Environmental Research	\$1,961,579
Total Vote 5 — Environmental Research	\$3,626,874

6.1 — Administrative Support	\$2,545,449
6.2 — Environment	\$2,959,000
6.3 — Municipal Affairs	\$250,000
6.4 — Culture	\$50,000
6.5 — Recreation and Parks	\$300,000
6.6 — Energy and Natural Resources	\$2,864,000
6.7 — Utilities and Telecommunications	\$300,000
Total Vote 6 — Land Assembly	\$9,268,449

7.1 — Program Support	\$2,408,247
7.2 — Plant Sciences	\$1,616,584
7.3 — Chemistry	\$2,891,358
7.4 — Animal Sciences	\$2,624,798
7.5 — Environmental Technology	\$1,758,655
Total Vote 7 — Interdisciplinary Environmental Research and Services	\$11,299,642

Total Vote 8 — Overview and Co-ordination of Environment Conservation	\$1,367,839
---	-------------

Department Total \$104,169,793

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I move that the votes be reported.

[Motion carried]

#### Department of Hospitals and Medical Care

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, we freshly got into the discussion yesterday when unfortunately we had to adjourn because of the time. I certainly have a few observations I'd like to make with respect to this appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, if I recollect his comments, indicated that in his judgment those people who are opposing the government's user fee concept, particularly the Official Opposition, are not coming up with any proposals at all as to how we can keep costs under control in the hospital system. I really don't think the minister has been listening to the opposition any more than he's been listening to the people of Alberta. Had he been listening, he would have noted that during the discussion on supplementary appropriations, or during the initial discussion when we had the minister and his department here, both



my colleague and I made continual reference to the Alberta hospital utilization committee report.

Mr. Chairman, I don't agree with everything in this report, but frankly there are a number of observations that would go some distance to meeting the challenge the minister throws out. The minister throws out this challenge and says to those who oppose his user fee concept, come up with some ideas as to how we can keep costs under control. Then we come up with proposals that arise as a result of the minister's own blue-ribbon committee which was commissioned to look into the hospital system.

I well remember sitting in this Legislature and hearing over and over again, from both this minister and his predecessor, of the importance the government apparently was putting on this hospital utilization committee report. Yet because it contains a whole series of hot potatoes from a political point of view — at least hot potatoes that affect the right wingers — we have backed off this committee report. If this minister is serious about controlling medical care and hospitalization costs in the province of Alberta, then I challenge the minister to move quickly on the proposals in the hospital utilization report.

Mr. Chairman, the minister challenged those who oppose user fees to come up with alternatives and options. We'll just take a few moments this afternoon to do exactly that. The minister downplayed the importance of it, but this government is not prepared to bite the bullet on seat belt legislation despite the fact that very few members of this House will not privately admit that seat belt legislation is long overdue.

Of course we can always cite the exception rather than the rule. We can always cite the one case where somebody is alive today because they didn't wear a seat belt. But, Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that statistics that have been compiled are overwhelming. The evaluation of these statistics by objective analysts — not by politicians who have to face election or politicians in the heat of partisan debate in the Legislative Assembly, but by objective analysts regardless of where they sit in the political landscape, whether they're on the right or the left or in the middle of the road — clearly leads one to the conclusion that seat belt legislation in place would reduce the number of fatalities, the severity of injuries, and the kinds of injuries which lead to damage and harm which are very time consuming and costly.

We talk about the utilization of our hospitals, Mr. Chairman. You cannot sidestep the impact of the injuries caused by automobile accidents in this province. One of the reasons that in the province of Saskatchewan, many members on the government side — it was a free vote. I refer members to that occurrence in Saskatchewan. I challenge this government to at least go that far. In Saskatchewan they had a free vote. One reason that prompted most of the members of Executive Council in Saskatchewan to vote in favor of compulsory seat belt legislation was the evidence that if you want to seriously control hospital utilization costs, you've got to do something with the one area where, by provincial legislation, you can reduce the battering which occurs daily as a result of automobile accidents where physical injuries are much more severe because people aren't wearing seat belts.

Another area we have to look at is the hospital planning process, so we don't get ourselves locked into the creation of active treatment hospitals, as opposed to an integrated approach that recognizes the value of extended care and home care. One of the major advantages of an integrated system is that we do not have to use hospitals

for purposes they really aren't established for. The minister even had to admit yesterday that there are places in this province where we don't have extended care facilities, where active treatment hospitals are frankly little more than very expensive dumping grounds for people who would be better cared for in an auxiliary hospital or a nursing home. But we don't have those facilities in place. Frankly, we have many people who could be cared for much less expensively in their homes, if we beefed up home care. Of course, that's one of the observations in the utilization committee report.

