

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Tuesday, August 19, 1986 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

**head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, in your gallery today is the British consul general for the western region, Mr. John Doble. His posting was effective last November, and we welcome him here for his four-year term. I wonder if Mr. Doble would rise and receive the welcome of the House.

**head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**Bill 35**  
**Business Corporations**  
**Amendment Act, 1986**

MISS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 35, the Business Corporations Amendment Act, 1986.

The purpose of this Bill is to extend the time within which a corporation can continue its existence under the new Business Corporations Act.

[Leave granted; Bill 35 read a first time]

**Bill 32**  
**Water Resources Commission**  
**Amendment Act, 1986**

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 32, being the Water Resources Commission Amendment Act, 1986.

The key part of this Bill is that it permits us to move from three members at large to four.

[Leave granted; Bill 32 read a first time]

**Bill 33**  
**Naturopathy Repeal Act**

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 33, being the Naturopathy Repeal Act.

This Bill will repeal the Naturopathy Act and delete certain references to naturopathy in other provincial legislation.

[Leave granted; Bill 33 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bills 32 and 33 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

**head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table four financial statements for the year ending March 31, 1986, for four Crown hospitals: the Alberta Hospital, Edmonton; the Alberta Hospital, Ponoka; the Alberta Children's Provincial General hospital; and the Alberta Cancer Board.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table responses to motions for returns 145 and 155 as ordered by the Assembly and also file the answer to Question 161.

**head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. DAY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you today and to the members of this Assembly Mr. Harlan Hulleman from Red Deer North, a teacher/librarian with a long-standing record of involvement in our community. He's here today to meet with our own legislative librarian and to survey our Legislature Library services. I'd like Mr. Hulleman to stand and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

**head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Budget Deficit**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Premier. Is the government still sticking by its budget estimates, which said that we would have roughly a \$2.5 billion deficit? Given that Bill 30 is asking for borrowing powers of up to \$5.5 billion, will the government now come clean and tell us what the real deficit will be?

MR. GETTY: As the hon. member knows, Mr. Speaker, that's the responsibility of the Provincial Treasurer, and I would ask him to deal with it when he returns to the House. Of course, the Bill has to progress through second reading, committee study, third reading, and then Royal Assent. The rules of the House provide for adequate discussion at that time.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you for that lecture in parliamentary democracy, but we're trying to get to some knowledge about what's going on with this government and their deficit.

Mr. Speaker, my question is this: so we can knowledgeably debate this when Bill 30 comes through, will the Premier as head of the government suggest or, in fact, direct the Provincial Treasurer to table all revenue projections done by his department since May 8?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, my first answer deals with this question as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair respectfully points out that any further references to Bill 30 will indeed be ruled out of order. Perhaps the framer of the question could do so in another manner.

MR. MARTIN: With due respect, I didn't even mention Bill 30 in that question, Mr. Speaker. But more importantly, by the nonanswers we're getting, I think it's causing Albertans concern.

Would the Premier — who I take it still runs the government, not necessarily the Treasurer — confirm that to try to deal with this tremendous shortfall that we're facing, the government is looking at, first of all, higher medicare premiums and income tax hikes for ordinary Albertans?

MR. GETTY: No, I wouldn't confirm that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. We were told by the hon. minister that they were before, which is correct. Would the Premier try to get together with his ministers and let us know?

MR. SPEAKER: The question, hon. Leader of the Opposition. It did have a question mark at the end of it, but ...

MR. MARTIN: That was just rhetorical, Mr. Speaker. I'll try to get to the point.

In view of the fact that there has been a severe drain on our provincial revenues since we signed the Western Accord, when will the provincial government start pushing for a floor price so that we can maintain some financial integrity in this province?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, first dealing with earlier comments by the Leader of the Opposition, the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care has never made the argument that we were seeking higher premiums. He mentioned that there is a possibility of even lower premiums or removing them altogether. The third option is higher. There are three of them.

Coming back to the issue of the floor price, Mr. Speaker, I realize question period is running out of steam. I don't know how many times we have to deal with the same question. We have said that that is an option that's well down on our list and not one we are currently pursuing.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question to the Premier. Is the Premier in a position to indicate if the committee that is looking at provincial finances is looking at a two-year, three-year, or four-year shortfall of revenue? Is there any kind of a scenario that the chairman of Executive Council is looking at as to when there could be a possible turnaround?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, that question leads itself to such a discussion of options and conditions that may be facing the province in the future that I don't think question period really allows discussion of it. I would say, though, that the Bill does. As I suggested earlier, that's an excellent time to raise that matter.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, also to the Premier. In facing the reality of Alberta's largest deficit ever, does the Premier plan to cut back not on people and not on programs but on the waste in the budget that the Tory government has imposed on this Legislature and the people of Alberta?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I don't agree with the debate part of his question at all. Not only do we work very hard to eliminate waste, we feel that members of this House should point it out as well. I listened carefully through the estimates and did not really hear that much. As a matter of fact, I think I heard more arguments for increasing the budget rather than reducing it.

MR. MARTIN: Selective hearing, they call it.

#### **Petroleum and Gas Revenue Tax**

MR. MARTIN: My second set of questions is to the Premier. It's in regard to questions from my colleague from Edmonton Highlands yesterday, when the Premier answered that he was "convinced that the PGRT will be removed and removed soon." I believe those are the words he used. To say that, the Premier must have some commitment from the federal government. My question is: could the Premier indicate what firm commitment he has from the federal government that would lead to his optimism?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, if you and other members will recall, I advised the House that I believed it would be removed. I still believe that.

MR. MARTIN: Do you believe in Santa Claus and the tooth fairy too?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you for the second question, Leader of the Opposition. Would the Premier care to respond to that question? All right then. Please, let's have the supplementary.

MR. MARTIN: Let's be consistent on both sides.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The Chair will be entirely consistent. In response to your question, would the Premier respond with regard to the tooth fairy and the other question?

Let's come with a supplementary. Could we have the question?

MR. MARTIN: My question is flowing from this. Has the Premier been in touch with the Prime Minister, and has he set a firm and specific date with the Prime Minister for complete removal of the PGRT?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, we've had a variety of discussions with the federal government at a variety of levels. That leads me to my judgment and therefore to my belief that the PGRT will be removed soon.

MR. MARTIN: That's very nice, Mr. Speaker. Could the Premier tell us if he has actually spoken to the Prime Minister since Mr. Masse's announcement of last week? If not, what he is basing his confidence on?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I haven't spoken directly to the Prime Minister, but my source of information leads me to the judgment and the belief which I've already outlined to the House.

MR. MARTIN: Isn't that interesting, Mr. Speaker. We've had a lot of discussions about the PGRT, but it's not even important enough to phone the Prime Minister.

Could the Premier tell us why he hasn't taken it upon himself? Is it not important enough that he get on the phone to Mr. Mulroney and tell him what this Legislature has told him clearly?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I have followed the course that I felt would give me the best information. That information has led me to say to the House that I believe the PGRT will be removed completely and soon.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, at the Premiers' Conference did the Premier do any negotiating or have any discussions with the Premiers of Ontario and Quebec to have them, as the primary consumers of our products, lobby to try to influence the Prime Minister to realize how important the gas and oil industry is to this province?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I think one of the very successful efforts during the Premiers' Conference was to discuss with all the Premiers — and certainly the Premiers of Ontario and Quebec, representing the major consuming provinces — the importance of Alberta's energy industry. I felt that for the first time there was a complete endorsement of the importance of the energy industry. Whether on a short-term, temporary basis it may provide lower prices for energy in their provinces, what they feel more important in the long run is that the industry is healthy and finding supplies for the future. I was very pleased by the attitudes of the Premiers. I think it was a significant breakthrough. They are prepared not only to endorse it in the communiqués on energy but to carry that argument to other parts of Canada, including their own voters and the federal government.

MR. TAYLOR: Sympathy is very cheap.

A supplementary to the Premier. What particular commitments did you get from either the east or central Canada's Premiers, maybe even to the point where they would recommend a tax on their consumers to help Alberta out?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, in a meeting like the Premiers' Conference the most important thing was the realization that all Premiers agreed to a shift away from national policies that have been supporting manufacturing and industrial regions, toward commodity and resource regions. That's a significant position for the Premiers of Ontario and Quebec, who represent mainly manufacturing and industrial regions, to commit to. They are prepared to carry that message to the federal government and of course to their own constituents. I think that was a significant breakthrough, as I said before, and it should be very helpful to our province in the future.

#### **Energy Industry Assistance**

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, we will continue the questions on energy to the Premier in light of the increasing tragedy in this province of 30,000 to 40,000 unemployed and the Premier's hope that in spite of the fact that neither he nor his minister gets anywhere with the federal government, somehow or another the two Liberal Premiers in central Canada are going to be able to get somewhere with the federal government. It's indeed rather intriguing. Can the Premier tell the Assembly what the industry's take-up to date has been on the incentive programs announced in the June 12, 1986, Speech from the Throne?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, with the announcement of the incentive programs, the developmental drilling program last April — as I've indicated in the House before, the deadline for that program is December 31, 1986. We anticipate a greater take-up on that program this fall. The take-up to date hasn't been what we expected. I don't have the exact numbers before me; however, we do expect a further take-up on that program during the fall.

The developmental drilling program and the well servicing programs have had a better take-up to this point, with a deadline of September 31, 1986. The well servicing program in particular has seen considerable activity but, again, it's difficult to say for sure because we won't know until the bills come in. The companies that are doing the work have to pay the contractors before they can submit their bills. So at this stage it's difficult to say. However, because of the cash flow problems of the industry, it certainly is not being taken up as well as we had hoped it would be.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. I know the count might be difficult, but I suspect that if he takes off his shoes and socks, he will be able to count the number of take-ups on both hands and both feet.

Nevertheless, could the minister tell the House whether he has any alternatives, any other programs that could be offered to assist the oil industry? The fact is that the other programs are just not working out, and in spite of the Premier's belief in Santa Claus, I doubt if he will get them all done by Christmas.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I think it's wrong for the leader of the Liberal Party to be making the conclusion that the programs haven't worked out. Let's judge that once those expiry dates come.

We are assessing on an ongoing basis as to whether there should be any modifications to those programs. In terms of other steps, we've looked at a wide variety of options and proposals, and as I indicated previously, I did present a proposal to the federal minister in Calgary last Thursday. The officials in our departments will be meeting with respect to that proposal, and subsequently I'll be meeting with the federal minister on it as well.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, since the minister has correctly pointed out that cash flow is pretty necessary to take advantage of the plans he outlined, can he outline any other plans or initiatives under consideration to aid the cash flow to the companies, particularly the smaller companies, so that they indeed can get up to the level to take advantage of the fancy scheme he worked out earlier this year?

DR. WEBBER: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the only way industry is going to provide activity is if their cash flow can be increased and subsequently investment takes place. The objective of the proposal I presented to the federal minister was precisely along the lines of increasing cash flow.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that one of the ways of increasing the cash flow is not only getting money up for oil, it is making a favourable climate for investors to give money to the companies which they then can invest, has the government worked out any long-term stabilization plan so that the investors of this country could have some confidence in putting money into the oil business?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, each question leads me to say what I said publicly last Thursday, that the proposal we presented to the federal minister was a cash flow stabilization program.

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Speaker, given the minister's admission today that the drilling assistance program is a failure —

only 14 percent of the rigs are working — what is the source of the optimism he expressed, that there would be a greater take-up in this program in the fall?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn would love to see these programs fail. In fact, you see smiles of joy on their faces every time you see the program not being taken up. They take glory in failure. That hasn't happened. The programs are in place, companies are making their applications, some activity is taking place, and I hope there will be more. However, the cash flow situation is a problem, as I've indicated, and we've made a presentation to the federal government. It's our intent to try to assist the industry to improve their cash flow situation.

#### **Hazardous Waste**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of the Environment. On July 18 the minister committed to create a registry in order to record all toxic wastes sites. Can the minister indicate if that registry has been created?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I also recall that the day I responded to questions in the Legislature, I indicated that I would be undertaking a five-approach program that would begin in the fall of 1986. Work is being done with respect to that matter right now. We haven't kicked into it. One of the reasons I wanted it delayed to the fall is that we're also intent on asking the people of Alberta to contribute with their basis of knowledge to help us find such landfills in the province of Alberta. We thought it would be best to kick that in when the summer holiday season is over so that we could deal with the maximum number of Albertans.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, the minister indicated that he is reviewing the joint venture agreement between Bow Valley Resources and Alberta Special Waste Management Corporation. Can the minister indicate when that final agreement will be signed?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I indicated earlier that I hoped to have the joint venture agreement reviewed by the conclusion of this fall session. I am anticipating that we will probably be here till mid-September, late September, or October, and that's the time frame I've been dealing with.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate the progress of the plant? Apparently, we are supposed to be receiving some of the hazardous wastes this fall, with full operation in 1987. Can the minister indicate if that timetable is being met?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any commitment to receive waste materials in Swan Hills in the fall of 1986. It was always my understanding prior to assuming this particular position, and certainly since, that we would begin receiving such materials in the spring or early summer of 1987.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate what mechanism is in place at this time to store hazardous wastes?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, such materials are being stored at a multitude of sites throughout the province of

Alberta. Some of course have been stored in the past at the Nisku site. Various industries and firms that have such material are currently storing them on site, and when the Swan Hills facility is operational, such goods will be moved to Swan Hills. It's also important to note that under the provisions of the legislation dealing with the Alberta Special Waste Management Corporation Act, there is a provision for firms, if they choose to establish such plants or facilities on their own industrial sites, to break down and neutralize the materials on site without having them sent to Swan Hills.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister set out any plan on how and where and what highways will be used for transportation of hazardous waste? Will there be enough time set aside for the municipalities involved so they can make representations as to what routes will be used for hazardous waste?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to note that on any given date in the province of Alberta, the number of truck movements associated with the so-called inventory of special or hazardous wastes might be in the neighbourhood of eight to 12 per day. A movement might be from a fertilizer plant near Medicine Hat to Medicine Hat. That would be counted as a movement.

We've undertaken a study by an outside consultant with respect to all the roadways leading to Swan Hills, having them evaluated in terms of safety aspects, gradients, bridges, and number of accidents that have occurred in the past. Quite frankly, it appears that most of the roadways in northwestern Alberta are very, very safe.

In terms of dealing with municipalities, that's been an ongoing matter. Just recently the city of Edmonton passed a bylaw dealing with their dangerous goods routes. City council approved it. The city of Calgary recently has. That's an ongoing system. It's a continuous one, and it's the responsibility of municipalities on an ongoing basis. There is simply nothing new with respect to the procedure in place.

MR. YOUNIE: Mr. Speaker, in the review of the joint venture agreement with Bow Valley Resource Services that was just mentioned, is the minister considering or is he willing to consider either reducing the rate of profit guaranteed to Bow Valley Resource Services or requiring them to increase the negligible risk that they are now taking in the venture?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions we've discussed that matter in the Legislative Assembly. I have responded to those questions in the past. It's also my understanding that there's a motion on the Order Paper, and I would look forward to the debate with respect to this matter when it comes up.

#### **Farm Credit Stability Program**

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, my questions are to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. They relate to recent concerns expressed about lending provisions of the farm credit stability program. Given the fact that a large number of farmers in Alberta find it necessary to work out and supplement their income from off-farm sources, can the minister indicate to what degree these off-farm sources of income are considered as it relates to determining cash flow viability?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, might I begin by congratulating the hon. member for being the author of the NFU news release yesterday and also indicate to him that we're gratified by the uptake of this very important program. To answer him in a very direct way as it relates to his question, that is used in its totality as it relates to one's repayment ability. Off-farm income is allowable to be calculated as it relates to repayment ability. I know it has been a misconception conveyed by some members — and I wouldn't want to accuse anybody — but it's obviously false, because that is used in our calculations.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, my sources include Unifarm and submissions from individual producers, and I think the minister would like to consider those representations as well.

A supplementary to the minister. What consideration has the minister given to waiving the land-as-security restrictions in cases where producers rent a major portion of the land base that they operate?

MR. ELZINGA: It has been indicated — and I'm sure the hon. member has corresponded or communicated with his banker — that repayment ability is the first criterion. In the event that one can show that the loans they are requesting can be repaid, that is the main and key criterion. In the event that security is available, it's only natural that security will be asked for. But repayment ability is the key criterion.

MR. FOX: Perhaps the minister should apply himself and see that land has to be taken as security under most loans.

Would the minister consider using separate guidelines for the two types of loans; that is, the loans that are intended to help farmers who need refinancing, schedule A and B loans, and the other types of loans which are intended to help farmers with new acquisitions, schedule C loans?

MR. ELZINGA: As I'm sure the hon. member is aware — at least he should be, because it was issued with the news release that he didn't take an opportunity to read when we first introduced this legislation but I'm sure he's had the chance to read since then — there are different criteria for those who are in the process of refinancing, as compared to those who are borrowing for new purchases. That lending criterion has been extended far beyond the traditional lending criteria of the banking institutions. This government is assuming a portion of that guarantee so that we can extend it to the full 100 percent for refinancing present loans that are out, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FOX: A supplementary to the hon. minister. Based on recent experiences farmers have had with the \$200,000 limit and the no-stacking provisions, what consideration has the minister given to waiving these restrictions at least as they relate to the refinancing type of loans?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, we acknowledge that there is a large farming population. We also feel a strong obligation to involve as many of those farmers as we possibly can in this very worthwhile program. Because of that, as I mentioned to the hon. member — I'm sure this is the fourth or fifth time — we didn't feel that we should allow stacking provisions, so that we would have the broadest possible spectrum involved in our lending criteria.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I sense a consistency here, as I did in Ottawa — I want to be careful with my words. In one moment the leader is asking us to reduce

the deficit; the next moment his members are asking us to spend more. They're speaking out of both sides of their mouths, and if that's not hypocritical, I don't what is.

DR. BUCK: One thing my MP never learned in Ottawa is humility.

In the minister's assessment of the \$2 billion, Mr. Speaker, is he in a position to indicate what percentage of that fund he perceives being used just to refinance the present loans? How much of it will be an injection of new capital into the farming industry?

MR. ELZINGA: When we introduced the program, Mr. Speaker, we indicated our initial projections. We haven't had an opportunity to assess them to date because we wanted to make sure that the money was turned around as quickly as possible. Our projections were — we were hopeful that about 75 percent of this money would be taken up for refinancing purposes. If I could share with hon. members, as of six last night we had 1,773 requests for funding, and the average loan is in the vicinity of \$150,000. We're delighted that we put a limit of \$200,000. It now shows our wisdom. Individuals were saying that it should have been a great deal higher. The average loan is in the vicinity of \$150,000.

Might I close by indicating to the hon. member that I'm going to take my humility lessons from him.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. I know he likes to leave being humble to those who have something to be humble about, but in view of his statement that the first criterion of lending is the repayment ability, it must be obvious even to the minister, who maybe doesn't do as much research as I do, that naturally the banks are going to lend to those who really don't need it, who can repay it quite easily. In view of the huge number of applications — he's had over 1,700 — at the rate it's going, the plan will disappear in a couple of months.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. TAYLOR: Don't be so noisy; the poor fellow is trying to hear. In view of the rate the money is disappearing, does the minister have any intention of informing the banks that they should be trying to lend first not to those that can repay it fast and don't need it but to those that need it and then, if there are funds left over, to those that don't need it so that they can speculate and do what they like?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is aware of any farmers that don't need financing. I hope that he would point them out to me. The farming sector is in difficulty right now, even if the hon. member isn't willing to acknowledge it. That's why we've introduced this very substantial program. As I've indicated on a number of occasions, the lending criteria, because of our government guarantees, have been extended beyond the traditional lending guarantees.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I find it rather ironical. In one breath the hon. member indicates that the program is no good, and in the next breath he's saying that we're going to run out of money because it is such a good program. I wish the hon. member would make up his mind.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I wonder if the minister would assure the Assembly that they

won't change the rules for new financing. There are people who have saved their money and haven't bid on land because they couldn't afford it, and now they may be in that position. I hope they won't change the guidelines and penalize them at this stage of the game.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Cypress-Redcliff has touched on a very key point, and that's why we attempted to develop such a fine line in establishing this program. We believe we have done so. Money will be available for new purchases. Again, the lending criteria have not been extended quite as far for them as they were for those who are in financial difficulty and who will use this for refinancing, but we didn't feel that we should deprive any of our agricultural sector of this worthwhile program.

#### Natural Gas Deregulation

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Energy. Last night the minister advised the House that the oil and gas industry had expressed concern to the minister that the federal government is tying removal of the PGRT to deregulation of natural gas on November 1. It's very disturbing that the Minister of Energy appears to have received the impression from last week's discussions with Mr. Masse that the two were not tied together even though Mr. Masse referred to a linkage in his earlier speech. What is the truth? Is Mr. Masse tying removal of the PGRT to gas deregulation on November 1 or isn't he? Or doesn't the minister know the answer to this fundamental question?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member can't accept my answer of yesterday, maybe he should ask Mr. Masse.

MR. CHUMIR: That's very comforting to the industry, I'm sure.

Mr. Speaker, does the government have firm conditions that it will insist upon before gas deregulation does take place on November 1, or is the government's position as mushy as it appears to this House?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, we dealt with a two and three-quarter hour session last night on gas deregulation. The hon. member raised points, and we had a discussion on it. He's asking the same thing all over again, but that's fair enough.

In terms of gas deregulation, as I've indicated over and over again, we will be trying to achieve the date of November 1 for total deregulation. However, a number of concerns have been raised by the industry, and they are important concerns. We will be addressing those concerns with the other two provinces that were involved with the agreement and the federal government. I have had discussions with Mr. Masse on the topic, as I've already indicated, and the industry is making their position known to the federal government as well. We will be trying to work together to remove those obstacles so that we can proceed on that particular date.

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Speaker, can the minister tell this House how many hundreds of millions of dollars it estimates gas deregulation will cost the industry in Alberta over the next year, or is this something else the government hasn't thought about?

DR. WEBBER: First of all, Mr. Speaker, it's a hypothetical question. I don't think the hon. member can assume that it's going to cost the industry extra dollars in the next year. As I indicated, we are addressing the concerns of the industry. Hopefully we will be able to achieve deregulation by that particular date. We will be working toward it.

MR. SPEAKER: Further lines of questions on this topic are ruled out of order because they can indeed be raised when it comes to Committee of the Whole with respect to that particular Bill.

The Chair recognizes the Member for St. Albert. [interjections]

AN HON. MEMBER: Order.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The Chair recognizes the Member for St. Albert.

MR. MARTIN: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Your point of order is?

MR. MARTIN: Could the Chair be a little clearer on that ruling? That's a new one to me. Pretty soon we won't have anything left.

MR. SPEAKER: I doubt that.

AN HON. MEMBER: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you very much, but the Chair will recognize the Member for Calgary Buffalo first.

MR. CHUMIR: Point of order on that, Mr. Speaker. That philosophy could be used to preclude questioning on any topic that might be considered to arise in future. This is certainly a matter of urgent importance to the public at this point of time, and the House is entitled to an answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair is somewhat concerned to learn that the matter — what urgency developed overnight, from the line of questioning that went on at some considerable length of time last evening?

MR. CHUMIR: The urgency, Mr. Speaker, is that the industry is now expressing concern and has indicated to the government that there is a problem. The government appears to be unaware of that.

MR. TAYLOR: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The federal minister said just yesterday that the PGRT is not going to go unless gas is deregulated, obviously tying the two together, obviously expecting lower gas prices. We ask the government how much lower, and they hide behind the skirts of some possible legislation down the road.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary on this issue. The Chair has listened carefully and is carefully listening again.

MR. CHUMIR: In fact, this will be a slight deviation from the line, Mr. Speaker, by accident but certainly not intent.

I wonder whether the minister might let the House in on the secret as to exactly what is the nature or the general tenor of the stabilization plan which has been presented to Mr. Masse with respect to the industry.

DR. WEBBER: Not at this time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PASHAK: To the Minister of Energy. What steps is the government going to take to ensure that small gas producers in Alberta aren't going to be displaced by downstream users buying up production facilities here in Alberta?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member raised a number of issues last night that were totally irrelevant to the point of discussion and today raises one relatively small point among a number of concerns raised by the industry. As I pointed out earlier, we are reviewing all the concerns of the industry, working with them, and will be making a decision down the road as to whether or not we will be going with the November 1 date or not.

#### **Labour Legislation Review**

MR. STRONG: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Labour I'll direct my question to the Premier. My concern is with the Labour Legislation Review Committee recently announced by the Minister of Labour. As the Premier and this Assembly are aware, the review committee consisted of three members from organized labour, three members from the general public, and three members from management, with the minister to chair that review committee. Given the resignation of two of the three labour representatives on this government's labour law review committee, what review is the Premier going to do of the advisability of striking such a committee without consulting the Building Trades Council or the Alberta Federation of Labour?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour is responsible for this matter, and I'm sure he will be happy to discuss it in the House when he returns shortly.

MR. STRONG: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I hate to belabour this, but in striking this committee, did the government give no consideration to the tenuous position all labour representatives were placed in in the absence of consultation with these two organizations, or did this government simply not care?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, my original answer applies to this question as well.

MR. STRONG: Mr. Speaker, I really get off on these nonanswers.

A supplementary. Will the Premier now direct the minister to abandon this process and establish instead an all-party committee of legislators to review labour legislation as it currently exists in the province of Alberta?

MR. GETTY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STRONG: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Since the Premier rejects in his nonanswer that it's the role of legislators to review the province's legislation, will he at least direct the minister to replace the resigning members on this committee with individuals nominated or elected by the Alberta Federation of Labour or the Building Trades Council?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, that is a matter the hon. Minister of Labour would want to deal with when he returns to the House.

MR. DAY: A supplementary. Has the Premier received any information either directly or indirectly that others in this province who are involved in positions of authority within the labour movement have already expressed a desire to fill the vacancies on that committee created by the pressure applied by the card-carrying Communist president of the Alberta Federation of Labour? [interjections]

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I have been advised of a number of people in organized labour in this province who would very much like to serve on that labour review panel.

MR. TAYLOR: This question is to the Premier also. Is the Alberta liquor board's court action against a legally striking union an indication that this government advocates resolution of labour disputes through the courts rather than through fair and equitable labour legislation?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, as the minister responsible for the liquor board, I'd like to point out to the hon. leader of the Liberal Party that when the matter is before the courts, it's not proper to discuss it.

#### **Care of the Elderly**

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, during the Department of Community and Occupational Health's budget estimates the minister spoke about the improved health promotion programs at the community level. However, recent information from the Edmonton Board of Health indicates that among the presumed well elderly in our community, over the last three years in Edmonton alone 10 elderly people have died of malnutrition in their own homes while 23 have committed suicide. What plans does the minister have for a special designation of funding amounts specifically for health promotion programs for the well elderly?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the representation by the hon. member and quite frankly was not aware of those deplorable statistics. There is no doubt about the fact that it causes me and my colleagues a great deal of concern.

As for health promotion education, that kind of activity is carried out both within our department, Community and Occupational Health, and the department of my colleague the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care as well as through the Edmonton Board of Health, which receives a good portion of its funding through our departmental budget. I appreciate the representation, and it's something I'll take up with my colleagues in the days ahead.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, what mandate has the minister given to the regional medical officers of health for illness prevention and health promotion programs for the elderly through a variety of means, including better education of public health nurses and private health doctors vis-à-vis good health in the aging process?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, one thing I failed to mention in my first answer is that the home care program, which is funded to the tune of some \$33 million in this year's budget, as well as a number of others within the budget, provides the necessary care, as best as we possibly can within limited resources, to keep our elderly people who can stay in their homes there so they are not forced to go into a costly institution. They stay with their family, friends, and neighbours in an environment that's familiar and com-

fortable to them. That's a major initiative by this government, something we're very proud of, promoting our intentions of keeping, assisting, and aiding the welfare of those well elderly.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for question period has expired. Might we finish this set of questions? Do we have agreement?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, that does not at all answer my question. Home care is for the frail elderly; I'm speaking about the well elderly.

Does the minister intend to provide additional funding for the five new nursing positions that Edmonton health officials maintain are essential for effectively co-ordinating and delivering illness prevention among the well elderly in Edmonton alone?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of the details of the Edmonton Board of Health submission for this year or for 1987-88, but that submission as well as submissions by the other 26 health units around the province will be carefully looked at, as all others have been. It would be my hope to provide the best service possible within the resources we have within the department.

REV. ROBERTS: Is the minister aware of any studies that have been done on the degree of costly institutionalization of our elderly or the unnecessary and tragic deaths occurring among the elderly? If not, will he commission such a study to determine the extent of these tragic problems province-wide?

MR. DINNING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm aware of those studies. It is an ongoing study within our department. I believe that the philosophy, intention, and basic purpose behind home care and the provision of that service within the community is something we should be moving more and more toward because it is a more effective way of delivering health care and it's certainly a more cost effective way of delivering health care.

MR. HYLAND: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister review with the same thoughts in mind the budgets of the 25 or 27 health units in this province other than the city of Edmonton — because there are parts of this province that face the same problems — and review with them their requests for educational things in their budgets dealing with this subject?

MR. DINNING: Most definitely, Mr. Speaker. We are now receiving submissions, as I say, from all 27 health units for the 1987-88 fiscal year. I'm certainly a strong advocate of health education and promotion not just in the city of Edmonton but throughout the entire province.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Would he extend the study about the issues of malnutrition and the shortage of funds of the Edmonton well elderly that he says he is going to do to the rest of the province while he is at it?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I can't say I made the commitment the hon. member has suggested. I can tell the

hon. member that that is an ongoing review by our department as well as by the 27 health units around the province.

MR. STRONG: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Which is?

MR. STRONG: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that during question period the Member for Red Deer North made some reference to a card-packing commie. Is that almost as bad as a card-packing PC? I don't think that deserves any place in this ...

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, I know the sound system here has its deficiencies. Perhaps you did not hear, but the Chair called the member to order at the time it occurred.

MR. STRONG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

### **Job-finding Centres**

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Social Services wishes to give supplementary information from a previous question period to an issue that was raised by the Member for Edmonton Calder.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yesterday I received procedural questions respecting the five job-finding centres being funded by Alberta Social Services. As a preface I would like to stress again that these are pilot projects, experiments if you will, and I have committed to report to the Legislature early in 1987. I also committed to get some detail on the arrangements between centres and the department in terms of recruiting clientele. Each job-finding centre is guaranteed payment for a minimum number of clients; that is, 30 per class. There are no quotas given to income security workers.