The whole point I want to underline, Mr. Chairman — and perhaps in rallying the defence for this argument, I might hearken back to some of the comments my Conservative opponent raised in the 1982 election. He was raising the question of the Berwyn hospital — the new Berwyn hospital that is going to be built in Grimshaw, I might say. He was arguing that in the north Peace, rather than having all these little active treatment hospitals in every community, it would make far more sense to have regional hospitals and a complementary system of extended care facilities so we can properly plan for the hospital use and attention of residents of this province.

So, Mr. Chairman, I don't think it is adequate for the minister to stand in his place and say there have not been alternatives. Even the question of home births — I'm given to understand that in Holland, for example, more than three-quarters of births are home births. That is an option. No one is saying there has to be compulsory home births, but for many of the families who choose that route now — and more and more people are looking at it — perhaps the old adage "the more things change, the more they remain the same" is correct. When we first raised this issue during estimates, my colleague the hon. Member for Little Bow pointed out that he was born in his family home.

The point I want to make is that the use of hospitals for births around the province is a significant factor. No one is saying there has to be an iron rule that those women who would prefer to have their child born in a hospital shouldn't do so. Of course they should. But for the many who are looking at other options, it seems to me that the encouragement of home births and midwifery is one thing that is an option. You can't just reject it out of hand, throw it out, and say no, that's just a negative suggestion and we're not interested in it at all. They may or may not accept it, but it's one of the alternatives that have come forward from people, again quite apart from where they stand, even on the user fee issue.

I've raised those examples just to underscore the point my colleague and I have attempted to make from the beginning of this debate. Before the government of Alberta brings in a system of user fees which at best is a thinly disguised tax on the sick, before they challenge the federal government in an area where we might well lose, where the interpretation could go either way and the federal government could very well say that the user fee concept is so completely in contravention of federal/provincial agreements that federal funding will not be made available to the province, so that we as Albertans will in fact be cutting off our nose to spite our face — to dig up a few extra million in user fees, we risk the loss of \$.25 billion from the federal government — before we get into that mold of thinking, surely there has to be some serious examination of the options.

In trying to describe this user fee concept, the minister and various Tory backbenchers have switched ground, all the way from the hospitals are going to need the money

— we know that's nonsense, because the extra money they're going to raise is going to be relatively modest compared to the administrative and cumbersome costs of collecting it. Imagine a little hospital like Grimshaw trying to chase down somebody in Newfoundland who hasn't paid their user fee. The administrative difficulties are going to be a nightmare.

Then we had the minister suggesting that all kinds of people were abusing the emergency wards, making baby-sitting services out of hospitals. Mr. Chairman, I would challenge the minister to describe and back up the number of cases of that. Of course when you have 2 million people in the province, there's going to be some abuse. But the extent of the abuse of the hospital system in that kind of way is remote. Had it been at all prevalent, are we to think that this committee, composed of competent Albertans who have no particular axe to grind — at least I suspect they haven't, because they were chosen by this government and not by the opposition or the nasty Liberals — did not obtain in their survey of hospitals the information that people were using them for baby-sitting services? Of course they didn't. The baby-sitting argument was more a figment of the minister's political imagination than any kind of objective assessment of what is going on in hospitals in this province.

Now I hear a new argument as people get back to us with the response they're receiving from government members: the people somehow have to know the costs of this system. Mr. Chairman, that is nonsense. That's misleading nonsense. Because in no way does the user fee represent anything more than a small part of the cost. The cost of our hospital and medical care system is much greater than \$300 a family. The point is that by putting in a user fee, you are impeding access to the system. You are not conveying to people the recognition of what the real cost is. The real cost is much greater than that. If we want, in an information way, to send out once a year — because God knows, we send out enough information. If we want to add to the medicare information as to the utilization of doctors by people — the number of times you've gone to see a doctor and who you've seen — if we want to add information about the cost of operating the hospital system, frankly I would agree with that. Because I think it's probably worth people understanding the cost of operating our health system. And it is a costly proposition. But a \$20 user fee, or maybe \$17.40, \$12.80, or \$6, is not going to do that. That's nonsense, Mr. Chairman. We shouldn't be asked to accept absolute nonsense as the argument for a major change in policy direction.