The other area, Mr. Speaker, that I think was raised related to whether clients could take programs at another centre. Staff does not recall any client making representation to retake a program at another centre. Further, the job-finding centres do continue to provide services to those people who have taken their programs and offer administrative support.

MS MJOLSNESS: Mr. Speaker, can the minister then assure the Assembly that it is strictly the social allowance recipient's choice to be involved in the job-finding centres?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

### **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

MR. SPEAKER: Might we revert briefly to the Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, several special visitors: Patricia Hartnagel and Colin Park, representing Project Plowshares; Julie Ann



LeGras, representing the Alberta Status of Women Action Council; Tom Monto and Bob Nichol, representing the New Democrat antiwar committee; Terry Matwichuk, representing the New Democrat women's section; and Juliette Trudeau, representing Voice of Women. I would ask that this Assembly accord them our warm welcome.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that the written questions and motions for returns on the Order Paper today stand.

[Motion carried]

#### head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

216. Moved by Ms Laing:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly acknowledge and endorse the declaration by the United Nations of 1986 as the International Year of Peace; and

be it further resolved that the Legislative Assembly encourage all Albertans to participate as best suits them in activities and undertakings having as their goal the achievement of peace; and

be it further resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government of Alberta to encourage the government of Canada, wherever possible, to advance forcefully and consistently an international policy in favour of the achievement of peace around the world.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to this Assembly Motion 216. This motion addresses the central and crucial issue that faces all peoples of the world. It is a motion wide in scope that asks us to recognize the worldwide search for peace and encourages all people to participate in a meaningful way in working toward worldwide peace. We would ask that they express their commitment to peace through whatever gestures or activities may be meaningful to them. For this reason I present a motion urging the government of Alberta to recognize the International Year of Peace and to encourage citizens of this province to participate in activities that have as their goal the achievement of international peace and to urge our federal government to do likewise.

In 1982 the United Nations passed a resolution designating 1986 as the International Year of Peace, and on October 24, 1985, 1986 was so proclaimed. In April 1985 the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba voted unanimously to declare the province a nuclear-free zone, and on July 10, 1985, the government of the province of Quebec approved in principle governmental participation in International Year of Peace activities. Other communities in Canada will also participate in such activities. The city of Toronto has established an International Year of Peace committee with a \$50,000 budget. One project, the peal for peace, is being organized for September 16. At noon of that day there will be one moment's silence, followed by the pealing of the bells.

The quest for world peace unites all the peoples of the world. You may well ask: what is this peace for which we all work and that we all seek? Peace is more than the absence of tension and war. The United Nations proclamation sets out the multidimensional nature of peace, which includes the removal of the threats to peace, including the nuclear threat, respect for the principle of nonuse of force, devel-

opment and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms, decolonization, elimination of the racial discrimination of apartheid, enhancing the quality of life, satisfaction of human needs, and protection of the environment.

From this we can see that peace is the presence of justice — social, economic, and political justice for all the peoples of the world. It requires that we recognize that all people have the right to adequate food, clothing, shelter, education, and medical care, that all are protected from pollution, and that all are to be freed from the threat of nuclear holocaust. It also recognizes that no people will be exploited for the economic or political advantage of another people. Such is our vision of peace. But such a vision of peace is not easily achieved, and too often, in our preoccupation with war and the arms race, we are blinded to other human concerns. Yet there can be no lasting peace without justice for all the peoples of the world. Our desire for peace joins us. However, not only are we united in our desire for peace, we are united in our fear for the future, fear for the world that our children and grandchildren will inherit, fear that the world as we know it will no longer exist, indeed fear that the earth will no longer exist.

But even as our fear unites us, our beliefs as to what methods are to be used to achieve peace divide us. This fear of which I have spoken takes two forms and further divides us. There are those who fear the loss of freedom and of our political, economic, and social way of life. For the most part, people who have this fear fear the Soviet Union. They fear Russian aggression and the imposition of the Communist way of life. They tend to believe that we must protect ourselves from armed aggression through the building of strong defence systems. Many believe that members of the peace movement will seek peace at any political price, that they will sacrifice freedom for survival. Often they characterize the peaceniks as cowards who are afraid to defend our way of life. On the other side there are people who fear destruction of the earth, who fear that the earth will be blown to pieces either by accident or through human or computer failure. Certainly all of us know that machines wear out, and international observers can observe how many close calls there have been due to computer malfunctions or how as human beings we all make mistakes.

Members of the peace movement also fear the proliferation of nuclear arms. They fear that nuclear weapons will fall into the hands of leaders such as the Ayatollah Khomeini or Muammar Qaddafi and that these weapons will be used in a fit of temper. Many believe that the defence-oriented movement will lead the world down the path to nuclear annihilation, that the defence-oriented believe it is better to be dead than to be red. In many cases these fears, however they are manifest, have taken the form of terror as we confront our feelings of vulnerability, powerlessness, despair, and hopelessness. Too often, to ward off these feelings, the fear is transformed into anger and hate.

Such is the basis, I believe, of much anti-Americanism. It is founded on fear that the Americans will not respect political sovereignty — Chile, Nicaragua, and Grenada are held up as examples — and fear that the Americans will put their interests before those of their allies and neighbours. Many Europeans fear this. The imposition of countervailing duties and the subsidization of farmers for wheat sales to Russia have shaken the confidence of many Canadians, and there is fear that the Americans will act irrationally. Certainly statements such as Reagan's, that Russia is an evil empire, escalate that fear.

In the same way anti-Soviet feelings arise. Fear of aggression as was seen in Russia's invasion of Hungary

and Afghanistan, fear of the imposition of political will and the destruction of freedom in sovereign nations such as has happened in Poland, fear that Gorbachev is a master manipulator of world opinion with his pronouncements about a moratorium on testing: thus do the superpowers hold the rest of the world hostage.

Most of us have some fear of both, even if we do align ourselves with one or the other. We are afraid because of how they, the leaders of the superpowers, respond to their fear. They respond by attempting to increase the fear and insecurity in the other leaders. They respond by transforming their fear into hate and paranoia, and through hate transform the peoples they fear into the other, the enemy, and in so doing rob those people of their humanity. These enemies are seen as other than human beings who are born into a self-conscious life, other than human beings who, in the same way that we do, dream and love, marry and have children and, after having lived, die hoping that the world is a better place for their children than it was for them. Our leaders fail to see that their so-called enemies feel sorrow and joy as we do. Thus they dehumanize them and create them as the enemy for us; thus we can with our leaders plan horrible consequences for those others because of the error of their ways and because we believe they are planning similar fates for us. The military people, the armaments people, work to instill in those people, the enemy, such fear that they will be afraid to act. Such is the philosophy of MAD, mutually assured destruction.

But what happens when people are afraid? They build bigger and bigger defence and even offence systems with all the inherent dangers that I mentioned earlier, and thus we have an ever-spiralling escalation of the arms race. Where might it all end? In conventional war? Not likely, if one side is losing.

[Mr. Gogo in the Chair]

Total nuclear war — we certainly know what that can mean — or limited nuclear war, if such a war is possible, which I do not believe, will result in a nuclear winter which will put in jeopardy all life on earth. Even a limited war will fill the atmosphere with radioactive particles, and we know from the Chernobyl accident how vulnerable we all are to radioactive fallout. It is said that the living will envy the dead. Thus, we live in fear. But the peoples of the world pay in other ways. Dwight Eisenhower said in 1953:

Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies in the final sense a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed.

The world is not spending money on arms alone. It is spending the sweat of its labourers, the genius of its scientists, and the houses of its children. In the United States 30 to 50 percent of scientists and engineers are in military focussed programs, and 50 to 70 percent of research and development budgets are focussed on armaments and military spending, developing high technology that has little relevance for everyday life. In 1986 the world military budget equalled \$1 trillion. That is \$2 million per minute, and every minute 30 children die from malnutrition or lack of access to basic medical attention. Just seven months' worth of world military spending would be enough to pay for supplying clean water and adequate sanitation to two billion people, the 40 percent of the world's population who now lack these bare essentials. If \$25 billion per year, approximately 2 percent of this year's arms budget, were

put into agricultural development for the next 15 years, the world's food problems would be solved. The \$1 billion cost of one nuclear submarine equipped with missiles is equal to the combined annual education budgets of 28 developing countries with 160 million children. For the price of one Pershing II missile, one million children could be immunized against preventable communicable diseases.

Scientists also note the cost in terms of environmental pollution: contaminated water, acid rain, the buildup of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, as well as the loss of topsoil and ozone depletion. Such factors, unchecked, place the future of life on this earth in jeopardy. However, we often close our eyes to suffering at a distance in other parts of the world, and we ignore the warnings of our scientists about the fragility of our ecosystem.

Here in our province in this city of Edmonton, we hear of another price being paid by our children, a price being paid by children around the world in the United States, Russia, Japan, and Sweden. In 1975 in the U.S. 22 percent of high school children feared that nuclear war or biological annihilation would be the fate of humankind in their lifetime; 35 percent thought so in 1983. About 30 percent of Canadian children think daily or weekly about nuclear war, mostly with fear and anxiety. In Edmonton 33 percent of adolescents say that their plans of marriage and having children are influenced by the threat of war. The possibility of war was the leading concern listed in their responses to the question: which three things do you worry about most? Twenty-nine percent said that chances were high or very high that nuclear war will occur in their lifetime. It is all summed up in a statement made to me by one of my children: "Why would anyone want to have babies when there is no future for them?"

Research shows that the most worried children are the better adjusted children, the ones who have higher grade point averages and more mature relationships. They are the children most perceptive and most interested in life, and these are the children most robbed of a sense of future, of a sense of the continuation of life. These children, as do many peoples of the world, feel as if they are helpless witnesses to the destruction of their future, helpless victims of the arms race.

The time has come for all of us to act to face this wall of fear that divides and immobilizes us. This motion before you today encourages you and all Albertans to work for peace in whatever ways are right for you. The work for peace can take many forms. People could write to Reagan and Gorbachev and demand that they resume negotiations in regard to test-ban treaties and bilateral disarmament. People could wear a pin that symbolizes peace. They could write a letter to Prime Minister Brian Mulroney in regard to the visiting of our harbours by U.S. warships carrying nuclear-capable missiles such as the ASROC, seeking assurance and confirmation that the ships are not carrying nuclear missiles. They could be involved with organizations concerned with human rights violations or with organizations that work to educate or aid Third World countries in other ways. They could just start discussion groups with other people to talk about their fear, their despair, and how they can take action to overcome their feelings of powerlessness, for it is acting, taking unto ourselves the power to direct the course of our lives and ultimately the course of human survival, that takes away from the despair we feel. We could put bumper stickers on our cars. We could approach municipal governments to have local districts declared nuclear-free zones.

We could ask for and become involved in education for peace, education that opens students up to the oneness, the interconnectedness, of life and of all people, of our shared humanity and thus to tolerance and understanding and a quest for justice for all people. Through such education we would foster peace through the discovery of new ways of viewing the world and new ways of solving world problems through communication instead of confrontation and force. Recognition would come that security today demands social and economic development and justice.

We share a world, and we will share in its fate. We must recognize the sacredness, the beauty, and the fragility of our world. It is said that when the astronauts first viewed the world from space, they were struck with wonder of the heart. I believe many of us are struck with wonder in the same way when we first see our newborn child. Life is indeed a miracle. We must act to protect and preserve all life, and then we will have peace. I ask through this motion that we and all Albertans commit ourselves to peace, to life.

Thank you.

MR. DAY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to address this motion today and concur with the member opposite that I would hope there would be a desire for peace in the hearts of every person here in this Assembly and in this province. I'd like to comment that matters of peace and defence as well as Canada's dealings with other governments and international government organizations like the UN fall into the domain of the federal government. However, that does not excuse our responsibility for voicing our concerns in this area. I think it would be instructive for us to ask ourselves: has this country and has this province commenced initiatives in the area of peace, and are there ongoing initiatives even sponsored by this province and this government?

We know that since the end of World War II, Canada has been instrumental in the forming of international organizations and policies designed to preserve peace and promote disarmament. The Canadian government had considerable impact on the formation of the UN in 1945; we know that. Out of this self-defined role Canada made, through the UN, considerable contributions to the restoration and preservation of peace around the world by pioneering the task of peace-keeping. Canada has provided manpower and financial resources to peacekeeping forces in the Middle East, Cyprus, India, and Pakistan, just to name a few.

One of the unfortunate outcomes of World War II was the polarization of international politics between east and west and, corresponding with and subsequent to that, the rapid increase of the nuclear threat. Because of her political allegiances and strategic geographic position, it was natural and necessary for Canada to join alliances which were formed in response to these developments. Canada does have an ongoing commitment to NORAD and NATO and fully accepts responsibility to maintain the effectiveness of these alliances. Canada does contribute to the deployment of NATO troops in Europe and provides training facilities for NATO troops within Canada. The Canadian government has also renewed its commitment to active participation in disarmament efforts, expressing concerns about the arms race and calling for arms reductions. In the speech given by the Rt. Hon. Joe Clark, federal minister of External Affairs, to the UN on September 25, 1984, that particular concern about disarmament was specifically expressed.

In terms of Alberta as a province, again, we look at the Constitution Act of 1867, which defines foreign affairs

as a prerogative of the federal government. On the other hand, nowhere in the Constitution Act are the provinces clearly excluded from dealings with foreign countries. So the province of Alberta has undertaken a variety of international activities which not only are beneficial for Alberta but, it can be argued, also make a valuable contribution to the preservation of world peace without interfering in matters of federal jurisdiction. These activities are geared primarily toward the creation and improvement of economic and cultural ties with foreign countries. As we know, the province maintains Alberta offices in New York, Houston, Los Angeles, London, Hong Kong, and Tokyo. The mandate of these offices is to raise Alberta's profile in economic and other areas. Foreign investment in Alberta is encouraged and trade opportunities explored, and this mutual understanding between Albertans and many foreigners is enhanced through the promotion of tourism. In the context of international peace and understanding, the Alberta offices in Tokyo and Hong Kong also deserve mention as their activities, among others, are geared toward the People's Republic of China.

Another important facet of Alberta's foreign relations is the friendly ties which the provincial government has established with its provincial counterparts in Hokkaido, Japan; Kangwon, Korea; and as recently as 1981, the province of Heilongjiang in the People's Republic of China. We believe that this type of understanding engendered between provinces has spawned great mutual interest between the citizens of those provinces to get to know each other better. Alberta has also hosted a Chinese trade show, many cultural exchanges have taken place, and some schools have been twinned.

An important facet of international relations which has an impact on the level of peace and conflict worldwide is the question of development aid. Alberta has traditionally made efforts to aid in the development of foreign economies through the Alberta Agency for International Development. This agency's commitment to development is considerable. In 1984 and '85 alone 83 nongovernmental organizations received close to \$10 million for 469 projects in over 90 countries in Asia, Africa, and the Americas. I would suggest that these peace initiatives of this province are significant.

As far as Alberta and the topic of national defence, the involvement of the provincial government is limited to ensuring that the danger of damage to the lives of Albertans be reduced to the lowest possible level. On matters of political principles cabinet ministers and private government members have repeatedly stated that they strongly oppose the use of nuclear weapons. They've also maintained that nuclear weapons and the principle of deterrence are political facts which have to be dealt with in a realistic manner. This includes Alberta's and Canada's commitment to western defence alliances. Again, our commitment is to ensure that the danger of damage to the lives of Albertans be reduced to the lowest possible level.

If we could use an analogy, I'd like you to picture yourself living in a home in a neighbourhood. In that neighbourhood I'd like you to picture a bully, a bully who breaks into other homes in the neighbourhood, a bully who terrorizes the people in those homes, and a bully who goes relatively unrestricted in his bullying. Were you to live in that particular neighbourhood, observe that sociological fact happening and look around and realize that nobody in the neighbourhood seemed to be forcibly bringing that bully to a halt, you would eventually come to the conclusion that to protect your family and your children you would have to do something to defend yourself. You would make it known to the bully that you were defending your home.

Were the bully to make advances on your home, you would not roll over and sit there peaceably and tell him to come in, knowing his history of past bullying. You would make it very clear — first diplomatically and then forcibly, I would think — that you were not going to have your home invaded by such a bully.

I suggest that on the world and international scene, there are such bullies in the form of countries. Let's now put ourselves in the global neighbourhood. We have seen — I know we can name others, but we'll use the Soviet Union as an example of a country which since its inception has declared that violent revolution and uprising will be one of the means by which it accomplishes its goals. It has never retracted those goals. Even with its present leader there has been no retraction to date. In the Thirties we saw an estimated 5 million in the country of the Ukraine systematically starved to death. We have seen invasions into Afghanistan; we have seen the influences in Angola and other parts of Africa; we have seen the influence, the bullying, and the terrorism that goes on in central America. I'm not saying that no other countries are involved in this; I'm just using one, the Soviet Union, as an example of an international neighbourhood bully.

We as a province and as government members are willing and proud to say that we love our families, our children, and this province. We will do what we can, first diplomatically and then along defence lines, to let such bullies know that they will not be able to come into our homes and bully. Because of that we are involved in certain initiatives along defence lines, at the same time declaring that we oppose the use of nuclear weapons and that we ourselves do not maintain nuclear weapons. I think we need to come to grips with this reality in terms of what peace initiatives are all about.

We can look at Alberta personalities who have been involved with the peace and disarmament issues. We can go back as far as the '30s and look at the late Chester Ronning from Camrose. [applause] Yes, he's worthy of recognition. He served as an Alberta MLA from 1932 to '35, for many years served as charge d'affaires in China, and was a special peace negotiator in Vietnam in the '60s. That's one of our Albertans. Douglas Roche, who was a Member of Parliament for Edmonton South, also has a longstanding involvement with peace issues. He's on the board of directors of the World Conference on Religion and Peace, is the international chairman of Parliamentarians for World Order, and was also appointed Canada's ambassador for disarmament by the federal government — another Albertan. Last but certainly not least — at least some would argue not least — the Member of Parliament for Yellowhead, the Rt. Hon. Joe Clark, should be mentioned. He is presently the Secretary of State for External Affairs and has on many occasions promoted the importance of the UN to the world community and the Canadian government's commitment to peace and an end to the nuclear buildup. So we see many examples of initiation from this province, both individually and collectively as a province.

One part of the motion that could be seen as controversial is the last section, which urges the government to encourage all Albertans "to participate as best suits them in activities and undertakings having as their goal the achievement of peace." I respectfully suggest to the member opposite that this wording might imply that the Assembly would encourage activities which would run counter to Alberta's and Canada's commitments to the western alliances and that the Assembly might condone potentially unlawful behaviour like civil

disobedience, as some groups may feel that that would be the best way to show their peace initiatives.

On the other side of that, we might see groups — many Albertans feel strongly that to establish peace we actually need more nuclear weapons. Many Albertans actually feel that. I'm not saying I share that feeling, but we could be encouraging those groups to come out almost confrontationally with other groups who would be on the other side of the issue. We could be encouraging actual confrontation between groups in terms of their various ideas on what should be done for peace. Many people in this province feel that our gun laws are far too restrictive, that we should all have guns and that would be a deterrent for peace. By telling people to take part in the activities which they feel would best promote their goals of peace, we would not want to be caught in the position of condoning or encouraging something that runs counter to either civil law or the present government position.

Through its action on many fronts, Alberta has consistently shown that it supports world peace and greater understanding between nations. I've numbered several of those. As such, while there has been no formal endorsement of 1986 as the International Year of Peace, the actions of the Alberta government have been consistent with this goal.

I would speak to this motion by saying I have some concerns with it on things that it might arouse us to do. At the same time, I would say to the member that I do support the principle of peace and supporting peace initiatives.

Thank you.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I think my comments will take even less than four minutes. I rise to speak in favour of this motion, particularly the third paragraph, which urges us to operate not particularly on the basis of prejudice and assumptions but rather asks that we petition the federal government to represent Albertans by advancing

forcefully and consistently an international policy in favour of the achievement of peace around the world.

To that end, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table copies of two postcards which I think may serve as reminders to all members in the Assembly of the sort of money, the sorts of jobs, and the sorts of priorities that we squander in the name of creating and perpetuating war, particularly as our society enters a very technologically advanced stage in the development of history.

I'd like to read exactly what these postcards say. They're about four years old, and they're from Britain. One says:

The money required to provide adequate food, water, education, health and housing for everyone in the world has been estimated at \$17 billion a year. It is a huge sum of money ... about as much as the world spends on arms every two weeks.

The other categorizes jobs generated by spending \$1 billion: military, 76,000; transport, 92,000; construction, 100,000; health, 139,000; education, 187,000. Admittedly, the actual dollars here do not reflect inflation over the last few years. Nonetheless, the general relationship between the figures stands and I think will serve as a reminder to all members how important it is that we keep our priorities right in defending this motion.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ALGER: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to participate in the debate on Motion 216. The resolutions put forward in this motion by the Member for Edmonton Avonmore are

timely ones which I have found to be quite thought provoking. I can't find much to disagree with in this motion in principle, and I doubt that anyone would. I'm sure everyone hopes for the achievement and maintenance of peace throughout the world. I agree that everyone should be encouraged and be able to participate in activities in the pursuit of peace, provided that these activities are within the confines of the law.

We are indeed most privileged to be living in a society whose foundations are democratic ones which support the notion of freedom of thought and expression. A price had to be paid for this freedom, Mr. Speaker. Many people lost their lives fighting for our freedom in the last world wars. I for one and indeed a lot of you knew some of the people who died in the Second World War, and I guess a lot of us had many relatives who passed away in the First World War as a direct result of the conflict. They sacrificed their lives so we could have the freedom we enjoy today.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that peace can only be achieved and maintained through a combination of measures, one of which is declaring our objections to war and collectively lobbying for the preservation of peace. I think this is what Motion 216 addresses most adequately. Realistically, however, I also believe that we must take the appropriate measures to protect ourselves. This involves making a commitment to our allies around the world and maintaining our military. A third and very important measure needed for the preservation of peace is a commitment to a variety of social and economic initiatives toward foreign countries. By developing social and economic ties with other countries, I believe we can develop a better understanding of the different cultures and perspectives of world issues.

In this instance, I think the Alberta government within its own provincial jurisdiction makes a valuable contribution to the preservation of world peace. A good example of this is the province's initiatives in developing economic and social ties with countries such as Japan, Korea, and the People's Republic of China. Another good example is the government's history of providing international economic aid to Third World countries. The provision of financial aid helps facilitate stability in countries where conflict is easily developed. Mr. Speaker, it's a combination of social, economic, and military measures that maintains the fine balance between conflict and peace.

I thank the Member for Edmonton Avonmore for bringing this issue to the floor for debate. It has allowed me to express at least some of my views on what I consider to be a very important matter. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this particular motion. It seems to me that more and more citizens in our province, our country, and our world are becoming involved in the peace movement. The reason they are becoming involved is because they have an apprehension and a concern about their future — their own future, their children's future, and their grandchildren's future. I think they're getting involved because they love this planet Earth that we all share together. More and more I think they're expecting some leadership in our relations with other countries from their governments at all levels — local, provincial, federal — to work toward relations that can allow us to live together in peace.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think we can have peace if we're going to continue to prepare for war. If we're really serious about having a society of peace, I think we have to do at least two things. One is that as a global community, as a

family, we have to shift our resources away from the massive production of weapons toward meeting the basic needs of all the people of the world. Secondly, if we're serious about working toward building a world of peace, I think we have to commit ourselves to saying that violence and war are no longer acceptable ways to resolve conflicts, if they ever were.

Peace is not a partisan issue, Mr. Speaker. With the present range in nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, we're really talking about our own survival as a species. At this point I think we now face a choice. We can either do nothing, drift along as we have in the past, and eventually have either an accidental or determined nuclear holocaust, or we can work together to make sure that all the people of the world have their basic needs met, renounce violence as a way of solving conflicts, and work together in a society that is characterized by peace. The choice is ours, Mr. Speaker, and I hope the members of this Assembly and the people of this province will choose life and peace.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to Motion 216, there are three components. The first, of course, is the endorsement of the United Nations' declaration of 1986 as the International Year of Peace. The second component brought to us by the Member for Edmonton Avonmore is the encouragement of all Albertans to participate in activities to achieve peace. Of course, the third component is the urging of our federal government to advance policies to achieve peace. I support the motion by the member and I endorse those components.

Who could otherwise not endorse or encourage or urge in this way? No one wants war. Certainly no one wants peaceful co-existence to end, unless it is a better peace. We all want peace, but surely not at any price. What of Afghanistan? Who speaks for 13 million people, 3 million of whom have been slain or imprisoned or taken away? What of Cuba? Who speaks for the Cubans? What of the eastern block behind the Iron Curtain? Who speaks here in this Assembly for them or for any others who've had their freedoms, liberties, and rights taken from them by force, conquest, terror, or thuggery?

We have a very special privilege: we can debate this motion in this Assembly. Manitoba can declare itself nuclear free. In my own constituency, the members of the town council of Cochrane can present to the citizens of the town in the elections this year a plebiscite to determine if Cochrane will be nuclear free. As the Member for Red Deer North so eloquently reminded us all a few moments ago, who debates peace and these principles in the communities behind that Iron Curtain, in Moscow, Murmansk, Kabul, and Cambodia?

As the Member for Highwood has said, I too would like to remind all of us — and I look at you, Mr. Speaker, in your other capacity as the Member for Calgary Egmont — of the wartime sacrifices of countless men, women, and children in the Armed Forces or the merchant marine or as civilians in our cities and on our farms. They gave their lives or their limbs for freedom. Today in peacetime there are military and civilian personnel in our country on active duty or in reserves prepared to maintain peace by offering themselves as our defenders.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I was hoping to put on my goggles and my helmet and by verbiage take you back 25 years to the construction of the Berlin wall in 1961. During that period of time I flew 500 missions in defence of our country. Other present and past members of this Assembly

have served their country. I was a pilot then. I was flying CF-100s, twin jet interceptors, in North Bay, Ontario, as a member of Canada's NORAD and NATO commitment. I was a little younger; I was perhaps a little wilder but dedicated to peace, just as the Member for Edmonton Avonmore is.

The aircraft was defensively, not offensively, armed. We protected Toronto or Edmonton or Chicago from a high altitude intruding bomber. In 1961 one bomber was capable of destroying with the push of a button any of those cities or our civilization as we knew it. We flew in rain, hail, snow, sleet, and darkness. We went through cumulonimbus clouds or above, in the jet streams. We were subsonic then. Today it's different, but our targets then were subsonic. Most of mine turned out to be off-track passenger jets, but someone had to be first up there to see who they were as they penetrated our coastlines. Many were Strategic Air Command, United States Air Force bombers, on penetrating missions to help make sure that we were ready.

Mr. Speaker, a number of my friends were killed. Many could not take the pressure and gave up and went home, back to civilian life. But there was no war, and if you were born at that time you could sleep at night, even if we wakened you at 2:30 in the morning with our noisy take-offs.

One of the activities I would like to see as an act for peace is to encourage our young people to consider service in Canada's Armed Forces. I also support the federal government's initiatives in NATO and NORAD and so do the majority of the constituents of Banff-Cochrane who have talked to me about this.

Mr. Speaker, in supporting this motion and in urging our federal government to advance international peace, I do not support any less vigilance, any sign of weakening of our defence budget and system, or any reduction of our central expenditures for the necessary defensive weapons and their replacement and renewal to keep abreast of technological change.

Others indeed gave their lives. I gave seven years for the freedom of this country and all of that was so we could have a debate like this in this Assembly in this country. Let us hope that freedom isn't bartered away in the name of peace and that we remain strong and vigilant in our search for peace.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, let us as an Assembly urge all people to make cool appraisal, devoid of preconceptions, of the actions of the leaders of nations around the world, temperately voicing our opinions accordingly and supporting those who appear to be against war and preparations for war, giving to those who seem sincere the benefit of the doubt and responding accordingly. Let us as an Assembly urge all people to be vocal about the efforts of those who are trying to uplift those oppressed by war with a view to the cessation of that war and support diversion of funds from the engines of war to the tools of peace.

Mr. Speaker, let us as an Assembly urge all people to support the efforts of the United Nations, recognizing the inherent difficulties of such a large organization always to progress lineally but at the same time recognizing that it is the chief hope of the world for the maintenance of peace. Let us as an Assembly urge all people to commit themselves to the principles of nonviolent solutions of disputes and tolerance for all generally embodied in the Christian ethic but which in truth is to be found in the principles of all the great religions.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the motion before us puts the matter as well as it can be without undue contentiousness, and I urge unanimous support of the Assembly for it.

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Speaker, just a couple of comments. When we as nations become enemies of each other, I think we have to be careful that to some extent we don't become what we see the other one as being. I think we are very much in danger of that in the world now. I think that we in North America and the western world see the Russians, to quote Ronald Reagan, as an evil empire. We — when I say "we" I guess I'd have to say mostly the Americans, in their foreign policy — end up doing things that we would normally be ashamed of and would not do, things like supporting Pinochet in Chile. Even in the paper yesterday we saw an article in which they asked him to for heaven's sake quit abusing the civil rights of his people so much. I'm sure if you go to Russia and talk to the people there, they perceive the west as an evil enemy, so they build up their forces and send troops into Afghanistan.

I have a good friend from Afghanistan. He walked out with his wife beside him and his child on his shoulder, so I know something of the Afghan situation. I'm sure they justify putting money into arms to defend themselves the same way we put money into arms to defend ourselves. Surely one cannot be against the reduction of expenditures on armaments if we can just convince the other side to also make a like reduction.

I would like to make that point.

MR. YOUNIE: Mr. Speaker, I've a couple of reasons for supporting this motion with some fervour. The Member for Banff-Cochrane mentioned his tour of duty in North Bay, and although I'm sure he meant it rhetorically, it is in fact entirely possible that he did literally wake me up in the middle of the night, because it was in the early '60s that my father was posted there.

Part of the reason I support this Bill is the military background. In two bases in Ontario I spent a number of nights in my childhood huddled in a basement after hearing a siren go off. It was what those in authority called an air raid alert. In fact, our houses were inspected from time to time to ensure that we had a three-week supply of food and water in the basement in case we were bombed and had to stay down there for the three weeks it would take for it to be safe to come outside again. Newer knowledge has taught us that three weeks might be a quarter of a million years too soon, depending on what kind of bomb blew up above us.