Last night the Friends of Medicare held a meeting in this city. Some 300 people attended, representing various groups. One of the people speaking at the meeting was a doctor who said that the government's program is going to create all kinds of distortions in the system. Suppose one hospital has a user fee and another doesn't. You're going to have over-utilization of one and under-utilization of another. Is that the best way to plan proper utilization of hospitals? According to this doctor — and I think he was quite correct in his comment — of course not.

The point I want to make now is to get back to the basic, underlying proposition behind health care. It is a very simple one, and I'm surprised that this caucus somehow doesn't understand it. It is that health is a right — not a privilege, but a right. Though some may argue that it isn't a right, we argue that it is. Most people in Canada accept it as a right. And because it's a right, we must pay for that right — which is a very expensive one;

no one is going to dismiss or underestimate the cost — in relationship to our ability to pay. That is the underlying philosophy of the Hall commission report, federal/provincial agreements, and Mr. Justice Hall's review of medicare at the behest of the Clark government. It is the basic, philosophical argument that separates this government from those of us who feel that user fees are totally wrong in principle.

Mr. Chairman, this government likes to claim that it's practical. It's not practical to jeopardize federal/provincial arrangements. It's not practical to dismiss positive alternatives to control costs, including alternatives that come from the government's own commission. It's not practical to create worry and fear among people. The other day in the House, one of the members from Calgary raised the issue about little cards that had been distributed to senior citizen groups. The minister very huffily said: oh, it's terrible they weren't identified; I don't know who put them out. Well let me tell you this, Mr. Minister. Last night at the Friends of Medicare meeting, at least half the people there were from an adjacent senior citizens' complex. They came out and expressed the kinds of concerns senior people have who now realize that even with the exemptions they're going to have to pay user fees. They don't like it, and it worries them.

Yes, we can talk about exemptions, but the exemptions aren't going to solve the issue. What we're doing is creating a bureaucratic muddle. We're creating injustice. We're creating worry and fear, particularly among older people who surely have a right to see this government honor the commitment to a proper health system.

I close by saying that we opposed this when it was introduced. We opposed it in estimates. We oppose it today. And I want to make it abundantly clear to this minister and this caucus that over the next three and a half years, as far as I have any time or energy, I will implacably oppose what I think is a totally wrong-headed proposal inconsistent with the principles of medicare. I simply say to the more thoughtful Conservative backbenchers: before this goes into effect on October 1, make your influence felt in caucus, so that instead of turning the clock back, Alberta can work on ways of moving forward to a stronger health care system.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, during this sitting of the Assembly, considerable time has been devoted in the House to the subject of our health care delivery system, its quality, financing, and costs. I'd like to make some remarks about the health care delivery system in Alberta and compare it to some other places in the world.

Mr. Chairman, modern health care and the system that delivers it is very complex. It's not back to the horse-and-buggy days. Indeed, even if you look at only therapeutic agents — pills and medicines — the whole concept of that alone has had to change from the old Hippocratic "first do no harm", which was possible because the therapeutic agents available were simple. Indeed they probably did little good other than the placebo effect and the faith people had in them.

Nowadays, we use very complex chemicals, therapeutic agents, drugs, which have tremendous physiological and biochemical effects upon body systems. Because of that, they alone are much more prone to cause complications and side effects. So we've had to go from the old Hippocratic "first do no harm" to the modern "the potential benefit must outweigh the potential harm". In other words, every therapeutic decision has to be much more complicated and much more thoughtful because of the

potential side effects.

That remark has to do with the end result of treatment, but there's much more to modern health care than treatment. It requires buildings that have become increasingly more complex. It requires equipment and systems that have become more complex. Therefore the people who administer the system and deliver it have to be much more carefully and highly trained. The training takes longer. As a result of all these items — the increasing complexity of the buildings and equipment, and the higher training of individuals — the costs have been going up. They've been going up faster than the inflation rate. But let's look at whether those costs are reasonable and whether the potential for future growth in those costs is within our capability to pay.

Every technological advance that has been made, whether in space technology or anything else, has applied somewhere to the health care delivery system. In modern society it is now reaching the stage where we have the capability to deliver health care which, if carried to its ultimate, is beginning to exceed our capability to pay for it. In other words, if we are to apply every life-support system available to every patient who might need it or might benefit from it, if we're going to do open-heart surgery and replace coronary arteries on every person who has narrowing or disease of their coronary arteries, can we honestly devote that amount of the total national product to health care? It's doubtful that we can.

Let's look at what this government is doing with the health care delivery system in this province. First of all, I'd like to address the subject of buildings, which is the first item I mentioned. We have extended-care nursing home facilities which are relatively simple buildings. They don't deliver any of the complicated care I've been mentioning. Consequently, the costs of those buildings have not been going up at an inordinate rate. But if one looks at the active treatment facilities in the province, they're divided into three tiers. There's the primary, small town, small city type of hospital. It's in Vote 6, and is referred to as community-based hospital care. We then get to secondary or regional centres, and of course eventually we get to tertiary care facilities such as one finds in the Mackenzie centre, the Foothills hospital, the southern cancer hospital, the Cross, and the Alberta Children's hospital. Those types of buildings are extremely expensive to build.

Some years ago in Ontario, an experimental building was put up at McMaster. It's referred to as the "factory" because it looks like a factory. Every second floor was really a service floor. That concept was never repeated anywhere, because of the costs, until the Mackenzie centre was built. But it has one outstanding advantage. Instead of having to pull down the building every 20 or 30 years, it can be upgraded as new techniques, which none of us can even foresee, are made available. But one cannot spend that kind of money in every community in the province. And once those facilities are built, obviously they should not be used for routine primary and secondary treatment. In other words, the Mackenzie centre or the Foothills hospital, with the facilities they have, should not be used for treating an ordinary case of croup in a child, taking out somebody's appendix, or doing a hemorrhoid operation. It would be a waste of those facilities to use them for that type of care.

When we look at equipment, it's only very recently that the CAT scanner — computer-analysed tomography — was developed. But the original CAT scan machines were simple compared to the new ones. Each generation of

CAT scanners makes every other CAT scanner obsolete. What do you do? Throw them away and always have the newest one? That isn't financially responsible. If one goes into laboratory equipment, modern neo-electronic solid state laboratory equipment is perpetually going out of date because some company finds a way of making a new auto-analyser. Again, does one throw out every piece of existing equipment because there's a newer and better one?

The design of operating rooms has changed in order to produce the sterility required for doing open-bone and hip replacement surgery. One cannot or should not do that type of surgery in a facility that isn't designed for it. On the other hand, the facilities designed for that type of surgery should not be used for surgery that does not require those facilities. The facilities required for cardiac-catheterization, other angiography, brain tumors, aneurysms in the head, and things like that, are all extremely expensive and society has a limited ability to pay.

Then would you look at the people required. I'm only 51, almost 52. When I went through medical school, we were still trying to produce what was called the general physician, somebody able to do perhaps 90 or 95 per cent of total medical care after maybe five or six years of medical school and three or four years of postgraduate training. That's no longer possible. In fact there used to be what was referred to as the general internist. We now have endocrinologists, neurologists, nephrologists, and a whole bunch of others. Those people have to be trained in order to use modern techniques and, indeed, to develop them further. But those people's training is much longer than mine was, and they do not enter the medical work force until they're well into their 30s. They probably have a working life of 25 or 30 years. During that time, they have to make a reasonable income that will repay the investment they and society have put into their training. If a complex system such as I've briefly described is not watched carefully and future development is not planned, it will run amuck, especially financially.

We should look at the planning going on in this province at the moment. Let's look at the building program. I don't know anywhere in the world where there is the effort going into hospital construction that is going on in the province of Alberta at this time. There's no equivalent anywhere. Part of it is because we are a rapidly growing population. Since I came to the province 25 years ago, the population has doubled. There aren't many places in the world where the population is doubling and the economy has the capability to look after that rapid increase. If one goes to the third world, yes, they have a doubling of their population, but they haven't got the financial capability to cope with that increasing population. We do have that financial capability, and we have done it. As I said, the building program is really excellent, but we also have planning and equipment.

I was talking about CAT scanners. The allocation and distribution of computer-analysed tomography equipment in this province, whether it be at the Cross hospital, the Mackenzie centre, Foothills, or the Alex, is not done on a haphazard basis where one has a non-system. In the United States they have CAT scanners in every private hospital. If a CAT scanner is there, it has to provide the income to pay for it, so there's a ridiculous over-utilization of the CAT scanner. In Alberta we try to rationalize it. The other alternative is to look at the British system, where getting a CAT scanner into a university teaching facility practically requires a cabinet deci-

sion in Westminster.