I have not been in favour of peace because my human nature tells me to be peaceful. Oftentimes when I disagree strongly with a person, my nature tells me that if I punch him in the nose often enough, he might start to agree with me. Practical experience has taught me that nine times out of 10 he will be bigger than me and hurt my nose worse than I hurt his, and I have perforce become a much more pacific person than my nature might dictate on occasion.

One of my strongest reasons for supporting this is the result of 14 years of teaching and seeing young people develop a sense of insecurity about the world they're living in. It fills me with dismay when I hear a child talk about what he might be if he grows up instead of when he grows up. We may live in the first age of human history where the bulk of children cannot be confident of the fact that as a group, if not as individuals, they will grow up and fulfill all of those potentials. I heard a report on the radio with

psychiatrists saying that more and more of the people they see are in fact young people and they are seeing them for longer periods of time for more serious ailments. They relate it to insecurities about their future. Although I was driving to work at the time and didn't want to jot down too many statistics as I drove, it filled me with a sense that we are not providing those children with the sense of security about the future that they need.

A government cannot provide security in all ways to all people, but I think that with the unanimous passage of this Bill, a number of the students I taught — students that I helped form a Youth for Peace club, which has started to spread to other schools in the province; students who in fact developed a petition and presented it in this Legislature with the help of their MLA for Clover Bar — will feel that this Legislature and the people in it truly care about their future and are truly concerned that that future happen in a way they find hopeful and decent. Regardless of political ideologies, if for no other reason, I therefore urge that we work together to provide for the young people of Alberta confidence that the people in this Legislature do care and do wish to give them some assurance that we are working for peace in their future.

Thank you.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, I too wish to speak in support of this motion brought forward by the hon. Member for Avonmore, and I thank the member for presenting it to this House. I fully support the first part of the motion in acknowledgment and endorsement of the United Nations' year of peace. As we know, the United Nations is not an institution or organization without frailty, but we must do everything possible in our power to make it strong, because it's there; it's one of the great moves for peace and security in our world that we know, and perhaps the only one.

Mr. Speaker, in my mind peace is not simply the absence of war. Conflicts cannot and will not be resolved by violence and war. Peace is freedom from the anxiety and threat of war, particularly nuclear war, perhaps the greatest anxiety and fear now present in people of younger years. Peace is freedom from racial discrimination, freedom from a polluted environment. Peace is freedom from hunger and the loss of clean water. It's all of those things that we in this country take for granted and that we don't seem to be totally aware are great sources of anxiety and fear in other parts of the world.

I thank the Member for Avonmore for her very thoughtful and passionate, yet rational, statement, and I can't add a great deal to it at all. I think any comments would perhaps detract from the importance of her statement, but I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it's not enough for us to have pious hopes or a time to be smug or comfortable in what we're doing in this province, in our cities, or in this nation.

I sometimes feel, Mr. Speaker, that we are so engrossed with our own objectives, which are often petty, ambitious, and parochial, that we fail to look up or take responsibility for the problems of the world we live in or do anything about it. Perhaps it's a function of having lived through World War II or the wars that followed, such as the Korean war, and the fear and total anxiety of looking after small children during the Cuban invasion, the Vietnam war, the Arab-Israeli wars, and the wars that go on all around us every day.

Or perhaps it's a function, Mr. Speaker, of having been privileged in my life to work and spend a great deal of time in other parts of our world and to get to know other

cultures. I am intensely patriotic, intensely Canadian, and intensely loyal, but when I see other cultures I realize how very much we have to learn, how many things in other cultures are valuable, beautiful, important, and safe, and how many things we should take unto ourselves from other cultures. Perhaps it's a function of aging, of being able to see the greater world around us and of trying to raise my sights beyond what's in my little, narrow, subjective world.

Mr. Speaker, how can we in conscience look at our children and grandchildren unless we take the right course, and the only course, here. I think we have to be prepared to test all our decisions and all our positions against whether they enhance or inhibit peace.

I'm pleased with the second part of the motion, because it acknowledges that we aren't all the worldbeaters that have been mentioned. I'm proud, too, to have known Mr. Douglas Roche and Mr. Chester Ronning, who was a good friend. But we can all do our part in whatever small way. We can be vocal; we can tell our decision-makers. We can make our position clear in our family life, our work life, and our community life. We can all do something, and we must all act together for the right cause, Mr. Speaker. In fact, the only cause is the commitment to the survival of humankind, to peace in our world.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add what for me has been a growing insight and concern and what has not yet been touched on in the debate on this motion so far this afternoon. I commend the comments of all hon. colleagues to date on this motion. I guess all of us who are new to the Legislature have been experiencing a time of transition in terms of the way we think or act or, at times, the way we look at the world. Certainly before I became a member of the Legislature, I was able to look at the world with very personal eyes; that is, in very interpersonal ways with people, one to one in terms of relationships of a very personal nature. But now that we are in a chamber of legislative authority and an assembly of political thought, my attention has turned to the third part of the motion, which directs us as legislators and as politicians in a sense to look at this issue and raise it at a political level, one which has of course been done in very many ways. It's one that is in a sense new to me in terms of how to best go about it.

Certainly in some of my earlier reading, which I've been rereading, there is a real difference between what one person has called moral man and immoral society. That is, there are differences between the way we can look at the compassion human beings have for one another as opposed to the competition nation-states have for one another. In this world view, what is the role of the nation-state, the collective, the conglomerate or, for that matter, legislators or politicians who, in terms of our defined nature, have their own self-interests, legitimate or not? As this commentator said, individuals have needs but nation-states have interests. When those interests, legitimate or not, come into conflict, how can peace prevail? Therefore, in the last of the motion, how can we lobby our own federal government to forcefully and consistently advance international policy in favour of peace, recognizing that in the nature of things and throughout human history, as long as we have had nation-states of any sort, they have come into conflict over how their interests are to be attained?

It seems to me that even as we often come into conflict in this Legislative Assembly over how, through our own partisan politics or the needs of our constituents, we see

there is certain inherent conflict in the nature of things, yes, we must all indeed acknowledge there is, at the root of motivation for power, great power in national self-interests mobilizing themselves. As other members have already said, I am proud to be a Canadian, for in Canada we have, partially at least, a history of a nation-state that has as one of its self-interests that of being a peacekeeper. We are a nation that works in the global community, in the international sphere, working with other nations to come up with not gaining interest for other nations through the use of violence, coercion, or force, but rather seeing that, yes, nations can work together peaceably for the economic, political, and social advantages of other nation-states. These skills are not violent and do not entail war but rather entail the greater skills of diplomacy, bilateral talks, and even sacrifice of particular national interests. These skills are what we are calling for in the third part of this motion in terms of what an international policy in favour of peace must entail.

My generation of Canadians has seen that with the buildup of nuclear weapons throughout the world, we have, as the hon. member who began debate on this motion said, nothing short of assured mutual destruction. We have a new political ethic. We have a new global ethic. That is, nation-states' interests are only viable in a world where there is one world. We have national self-interests, which must now be transcended to seem the interests of not one particular nation-state over another but rather how the interests can be bilaterally achieved.

We are in a world today where national defence must resolve itself into global economic sharing in the interests of humanizing our one planet. This international policy for peace, Mr. Speaker, must entail paying a new cost. This is the cost of increasing what it is to share. This is the cost of what it is to lay down our lives for one another. This is the cost of seeing ourselves, myself, as the enemy. This is the cost of being Albertans and Canadians, yes, but most especially we are citizens of one world with our 3 billion brothers and sisters scattered over 100 other nations. This international policy is one that we all need to work for with fervor and with every fibre of our bodies. I think it is asking us to think globally and act locally. This is peace. My brothers and sisters in this Assembly this afternoon, I hope this is what we are being drawn to from the roots of our humanity.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PASHAK: I'd like to make a couple of brief remarks, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to respond to some comments made by the Member for Red Deer North, who tried to build a case that we can only really build peace through building strength. I'd like to suggest to him that I think the history of the world would show a different record. Those nations that prepare for peace through building up armaments actually find out that they wind up in conflict.

The second point I'd like to make is in response to some remarks made by the Member for Highwood. I really appreciated some of the thoughts he had to express. He suggested that one of the ways we could reduce global tension is to engage in more trading relationships. I think that is the experience of the world too. I appreciate his remarks on that point.

I would like to try to address this question from a somewhat personal point of view. We have been talking about a negative stereotype of the Soviet Union, the evil empire. In my rather lengthy time on the surface of this

globe I've seen many nations treated as enemies, and over time a lot of those enemies have become our friends. I think back to when I was in grade school, or even younger than that, during the Second World War. Many of you can recall the image of the Japanese and the Germans that was presented at that time, the stereotype of these people as being evil and fanatic. Now through the trading patterns the Member for Highwood mentioned, they are our friends. They're important allies, and we share many things with them. They helped us to improve our standard of living. I can remember, too, the image of the Chinese that was created in my mind as a high school student. Remember, at that time you had the Korean War; United States troops began to cross the Yalu River and the Chinese came down into that. The image created in our minds of the Chinese during that period of time was a bunch of totally ruthless people with baggy pants from a completely authoritarian society.

When our Prime Minister went to China back in the 1970s and opened up some kind of diplomatic relationships, we began to visit China and the United States began to visit China. We began to see that at a certain level the Chinese really weren't that different from ourselves, that they had the same concerns and they too wanted to have prosperity and a good life. As trading patterns developed, we began to share new understandings with them. I think if we could only do that, encourage more association and more contact with nations around the globe, we would begin to see that at a certain level we're all the same. We all want to live in a world of peace and harmony. If we could begin to arrive at that world by working toward the goal of disarmament, we would find that we would begin to have more wealth available for social purposes. Co-operation and sharing in itself would help to bring an increasing reduction in the arms race, which to my mind is the most serious obstacle to the question of peace.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: May the hon. member for Edmonton Avonmore close debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MS LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank all the hon. members that have spoken in support of this motion. I think we are all united in our commitment to peace. Even though we have expressed different positions, we all recognize the importance of peace, and if this motion passes, I hope all MLAs will return to their constituents and encourage them, as groups or individuals, to act toward the building of world peace.

I thank you.

[Motion carried]

217. Moved by Mr. Jonson:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to consider targeting the provincial share of grades 1 to 12 schooling costs towards providing an average of approximately 85 percent of the expenditure of school boards in the province on this program.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, since the 1970s the local share of the payment of schooling costs has increased substantially. Many concerned citizens, as well as municipal governments, have expressed alarm over the rising level of



school requisitions. They maintain that the costs of education increasingly are being borne by the local property tax payers.

I was just glancing at a major Alberta School Trustees' Association document in which they've documented their concern regarding this particular trend. As another example, the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association for some years has lobbied for the use of the general revenues of the province to fund education. During its 1984 convention, the association passed the following resolution:

Therefore be it resolved that the government of Alberta be requested to fulfill its 1971 commitment to remove the funding of schools from the property tax and have this important service to people funded through the general revenues of the province.

While I would not support the 100 percent type of funding that the AUMA is advocating, certainly it focuses upon a general trend and problem.

There is also some concern that as this trend continues, Mr. Speaker, there is an increasing likelihood of education inequities occurring across the province. There is statistical evidence that while there has been the general shift to a greater percentage of education costs being borne by local governments, this shift, when divided up so to speak, seems to be falling somewhat more heavily upon smaller jurisdictions and smaller rural jurisdictions.

Mr. Speaker, in a recent constituency survey the question of whether or not the province should be picking up a greater share of education costs was posed. A solid majority felt the province should pay a greater share. The indication was that, in their minds at least, a reasonable level would be 75 percent of total education costs. My constituents are not shy about writing any comments on these questionnaires. There were several comments, some in very explicit language, indicating that the property tax should be used for the service to property and that the cost of education should be more of a provincial cost. I thank the people who contributed to that questionnaire and took the time to comment on the matter of education.

Mr. Speaker, one could go on at greater length quoting sources of concern. Perhaps it's because school enrollment as a percentage of our population has declined from roughly 26.5 percent in 1971 to 18 percent today, and the proportion of people with school age children has declined while property taxes have increased somewhat. Whatever the factors — and I want to focus on some of them a bit later one — there is a general concern about a trend to a greater share of education costs being borne by the local taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, massive amounts of statistics have been generated by the school trustees, Alberta Education, the Alberta Teachers' Association, and many other groups to support one side or the other of the question of whether or not the province should pick up a significantly larger share of education costs. Over the years I've had the opportunity to read through quite a few of these documents, and in my remarks this afternoon I'll try to just zero in on two or three key pieces of information which I think put the whole problem in perspective. I would like to review these findings this afternoon.

First of all, I think it has to be acknowledged, and certainly should be acknowledged overall, that per-pupil expenditure in Alberta ranked second among provinces in Canada from combined provincial and local sources, second only to the province of Quebec. In 1986 it is estimated that this expenditure will be roughly \$4,085 per pupil, made up of \$2,597 from the provincial coffers and \$1,488 from the local taxpayer. Also, another related statistic: in 1984

according to Statistics Canada — and I don't believe this ranking has changed — Alberta ranked first in terms of school board expenditure per capita. So in overall terms, in Alberta education is being funded rather well. In the motion I'm not talking about there being a great overall deficiency in funding for education in the province; I am talking about the relative relationship between the two major participants as to who should be paying the greater part.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

A second factor that I would like to comment on, Mr. Speaker, would be the trend we have in the province with respect to who is paying the cost of education. We could go back to the 1960s when the school foundation program was introduced and the provincial share of education costs was approximately 90 percent, but to shorten up the time frame, I will use the period 1974 to 1983. I ran across a convenient table prepared by Alberta Education, and it outlines the situation rather well.

Mr. Speaker, in 1974 the provincial contribution was 81 percent, and the local contribution, raised mainly from property tax, was 19 percent. By 1983 the provincial contribution was 64.9 percent and the local contribution was up to 35.1. More recently, the relationship is 63 and 36 point something, although that's an estimate for '86. So, Mr. Speaker, there has been a very significant proportionate shift to more local expenditure in support of education, and that's mainly coming from the property tax although somewhat from school fees and other miscellaneous forms of revenue.

Mr. Speaker, the third statistical area I'd like to comment on is that, yes, the provincial government support through Alberta Education to schools has kept ahead of inflation, as shown by the consumer price index and the education price index, although there is debate over the actual degree to which this support has exceeded inflation. One recent, fairly reputable publication, I think, from the University of Alberta would indicate that during the period 1974 to '83 the provincial contribution to grades 1 to 12 schooling has increased to something in the neighbourhood of .6 percent per year, while local contribution has been going up at about 10.9 percent per year.

So we have a situation, Mr. Speaker, in which the overall educational system is rather well supported, where, yes, the provincial government has been able to keep pace with inflation in terms of its contributions to school boards, but there has been a decided shifting of the cost of the offering of the grades 1 to 12 program to the local taxpayer. So one has to consider next: why the shift? Why has the local contribution increased? Certainly this needs careful study, but at least the following factors are involved. First of all, we have the matter of program changes, and most of these are initiated at the provincial level, although certainly some are the decision of the local board, and that should, as I'll mention later, be their financial responsibility. I could use a couple of good examples here, because they fall into curricular and what I call co-curricular categories.