Mr. Chairman, I've been talking about the system that produces the costs. If we look at the estimates for the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care for this year, we're looking at a capital outlay of some \$366 million, an operating expense of \$1.2 billion in acute care, and medical costs are estimated at some \$350 million. The total comes to \$2.2 billion. That's almost \$1,000 for every man, woman, and child in Alberta. If we are going to spend that amount of money — \$1,000 per head, \$4,000 per family — is it too much to ask that the people who use those facilities and that system should contribute \$300 a year per family at the most, the cost of one hospital-bed day per family. It's not even 10 per cent of the potential for that family on an average basis. The rest of it, the other 92 per cent, is paid for out of general revenue and the contributions to medicare for the \$350 for medical costs.

To hear the socialists say they have a better system, that it should be free, means that 20 years down the road we're going to be looking at the system they now have in the country I came from, the British health care system, which is so inadequate, and progressively getting more inadequate, that there is no possibility of that system being renovated within the financial capability of the British economy. The result is that whereas here . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I regret having to interrupt the hon. member, but we're now into the matter of procedure according to our *Standing Orders*. I'm sure all hon. members are aware of the Standing Orders as they are at present. Section 51.1(1) provides that not more than 25 days of the sitting be allocated to consideration of the main estimates. Under section 51.2(2), 15 minutes before the normal adjournment hour on the 25th sitting day, which is today, if the main estimates aren't all reported, they have to be put to a single question.

Naturally the Chair has some regrets that we have not completed all the departments, but I would note that the present department, Hospitals and Medical Care, has had some pretty extensive discussion within the committee. On April 11 and 13 we had full afternoons on this department, and of course yesterday and today we've had part of an afternoon. So I now put the question to you, pursuant to Standing Order 51.1 and 51.2(2).

Is it agreed that all main estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, not yet voted on be reported?

[Mr. Chairman declared the motion carried. Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung.]

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might rise on an irregular point of procedure. Earlier this afternoon the hon. Member for Camrose was assaulted in his chair. He lost the bottom half of his tie. Some members formed a posse for the lynch mob, and sought to replace it. The replacement tie was stolen by the hon. Member for Camrose before it was presented. In fact the two ties are in his hip pocket. But some hon. members thought we should make a little presentation to the gentleman, and we have a congratulatory certificate signed by many members of the House, recognizing that the hon. member has risen in stature. He is now quite sartorial. He has never looked better, I might add. I think what we ought to do is present this certificate to him in recognition of this. I might add that he lynched my tie to the point where it's now not serviceable. Hon. members should

appreciate that we've made a real gesture in improving the culture and tone of this Assembly. [interjections]

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Adair	Hyland	Planche
Alexander	Hyndman	Purdy
Alger	Isley	Reid
Batiuk	King	Russell
Bogle	Koper	Schmid
Bradley	Kowalski	Shaben
Campbell	Koziak	Shrake
Carter	LeMessurier	Sparrow
Cook	Lysons	Stevens
Crawford	McPherson	Stiles
Cripps	Moore, R.	Stromberg
Diachuk	Nelson	Thompson
Embury	Oman	Trynchy
Fischer	Osterman	Webber
Fjordbotten	Pahl	Young
Fyfe	Paproski	Zaozirny
Gogo	Pengelly	Zip
Hiebert		

Against the motion:

Martin	Notley	Speaker, R..
--------	--------	--------------

Totals: Ayes - 52 Noes - 3

MR. CHAIRMAN: The *Standing Orders* provide that the committee shall forthwith rise and report. So we will now rise and report. Are you all agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, sums not exceeding the following for the departments and purposes indicated:

For the Department of the Environment: \$5,704,066 for departmental support services, \$18,629,229 for pollution prevention and control, \$4,523,975 for land conservation, \$49,749,719 for water resources management, \$3,626,874 for environmental research, \$9,268,449 for land assembly, \$11,299,642 for interdisciplinary environmental research and services, and \$1,367,839 for overview and co-ordination of environment conservation.

For the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care: \$34,875,290 for departmental support services, \$353,250,000 for health care insurance, \$1,197,882,977 for financial assistance for active care, \$148,105,708 for financial assistance for long-term chronic care, \$99,354,792 for financial assistance for supervised personal care, and \$366,577,868 for financial assistance for capital construction.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Assembly will not be sitting tomorrow evening. On Friday it is proposed to call second reading of Bill No. 44.

[At 5:31 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]