One area where there's definitely a curricular change — there's a promotion from the provincial level — is the whole area of French language and French immersion programs: very admirable developments in education, I think, ones that are quite popular and where demand is expanding throughout the province. But as trustees around the province and other people involved with education have noted, the introduction of a specialized program of this type has certain

cost implications that go beyond the simple consumer price index. Another example would be the library policy that a short time ago was approved by Alberta Education and distributed to school boards and schools across the province — an excellent document, Mr. Speaker, one that I think was long overdue — and I certainly hope that policy can be implemented. But once again, the cost implications of delivering on that policy go far beyond the simple matter of keeping pace with the consumer price index.

A second factor, Mr. Speaker, in explaining this trend is that there has been a shift in the mix of provincial funding to providing more provincial funds under special grants rather than in a more general way through school foundation program funding or through the per-pupil grants. Some of these grants — I might use as an example the recent library resources grant — provide a net gain in the revenue that a school board receives. But others require, in order to get and utilize them, extra local expenditure, and quite often that is not allowed for when the amount of the grants is decided upon. One area — and once again it's an excellent move, but it has to be recognized as being of some cost — is the school modernization program through Alberta Education. I think it is an excellent move on the part of the government to upgrade our aging schools. But the problem once again, particularly for some rural school boards, comes up when you first of all have an 80 percent provincial, 20 percent local formula for funding the project, and then you apply a utilization factor and consequently pretty soon the local school board has to pay 30 or 40 percent of the cost to modernization. Nevertheless, a good program. But it also is shifting more and more expenditure burden onto the local taxpayer in some cases.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we come to a factor in this shift, of interest I'm sure to everyone, and that's teachers' salaries. Over the past number of years from 1981 to '86, the last five years — though we could go back earlier — the actual negotiated teachers' salary increases have exceeded the consumer price index by about 1.9 percent. Yes, there's been some gain there, but it's far below the total overall percentage increase in terms of educational expenditure. So teachers' salary increases have pretty well tracked inflation. But I think it has to be recognized that the the total cost of salaries has gone up faster than provincial support. I suppose this is caused by the payment of increments, but the major factor in all of this is a factor which I think is now diminishing in terms of its impact. That is, some years ago — once again a very commendable move — the provincial government through the universities and then through the existing board of teacher certification set in place the policy that all qualifying teachers in Alberta should have a Bachelor of Education degree. Consequently, teachers who were not in that position got busy and began upgrading, and their salaries came up. That factor which might, by some people's estimates, account for about 2 or 3 percent in the salary load of the school boards of the province over a period of years to my knowledge has never been factored in to the grants to school boards.

The other factors to be considered are declining enrollments; there's been a slight reduction in the pupil/teacher ratio across the province and an even more slight decrease in the class size/teacher ratio. These of course have caused some increase in the overall cost of the education package.

I'd like to get back, Mr. Speaker, to what I consider to be the major factor in all of this, and that is that the increased costs of provincially initiated and maintained programs have to be recognized when they're initiated and

funded to a large degree from the provincial level. This problem, plus several others related to education finance, was recognized as needing attention in 1982, and the Alberta study program on education financing for grades K to 12 schooling was initiated.

This research group was to provide the best possible information to the minister's school finance task force, made up of representatives from 15 organizations in the province concerned with taxation and education funding. The list included the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties, the Alberta School Trustees' Association, the Alberta Chamber of Commerce, the Alberta Federation of Labour, the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association, the Alberta Teachers' Association, plus a representative from the general public, and I won't go through the other eight or nine groups on the list. The task force made some 19 recommendations. Several of the 19 have been acted upon, but what was generally considered the major recommendation was not. This was recommendation 3, and I'd like to just read it from the document:

The provincial share of total education costs should be targeted towards providing an average of ... 85% of the total expenditures of all school boards in the province, leaving an average of 15% to be raised by a local supplementary requisition.

Mr. Speaker, following the completion of the report, some exchange took place between the minister of the day and the committee regarding this particular recommendation. The minister expressed the concern, and I think rightfully so, that this would lead to increased local expenditure driving the size of the province's expenditure. The committee indicated in response that the move to 85 percent would be expected to be gradual and that, as indicated, the province should have a defined education plan or program that the government would eventually fund to the greater level of 85 percent. If a board of education wanted to add their own program, their own features, that would be their cost and their responsibility beyond what would be the remaining 15 percent.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that through the putting into place of a school management and finance plan Alberta Education has in place the means by which a defined educational program they're supporting for the province could be put in place, monitored, and of course funded to a greater level than is currently the case. I chose this report as a base for phrasing the motion that is before the Assembly. In the wording of the motion I've captured the part of the recommendation which recommends that funding go to the level of 85 percent. I know that some may look at the increasing of the local tax burden or the requiring of local expenditure to a greater degree as being a way of controlling educational expenditures, and if the province contributes more, then somehow local boards will go racing out finding ways to spend additional money. I think local trustees would handle the situation very responsibly and be grateful for it. Further, Mr. Speaker, this approach should not detract from the fact that overall, when we look at other economic statistics, the factors which affect the cost of education are more related to general economic conditions, increases in costs, and not due to any relationship between the percentage the province is paying versus the percentage the local jurisdiction is paying.

Mr. Speaker, I also realize that some might say, "Well, this is not such a good time to initiate such a move." As I've emphasized, the intent is that this is something that would be methodically phased in in terms of the funding

program of the province. I suppose there is never a good time in the minds of some, because when there are good times, people can afford to pay their local property taxes at an increasing rate, and when times are not quite so good, the province can't afford to change the ratio. But I would urge support for the motion. I think it is a matter that should be looked at. I sense that there is increasing discontent over the trend that is occurring, albeit people recognize there is a great deal of money being spent on education.

I note that in the past number of years it seems there have been great dislocating cycles gone through in terms of educational financing. In the 1960s the local tax load built up to a point, and then there was a decision made to go into the school foundation program funding. For a period of time there was a major provincial contribution to education. Then in the mid-1970s our government removed the school foundation plan levy from certain types of property and the ratio between provincial commitment and local commitment went back to, as I said before, somewhere around 80 percent for the province and a lesser amount for the local jurisdictions.

What I think has to occur, Mr. Speaker, is an investigation of just what factors are involved in the current trend. We have to come up with a plan to phase into a greater provincial commitment to the funding of education, and along with that has to go a description of just what program the provincial government is prepared to make this greater commitment to.

Thank you.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of this motion. We too have noted the increased tax load from 11 to 29 percent that has been shifted onto local taxpayers. Although grant increases have kept up with the cost of living, they certainly haven't kept up with the increased cost in more complex and more specialized education and the increasing demands put on the school. Particularly, we see the need for increased technology: electric typewriters, computers, as well as technology for the learning disabled and people that have disabilities. In addition, there is a new curriculum being introduced that may increase the burden on the schools as that is implemented. Another area where there has been an increase in cost has arisen from mainstreaming, where more specialized services, again in terms of technology or teachers' aides, are required.

To meet these increasing demands municipalities have turned to user fees, in 1984 collecting \$20 million in user fees in terms of bus fees — in one case \$180 per family — locker fees, school book fees, gym fees, instrument-rental fees: the kinds of fees that sometimes exclude children from some programs. In some areas classes or schools have been closed. In 1985, 11 schools were closed in Calgary. We see an increase in the number of multigrade classrooms, where a teacher has to cope with more than one grade level and one developmental level, or larger class loads that mean that teachers can give less personalized attention to each child even in a period when we are focussing on individual attention and meeting the needs of individual children. There's been reduction in specialized personnel: librarians, teachers' aides, consultants, this kind of thing. This happens in a time when rural municipalities particularly face a crisis due to the crisis in agriculture. What we see may be happening is the setting up of a two-tier system of education. This two-tier system may come about in one of two ways or in both ways: one, the split between the quality of education in the rural municipalities as compared to that

in urban municipalities, and in the second way, the kind of education that is available to children whose parents are of a higher economic status than those children of parents of lower economic status.

Interestingly enough, we see at this time increased standardization through the use of achievement tests, increasing centralization through the introduction of compulsory curriculum, but a decrease in funding. This flies in the face of the principle that he who pays the piper plays the tune. In addition, I would point out that income tax better reflects the ability of people to pay than property taxes do. For this reason I support this motion.

MRS. KOPER: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased the Member for Ponoka-Rimbey brought this matter to the floor of the Legislature. I feel it's most worthy. As a former member of a committee on the School Act review touring the province, I am quite familiar with the points that are being brought out. There were some suggestions in the presentation Partners in Education regarding the financing of education and the kind of structure in the face of the system that I think need a discussion of this type regarding the funding of education. Therefore, I'm pleased to rise and speak about this.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that this discussion reminds me very much of a quotation attributed to an Albertan, now deceased, who served as an alderman in Calgary, as a member of this House, and as a Member of Parliament — sometimes at the same time as well. As John Kushner would have said in his own inimitable way, "There is only one taxpayer paying these bills, and that's you and me."

So in a way, what we're talking about here is rather academic, and how we want to finance this, who we want to pay it — the taxpayer is definitely the bottom line. As I see the suggestion that comes from the task force on educational funding, what is really being suggested is income tax as a replacement for the education property tax. A whole new set of problems emerges from this, requiring further research before I feel it can be adopted as a desirable policy for our government. Property tax has been accepted as a legitimate source of revenue for local school boards over a period of many years. For instance, at least 30 years ago property taxes were the sole funding of schools.

Mr. Speaker, I think this motion should really be considered very carefully by the members of the Legislature, because while it is important that the province shoulder a major portion of educational costs, a fixed percentage perhaps is not what we are looking for. A fixed ratio formula for educational funding could result in local school boards determining the size of our provincial educational budget. That would be like an open cheque book. Provincial controls on board spending would have to be implemented; otherwise the education budget would be just wide open. I see this as a problem that leads to yet another far more serious implication: would trustees be necessary any longer? If the province is funding that proportion of education, is there a viable role for trustees at that point? If trustees are no longer responsible for making the decisions regarding extra funding or the basis of funding, are trustees really necessary?

Mr. Speaker, school board revenues make up a significant share of the local property tax. Perhaps they are not accountable to the municipal government, but they are accountable to the electorate, and it's important that they continue to be responsible to the electorate because their decisions regarding the particular circumstances for which they are responsible are likely far superior to decisions that

could be made at a provincial level. I think that if the focus from education in a local jurisdiction were shifted to the province, all of us in turn would suffer.

Mr. Speaker, since 1971 the government of Alberta has removed the school foundation program fund levy from residential property. The result was that in '75 the provincial General Revenue Fund supported the great majority of education costs. It's generally true, however, that school supplementary requisitions have increased substantially since the late 1970s because of the discretionary spending made by local school boards. But it is also very true that in Alberta we not only rank second in our per pupil costs but rank at the top of the heap, so to speak, in the amount of provincial cash that goes into the education dollar.

I believe strongly that property taxes make up about 12 percent of all taxes paid by individuals. A very important resource is funded through these taxes. We say in this Legislature many times over how important education is to us, how vital it is that this resource of our province be given the fullest possible attention. Mr. Speaker, I feel that's a worthy piece of rhetoric, but we certainly should go far beyond that. Our local responsibility for this is very important to me as a person. I know that in Calgary, being very proud of our school system, we feel that local autonomy is far more important at this point in time.

I think we must recognize the challenge relating to the general economic conditions and the authority and responsibility of the local school boards in expenditure matters. Property tax is a significant and important source of income and revenue for school boards, and I feel school boards are capable. They're elected by the people and they're capable of determining where these expenditures should go. Local education taxes, originally the school finance program fund, contributed 90 percent of the required revenues of school boards and was funded through local property taxes and provincial general revenues in approximately equal proportions. Mr. Speaker, provincial revenues currently provide approximately 60 percent of the required revenues, with less than one-sixth of the school finance program fund being funded through local property taxes.

Prior to 1975, school taxes increased at a lower rate than personal income, housing, other prices, and other forms of taxation. Mr. Speaker, during the last five years the rate of increase of school tax has been higher than these other indices, but the present residential school tax burden amounts to less than .5 percent of urban residential market values. As a citizen of Alberta, I don't believe that is high when I consider that the young people that are educated here certainly contribute to the quality of our lives. This figure, .5 percent of urban residential market values, should also be compared to a range of .2 percent to .7 percent from other jurisdictions in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, school funding is extremely important. The hon. Member for Edmonton Avonmore mentioned that fees are sometimes asked for in addition to the funding. I know of no child that's ever excluded from any activity in this province because they couldn't pay the fee.

Mr. Speaker, education must evolve from a need to a stated purpose. It must recognize and must respond to the individual needs of students, to the needs and aspirations of the parents as well as the students, to the needs of the community, and it must serve our society as a whole. In my opinion, the responsiveness, flexibility, and access to education are key factors in whatever method of funding and educational structure we design. In conclusion, the

important thing is that Alberta's current funding arrangements are proving to accommodate this wide range of needs.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that very serious thought should be given before we produce any fixed rates, open up the cheque book, so to speak, and lose the responsibility at the local level.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. YOUNIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in favour of the motion. As with the last motion we debated, it's because of my 14 years as a teacher. In fact, in my experience in 14 schools in five provinces as a student and teacher, I've seen a lot of schools. The one thing I noticed was that the quality of education in those schools tended to vary a lot, based not so much on the province in which the schools were located but on the commitment of people involved to the quality of education. I think oftentimes the amount of commitment any particular group feels towards education is directly proportional to their willingness to spend money on it. On that basis I would say the provincial government's commitment has been, if not reduced, certainly not increased as quickly as the cost of providing a good education has gone up.

The responsibility for funding quality education has been sent down a step to the next level of government, the municipal government. It becomes their job to find sufficient funds. So across Alberta oftentimes we find the quality of education an Alberta child receives is directly proportional to the willingness of the local municipality or jurisdiction to spend additional moneys over and above what they are getting from the province. Many of them do not have the same tax base across the province. I think it's obvious that the provincial government has its tax base and can send money on an equal proportion to various jurisdictions. Not every municipality has the same level of tax base, and therefore not every municipality can afford to put money into education at the same rate. So you find that a municipality, county, or jurisdiction with a very strong tax base is willing to put money, because it hurts a little less, into education and provide a top-notch system.

When I taught in the county of Strathcona, I found they were willing to put a lot of money into education and had a top-notch system. Although I won't name any other jurisdictions, I found that some I taught in in the province did not share that same commitment to quality education. I also found in the county of Strathcona, though, that they followed the example of the provincial government and sent it down one more step, that being to the parents of the students. I taught students who made an economic decision not to take phys ed 30 in grade 12 because parents literally could not afford the extra \$50 and some it was going to cost them in September, especially when they knew that besides the \$50 and some, there would be an extra \$2 and something for badminton birds, \$5 for busing, \$15 for the camping trip, and so on and so forth. I think the provincial government has set an example for the jurisdictions that they have in turn followed.

On a personal level, I think one of the most educationally horrifying things that was done to me in 14 years of teaching was last year when I in fact had to tell some of my students that I could not give them textbooks until their parents signed a legally binding contract to pay their school fees. Until I saw that legally binding contract signed and on my desk, I would not give them the textbooks that are required. For some students, if their parents in fact could not pay that until the end of September or weren't sure they would

ever be able to pay and therefore didn't want to sign a contract they might have to renege on at some later point, for a month I had to deprive them of the textbooks that went along with the lessons I was teaching.

I thought that showed a negligence on the part of their provincial government to make sure that fair, equitable, and equal education across the province was maintained. I also took offence at being put in an adversarial role with my students, who I saw as my partners in achieving educational goals. I thought it was a very untenable situation to put all teachers in, and I directly attribute it to the insufficient funding, as the board saw it, that they were getting from the provincial government.

Mr. Speaker, although there are a large number points that 14 years of teaching would give me to bring up on this point, in view of the time, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry, does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, since it's planned that we'll sit in Committee of Supply this evening, I now move that the House adjourn until the Committee of Supply rises and reports progress.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Acting Government House Leader, all those in favour of the motion please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, if any, please say no.

[The House recessed at 5:27 p.m.]

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

#### head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Gogo in the Chair]

#### ALBERTA HERITAGE SAVINGS TRUST FUND CAPITAL PROJECTS DIVISION 1986-87 ESTIMATES OF PROPOSED INVESTMENTS

#### Department of Agriculture

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. minister, do you have any comments?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Chairman, as we proceeded so well last night when we got through the first two votes, there were a number of technical questions relating to vote 3, the \$30 million we are requesting from the heritage trust capital expenditure fund. I've asked the hon. Member for Chinook if he would be kind enough to respond to the

detailed questions that were raised by the other members. At this time, we call upon the hon. Member for Chinook.

#### 3 — Irrigation Rehabilitation and Expansion

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Chairman, because the questions were asked yesterday, I probably won't hit them sequentially as they came up, but it will be easy to bring them back in case I miss some of it. However, I'm not going to deal totally with the answering of questions. I think we could use some explanation as to what is being attempted when we talk about irrigation and rehabilitation of the system and what the object of the exercise is.

Irrigation isn't a matter of someone frivolously wanting to run water through a system. Irrigation is economic development and food production, so we have to look at it in that context. Alberta has most of the irrigation in Canada, and it's about 80 years old and was started by the CPR. The reason for irrigation has to be looked at, because if irrigation doesn't make sense, the rehabilitation of irrigation doesn't make sense.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I hate to interrupt the hon. member. Members of the committee, please give the member the courtesy of being heard.

MR. KROEGER: The competition was tough. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

If you take a look at the geography of Alberta from an agriculture point of view, you divide it roughly into three parts: the southeastern part of Alberta is generally a very dry area with good heat units and not much moisture, the central part is roughly parkland and is very productive, and the third area is northern Alberta and is generally called the Peace River country.

There were some questions raised about the inequities that came into water management and the cost of it between north and south, and I want to touch on that. In northern Alberta you have the strange anomaly of flooding and then a shortage of moisture, and that becomes a double jeopardy. Because we're essentially talking about rehabilitation of irrigation, let's first of all take a look at what irrigation does. In a nutshell, you can take dry land where the heat units are and the soil is reasonably average, and it gives you a production increase multiplied by about four and a half times. In other words, about 4 percent of our agricultural land in the province is irrigated, producing roughly 18 percent of the ag production.

I realize that talking about production capability today isn't quite as important as it has been at other times or may be in the future, but you can't simply change your productive capability at will. Some of you haven't had the benefit of seeing what production means, but in my lifetime, in 1941 in the middle of the last war, the federal government paid me not to produce wheat. If that sounded strange then, it sounds strange today. In 1970 the federal government produced farmers not to produce wheat again. Again, before they got the cheques out, they were back saying, "Please grow more." So the capability to produce must be maintained, and irrigation fits that very well.

I want to point out something else to the House tonight in the way of looking at production capability. Last June the then Minister of Agriculture invited me to take a trade delegation to the Soviet Union. What I essentially wanted to see was their production in agriculture. They were very good about it and toured us for nearly two weeks almost

anywhere we wanted to go. But I found it very interesting talking to them, especially talking to the federal minister of agriculture for the Soviet Union. He said he wished they had our problem. And what is the problem? We have too much production. What's theirs? He said they don't have enough production.

I wanted to know why that was, because if you think about it, the Soviet Union has approximately the same amount of ag land, the same number of acres of agricultural land, as Canada and the U.S. combined. The population of the Soviet Union is roughly the same as Canada and the U.S. combined, but they can't produce enough to feed themselves, and we produce too much some of the time. They are very interested in irrigation and are in the process of developing it. They have a long way to go, but I'm just simply throwing that in because we're really talking about production capabilities now.

We have an irrigation system that's about 80 years old, consisting in the early stages of nothing much more than a few minor holding basins, dams if you like, and some ditches to flow this water through. These ditches were just that: a ditch through the ground. That ditch would cave in and you would have to clean it out. It gets weeds in it and the water flow is inhibited. It had deteriorated over that 80-year period to the degree that this government decided a rehabilitation program ought to be developed.

That rehabilitation program has been going now for quite a number of years, and specifically, Mr. Minister, we're now talking about \$30 million to continue the program. What does that do? If production is important and if irrigation does what I suggested to you in the numbers in the way of increasing production, then obviously a system like that wears out or deteriorates and has to be rebuilt. Furthermore, we're into flood irrigation and other forms of irrigation, specifically sprinkler systems and so on. These old ditches, both the major distribution ditches and the smaller ones through the 13 irrigation districts, then had to be rebuilt. And they are being rebuilt.

This is fairly expensive, but if you think further about the kind of land that is now into a production level of about four and a half times of what it would be in standard, normal conditions, then there of course has to be some spending that goes with that. The benefits of ag production are roughly on a ratio of seven to one, so if a farmer gets a benefit, that benefit to the rest of the province and the rest of the country breaks roughly into an 86 percent benefit for people who aren't farming as opposed to 14 percent to the actual producer. The benefit is split that way. The farmer pays the 14 percent and the government pays the 86 percent, and that's how that formula was developed. We think it's very important that this system be maintained and the ability to produce be maintained.

We aren't capable of expanding our irrigation much more now in southern Alberta. We did an in-depth study and held hearings in the south almost two years ago to take a look at the water that's available in the south. In southern Alberta we generally talk about the Red Deer River, the Bow River, and the Oldman River. We have a limited amount of water as far as agriculture is concerned, because agriculture will use almost 96 percent of that water as compared to municipalities, industry, et cetera. I imagine that report will be available fairly soon. We dealt carefully with the management of the whole river system. It's finite. We can't expand the irrigation much more, so we have to concern ourselves with using what we have to the best advantage possible.

I've heard a good deal of comment about the waste that goes with irrigation, that it is inefficient, and all of these kinds of things. I heard a comment about the bad concept of building the Oldman dam. I heard comments that we ought to be using off-stream storage as opposed to on-stream storage. The off-stream storage comment is valid, except there aren't many places to store. If you spread water over a thin enough area, the evaporation will take care of most of it. So unless you get reasonable depths, off-stream storage is simply not feasible, and there aren't many locations where you can do that in any case.

The quantity of water you can store by building a dam in a river basin or on a river itself, where you have depth and not too much surface, simply has to be the one we use. If you don't like the idea — and I know we get a lot of criticism for the idea of building dams. In fact, in the hearings we were told that rivers ought to be left alone, they should flow freely, and we must not use them. I suppose if you follow that through, we shouldn't have used rain barrels in the days when we had to catch water, because we were interfering with nature. I assume that water is there to be used, and a dam is really not much more than a rain barrel. It's water flowing down that river, the major flow flashes through the system in about six weeks, and it's gone. It doesn't do very much for you. Unless you can interrupt that flow and hold it, you won't have it to use. Therefore, you have to look at ways of keeping it so it's available for people to use.

Mr. Chairman, I want to touch on the comment that was made about the inequities of moneys spent in the south on irrigation as opposed to what ought to be spent in the north. I would like to comment that the first project we funded as a commission was to identify those areas in northern Alberta where we could do reasonable things with drainage. That report will be coming down shortly. For those of you who haven't seen what flooding in northern Alberta is, it might be useful for you to go up. I've made four tours through there to have a look at it, and I wondered about this flooding. In parts of the country I have seen, flooding isn't a problem at all, even though they have a lot of water. What I discovered in these flood areas in northern Alberta is that they have a different condition, and the condition they have develops into something they call sheet water.

I don't think there are many people in this House who know what sheet water is. I didn't know what it was. When I asked the question as to what it was, they took me out and showed me a section of land as flat as this floor, covered with about three-quarters of an inch of water. It won't move. There is no drainage. It isn't because there's much water, but you have to wait for that to either evaporate or just simply go into the soil. You can't farm it until that happens. During some years, that land is simply not able to be farmed as people would like to do it. So they're talking, and a lot of work has been done on drainage to make this land usable. Mr. Minister, I think you will eventually be approached — I know your predecessor was — by our northern friends to look seriously at expanding the drainage programs that have already been started.

Some comment was made about salt. Irrigation simply was a process of damaging and destroying soil because of the salt factor. People who manage soils have discovered that you can irrigate land that tends to that if you do it right. Generally, in the irrigation block you'll get about 30 inches of water, 18 inches of which will wind up on the soil. They put that on fairly fast because of the kind of

soil it is. If you have worse conditions, you reduce the amount of water and the rate you put it on, and you don't have to convert that soil into salt flats. It will become very productive.

Mr. Minister, because some of the questioners that asked about various elements on this process aren't in the House now, and beyond that, while I don't for a minute think I have touched on all the issues that were brought up, I wanted to first of all emphasize the importance of irrigation from a production point of view and the importance of the rehab program that your department is directly involved in. I would like to leave it at that temporarily, and if questions come and you'd like to redirect them to me, I'd be glad to take them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions on vote 3, irrigation rehabilitation and expansion? The leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, just a short question. I don't think it's been covered. One of the things that has bothered many people that deserve irrigation, and coming from an irrigation area myself, I've often wondered why we dodge the question of metering the water as much as we do. I think it's not so much that the farmers may or may not be wasting the water; it's more a question of selling the idea to the rest of the province. You've done the 86/14 percent bit, and that may well go over with many people. But one of the areas I have the greatest trouble with in argument and sticking up for irrigation farming is the tremendous amount of money that is spent on irrigation versus what the rewards are.

One of the things that's most often pointed out is that we use a flat water system, which we know in cities like Calgary versus Edmonton leads to a huge consumption of water compared to what's used for doing lawns. Yet you will argue that when it comes to agriculture, metering would really be of no help. I'm wondering if either the minister or the Member for Chinook would wish to comment to the House just why that idea of metering is not used in the sale of water to the farmers.

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Chairman, in the early years water was deemed to be a free good. If it was there and you could find it, you would use it. There were charges for using it, simply by virtue of having to pump it or build a ditch or whatever you did. But now water is a finite resource, particularly in that part of the province. It's not there in quantity anymore, and it isn't a free good anymore in the very real sense. In fact, in the report we did on the use of water and the management of the whole river system in southern Alberta that I made reference to, we do address the possibilities. It's a matter of how you would do it and how much. There is a charge now, but it's still very minimal and certainly not enough to cover the sorts of things that people generally visualize.

In the U.S. they have an entirely different system. And by the way, we're just minor leaguers in irrigation. We have roughly 1.2 million acres. They have about 40 million acres stateside. So they've had a lot more experience than we have, and they do handle it differently. For instance, if you build a dam for irrigation there, you build in power generation, and that irrigation district becomes the owner of the power capacity. They use the earning from that to offset the cost of the development. We don't have that here in Alberta. The power companies are involved. In any case,

we don't have the major power generation that exists in B.C. because of the slope of our land and so on. Conversely, a river like the Colorado River has very major developments. We are looking at how to do this and how to do it in such a way that you still maintain your productive capability.

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Chairman, I found the comments and remarks by the Member for Chinook very interesting and very informative. As a city person, I'd like to ask him a question. I've always wondered why we import so much of the produce we consume in this province. I've become very interested in an experiment that's going on in the city of Calgary. There's a Sprung plant there that's using hydroponic techniques to produce about 0.005 percent of all the fresh tomatoes and cucumbers that are annually consumed in this province. It would seem from the remarks the member made earlier that there is perhaps a limit in terms of the water supply that would be available to encourage the development of these hydroponic plants. I was just wondering if he has ever investigated the encouragement of the development of a produce-growing sector in our agricultural industry and whether in fact there is a limit to what we can do here because of the availability of water and if he sees any way we can get around that using irrigation techniques or whatever.

MR. KROEGER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I looked at what they do in Holland, where they're growing lettuce in stacked trays. Certainly they're doing it. California was mentioned. You're quite right; I don't know what the numbers are today, but in 1980 we were importing \$200 million worth of tomatoes and lettuce into Canada that we could not grow in southern Alberta, simply because we haven't developed some of the techniques that would go with that. The potential is certainly there.

Going back to the cost the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon mentioned, what is the cost of this development compared to what they do in other places? Some of you have heard me comment on this before. I spent some time in Holland taking a look at their production. I mentioned the lettuce thing, but they do much more than that. They have a lot bigger problem than we do. They are recovering land from the floor of the North Sea. When I went over there and met with the people who were doing that, I said, "How much does that cost for an acre of land?" I wanted to make a comparison between that and irrigation. They said: "Well, it's too early. You do a little tour before we answer that question." Then I wanted to know what they grow. This has to be expensive land. They grow poor wheat, and they have to buy ours to mix with it so they can use it for milling. They grow some canola, a lot of hay, and a lot of potatoes. We can grow all of those things here.

When I took a look at the process they go through to reclaim this land, it takes eight years from the time they get a dike built and the seawater off it to dry it out, and then they put it into ag production. In 1980 numbers it cost \$13,000 an acre for that reclaimed land. You make that comparison to about \$1,000 an acre to bring irrigation to dry land. They produce nothing more complicated than what we can produce. You have to ask yourself why they do it, and why shouldn't we increase our productive capability.

I think there's a very good argument — we heard a lot of good comment this afternoon about hardships around the world and peace initiatives we should take. I've made the comment a number of times that the strength of nations

over the years has not been measured in their capability to throw rocks, shoot bullets, or drop bombs. It has been the capability to produce food. If you look back in history, the strength of nations has been predicated on the ability to produce food. You can't resolve the problems worldwide if there's a shortage of food. California can't begin to eat what they produce, but they do it. They've got the capability and they maintain it, because this fluctuates up and down. Therefore, I think it's very important that we maintain the process we're in to rehabilitate a system that exists and works. We have the expertise and we have the program going.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to follow up a couple of questions that I briefly asked last night and which haven't actually been answered. They're related to the sorts of conditions that are attached to the expenditure of the \$30 million when it comes to renovating the irrigation works to make sure the process of salinization of soil by the raising of the water table, bringing salts to the surface, as I understand, which is caused by the seepage from the ditches and so on — presumably nowadays, when the ditches are renovated, they are made impervious at the sides and so on. I just wondered as to the rigorousness of the conditions attached to guard against that, which I understand has been a problem in irrigated areas.

Secondly, the breakdown now between the flooding way of irrigation and the sprinkler systems which one sees in British Columbia and other places, which I take it are a more efficient means of using water. Thirdly, the extent, if at all, to which the even more efficient methods of using water, just delivering almost minute quantities of water exactly to the places where you want it such as you see in Israel, are in use or considered or are economically feasible in your irrigation districts.

MR. KROEGER: The member is quite right that there is a great deal more you can do, and the member specifically mentioned Israel. I spent eight days over there taking a look at what they do. Of course, the ultimate there is drip irrigation, where water isn't put through a system where the sun gets at it. It actually goes through a plastic tube about a quarter of an inch in size and it drips. In some of those fields I saw that they had the whole field covered with white plastic so there wouldn't be any evaporation. That's the ultimate, and they have of course done it very well.

The reason they've had to go to those extremes in Israel is that they simply don't have very much land. You could put the country of Israel into my constituency and have a lot of room left over. They have 4 million people there — I've got about 20,000 — so they have to get maximum production. All their agriculture is irrigation. There wouldn't be any if they didn't have good, controlled irrigation. The Sea of Galilee is where it starts. The Jordan River used to carry that water. Practically nothing goes down there any more; it all goes through major concrete pipes and is distributed, and every possible conservation concept is involved. If there's any spillage, they build a little fishpond, two acres in size, and grow fish in that. It was mind-boggling to see what they do.

On the business of rehabilitation, the question was what seepage does to land. Of course, you get salinization. It turns white and then it won't produce anything. You have to think about the rehab program in two parts. There is the major distribution system, which is run through the

Department of the Environment. Some of the major canals are being reconstructed. Some of them are being lined in parts, not everywhere because there is such a difference in soil. Some soils are almost impervious to water. They don't absorb it and they will stand there. In other places these canals will cross gravel or sand areas. Those have to be lined, and they're being lined with vinyl. That's the major system.

The secondary system, which is administered through Agriculture, is the distribution system in the 13 districts, and those are sometimes very small ditches. Certainly you get this leakage. There has been a lot of experimenting done with concrete, which doesn't work very well. In the wintertime it freezes and heaves, and then you get breakage and this kind of thing. I was trying to brainwash the minister last week about some testing that some of his people are doing with a variety of materials, with asphalt lining and even aluminum, if you like. I looked at some of that and fibreglass lining. Of course, the cost is an element in all of this.

There is a company in Alberta now that is experimenting, and a machine is being built in Seattle that is supposedly going to be capable of lining an irrigation ditch with fibreglass. One of the benefits of that is that according to engineers — and I'm not one of them — in a rough ditch, as we now have them, compared to a lined ditch with fibreglass, the fibreglass ditch of the same size will carry 30 percent more water simply because of the ease with which it passes through. Then of course you don't get the seepage you were mentioning. Does that cover the questions you were asking?

MR. WRIGHT: Sprinklers versus flooding.

MR. KROEGER: Okay; we are into the sprinkler business in southern Alberta in a very major way. As a matter of fact, those sprinklers themselves are being changed. At one time the concept of a sprinkler was such as you see it right out there, where it blows the water up in the air, it flies, and you get a lot of evaporation. Now the water is going straight down from the new sprinkler systems, and most of the irrigation is now sprinkler in the south.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, just some comments. I can't resist a comment to promote something for my area. The hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn mentioned greenhouse growing of cucumbers or hydroponics of cucumbers. To the hon. members, if you want good cucumbers that are grown in Alberta, look for the brand name Red Hat Co-op. They're grown at the greenhouses in Medicine Hat and Redcliff, and they're second to none of any cucumber you can buy that's grown anywhere in the world.

MR. FOX: Bring us each one.

MR. HYLAND: Member for Vegreville, I'll talk to the greenhouse co-op and see if they'll reproduce what you did with honey.

The Member for Chinook covered sprinkler systems in answer to the Member for Edmonton Strathcona. Sprinkler systems have changed dramatically, and we've gone from a high-pressure lateral wheel sprinkler system operating at 60 pounds of pressure to a pivot system operating at 90 pounds and back to a pivot system operating at 55 pounds and virtually dropping the water straight onto the soil to cut down on evaporation. The cost of these systems and



the income from the products grown underneath have forced farmers to improve their systems to the greatest potential — if anything, a farmer's delivery system once it gets to his gate. They've improved even with the considerable amount of money that has gone into upgrading of irrigation systems. The farmer's delivery system from the time he takes the water to the time he gets it on his soil is, with the exception of the things that happen in a country like Israel, second to none anywhere. He's improved faster than we've been able to improve in delivering the water to him.

I would also invite that member and all members to view an area that was done south of Bow Island on a lateral where all the ditches were taken out and it was put in a pressured pipeline and run to the field. The farmers are charged something between \$30 and \$35 per acre for the water delivered to their land, and that includes pumping that's delivered at somewhere around 60 pounds of pressure and put on the field. If anybody wants to have a look at that, it's really worth while, because that was put in under the program we're talking about. The farmers themselves paid somewhere around \$100 to \$125 per acre to pay the 14 percent of their share.

Just as a matter of interest, when I was over in Israel the one figure that stuck in my mind was that on trickle irrigation, as the Member for Chinook described it, with 36-inch spacing for an acre of land, trickle irrigation would take approximately a mile of pipe. You have a lot of work rolling that pipe out, rolling it back up, and you have a lot of room storing it. So it isn't all as cut and dried as it seems when you talk about it.

I would invite all members, on whatever side of the House, to take a tour of irrigation areas, because the districts are more than happy to show people what's happening, the main delivery systems and how the lateral delivery systems have been improved. They're more than happy to take people out and show them. In fact, last year a number of members of the heritage trust fund committee took a tour of the irrigation areas as part of their duties for the heritage trust fund. I know a lot of them were very, very surprised after they saw the numbers that go into irrigation and how the money has been spent, the improving of the systems, and the real difference it makes when you see the old canal. It could be a couple of hundred feet wide where the land is destroyed and lost, and you see the new one going through it. You've got the width of a canal at 30 feet or less, and you see the vast difference between the two.

To people like myself and the Member for Chinook who have worked with this for a number of years, we're still hyped up and psyched up about it. But you don't really realize it; we forget sometimes that other people don't see it. Everyone should take the chance to come out and look at these areas, and you'll indeed see how the money is spent and how well it's spent.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Chairman, I've found this evening to be one of the most informative sessions of any we've had since the Legislature opened. I wonder if the hon. Member for Chinook might give us a brief update or an overview of wastewater irrigation applications in the province of Alberta. I know there are some smaller communities that are doing it, and it's one thing I have made brief reference to previously in this Legislative Assembly, perhaps looking at some kind of pilot project involving one of our larger centres such as Calgary, the one I'm most familiar with, and whether or not that kind of idea has been looked at.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was going to say that it seems to be at some variance with the vote, but that's up to the Member for Chinook.

MR. KROEGER: I mentioned that the only other time in this sitting that I've had anything to say something about is the Calgary situation. Calgary is heading into some difficulty of its own on the management of water, but it's not necessarily on the supply side. It's on the disposal side on the east side of Calgary where the Bow River is being forced to absorb more effluent than it's capable of doing. Something else has to happen. Either we do something with effluent irrigation or we have to get tertiary treatment that will do the job. Either one of those two options is very expensive, but unless one of those two options is addressed, Calgary may have to stop growing. So I'd like to leave that for you to think about.

On the specifics of the effluent irrigation, Taber is doing a bit of it. We went to Cranbrook to take a look at what they do. Theirs is larger. The problem with the quantities you get out of a city like Calgary is that, yes, you could use it through the irrigation season, but what do you do with it for eight months when there is no irrigation? We've actually looked at Eagle Lake, for example. I'm sure the member for Calgary would know that Eagle Lake would be a potential storage basin that could be developed, and then it could be used in the season for irrigation. So the possibilities are there and they have to be dealt with. It's not something we have the luxury of avoiding. That will have to be addressed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other comments? Mr. Minister, do you expect to comment? Excuse me, Mr. Minister. The Member for Bow Valley.

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Chairman, coming from a major irrigation district, I should make a few comments. The topic of drip irrigation was talked about. A few years ago I was over in Hawaii and I noted there is a lot of drip irrigation used in Hawaii. By the way, in those areas they get about 10 times the annual rainfall we get in southern Alberta. Still, for the raising of sugarcane and pineapples, they do use drip irrigation. The thing about that is that it takes two years to grow a pineapple, and it takes two years to grow a crop of sugarcane. In the case of sugarcane it's planted every third crop, so it's only farmed every six years. In the case of pineapple, it's only farmed every two years. In those cases they bury those pipes for drip irrigation, and they are never taken up. When the land is farmed again, the pipes are plowed into the ground, they plant their crop, and they put in new pipes.

In southern Alberta, if you were to have to put new pipes in for drip irrigation every year, it would certainly be costly. It would be twice as costly as it would be for pineapple and probably six times as costly for sugarcane. So there is one reason why it hasn't been popular in southern Alberta compared to those kinds of crops.

I hear people concerned about salt in land caused by irrigation. For your information, irrigation never causes salt in land. Your main irrigation canals or areas where water is pocketed do bring the salt to the surface and do cause alkali. In fact, you can take a piece of good flood-irrigated land that does have salt in it and by constant irrigation you remove the salt from it if it has good drainage. Particularly

in my area in southern Alberta, there's flood irrigation. There has been lots of land that was quite salty. The salt was removed because it was machine levelled to a grade so that water didn't stand on the land at any time but moved over it and washed the salt out through years of irrigation.

The topic of wastewater came up. Of course, I am a great believer in using municipal wastewater for sprinkler irrigation. As you all know, I had a private member's Bill on it a few years ago. In mentioning the city of Calgary in my study, it was also noted that Deadhorse Lake at Hussar could be a winter storage area for the municipal wastewater of Calgary. There's another topic about wastewater. Everyone is concerned about flood-irrigated farmers particularly, but even sprinkler irrigation, that spill some water during the irrigation season. In this area, since sprinkler irrigation is the superior way of irrigating, most of that wastewater is again pumped out of our spillways and used for irrigation. We have to send 50 percent of the annual water supply from the South Saskatchewan River system into Saskatchewan, and any bit of water that goes through our spillways into the Red Deer River or the Bow River is only contributing to that amount of water that has to go into Saskatchewan.

Those were just a few comments I had to make, Mr. Chairman, before we close the topic.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Chairman, I just indicate my deepest thanks to the committee for the speedy progress we've made on these three votes as it relates to the trust fund.

I wasn't quite sure, Mr. Chairman, whether it was the hon. Member for Calgary Glenmore or the hon. Member for Bow Valley who was speaking. [interjection]

Thank you, sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question on Agriculture?

Agreed to:

Total Vote 3 - Irrigation Rehabilitation and Expansion	\$30,000,000
--	--------------

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Chairman, I look to you for some guidance on this. I would move the adoption of those three votes as they relate to the agricultural sector under the capital fund of the heritage trust fund if it's so required and would again indicate my deepest thanks to all members of the committee of the Assembly for such speedy passage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the minister would move that the vote be reported, that would be satisfactory.

MR. ELZINGA: I move that the vote be reported.

[Motion carried]

#### Department of Hospitals and Medical Care

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are two votes, minister of hospitals. Any comments?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, just a few opening comments. First of all, with respect to the expenditures of the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences complex, I'd like to indicate to members of the committee that the total budget

now projected in 1986 dollars for the completion of phases 1 and 2, which are the only phases that are approved at the Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre, is \$414,089,000. That is comprised of \$312,000 in round figures, which was expended to the end of 1985, some \$44 million that was in the last fiscal year budget, the current request of some \$33.5 million for the '86-87 fiscal year, and the remaining expenditure of \$24,591,000 to complete phase 2 of the project. That total of \$414 million compares with the estimate of \$423 million that was provided by the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care three years ago in October 1983. In fact, over the last three years there has been some modest decrease in the estimated capital cost to complete phases 1 and 2 of the project.

I'll just conclude my remarks, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre by saying that from the original projected cost to now there was indeed a very substantial increase in the capital cost. That was brought about in part by some significant changes to the scope of work that was envisioned from the original approval. It was brought about in part as well by some very significant inflationary costs during the early stages of the project. All those cost increases were fully explained by my predecessor, going back as far as the fall of 1981, '82, and '83, so I don't want to review them again, except to say that they're well documented in the *Hansards* of those years.

Mr. Chairman, we do have a facility there — for those who haven't had an opportunity to see it — that is indeed world class in every sense of the word in terms of the physical operation and has proven over the course of the last couple of years in particular to be world class in its ability to attract medical specialists in all areas. The physical facility, coupled with the operating commitment we've provided and with the Heritage Savings Trust Fund commitment to medical research in this province, has enabled us to embark upon such programs as the heart and heart/lung transplant program announced by the Premier in April this year, which is unique to western Canada.

Mr. Chairman, I'm confident that while the capital costs are high and the ongoing operating costs are high as well, in terms of a superb medical facility for Alberta and western Canada and our capital city, we've embarked upon the right course of action.

Mr. Chairman, I'm in your hands. I'd like to make a couple of comments about applied cancer research, but perhaps I ought to just conclude my remarks on the Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre and deal with the other votes separately.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We did establish a practice last night that we'd take the votes in numerical order. That would be vote 1, cancer research, on page 13, Mr. Minister. It may be perhaps appropriate if you address that now and then answer questions dealing with page 13, vote 1, applied cancer research.

#### 1 — Applied Research

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or observations on vote 1, applied cancer research?

MR. YOUNIE: Yes, just a couple of very short ones. It seems to me an appropriate area for us to look at, not just looking into where we suspect problems may have arisen, but I would suggest in a couple of areas of the province

— one in particular in the Swan Hills area, where we will be building a plant to treat toxic wastes — that perhaps some of the applied research to be done by the Cancer Board would be to do a baseline study of cancer rates so that 10 years down the road, if we do have a perceived problem in the public, we won't have arguments saying they're being hysterical and it's all in their heads. In fact, we would have something to go on based on adequate and accurate research before the plant was built and operational. Then if rates are slightly above the provincial average 10 years down the road but a baseline study showed they were in fact well below the average, we would know that it was causing a problem. I think that would be a very worthwhile and very significant place for that to work.

I would also suggest that studies in the Fort Saskatchewan area at the moment might be warranted in terms of the future possibility and in terms of a recent observation by the Cancer Board that cancer rates in the county of Strathcona were somewhat higher than the provincial average in a number of areas. There have been arguments and consternation over why that might be and if these statistics are indeed accurate. Perhaps some more in-depth study, which I'm told they are in fact planning to do, would again be in order. I'd be most interested to hear about areas where industries are moving in, as in the Swan Hills toxic waste plant area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other comments on vote 1?

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I must admit some ignorance as to what the other cancer hospitals are, apart from the Cross Cancer Institute, which is in my constituency. My questions really are: what is the type of grant that is being made? What is it specifically for, if some general idea can be given? Where is the research being conducted? Is it at the Cross Cancer or at other hospitals? What has the experience been in the past as to the productiveness of the research and the results achieved? Perhaps the minister can just fill us in a little bit on the progress of the research.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, hon. member. Mr. Minister, there are other members wishing to speak on this vote. Do you wish to hear their comments prior to responding?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, the entire project is administered by the Alberta Cancer Board. They have a research committee and a grants panel of people within the board who sit in judgment on the various applications that come in. The recommendations with respect to the research grants are then forwarded to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care for approval. I personally have not received any or approved any in my short time in office. One would expect that for the most part the minister would approve what comes from the grants panel, which has had an opportunity to review grant proposals in some detail.

The suggestion that there ought to be research into certain things like cancer-causing industries and so on should probably best be referred to the Alberta Cancer Board, and it could be referred directly by an hon. member who is interested, or perhaps the member might like to write a letter to me outlining the concerns the member has, in which case I could then refer it to the Alberta Cancer Board grants committee and ask them to please review this type of thing.

Generally speaking, though, the grant request will come from specific professional people or organizations who have

a project in mind that they've developed and want to get funding for. I don't have a list of all the projects that have been carried out over the years, but I'd certainly be prepared to get that and provide it to any member who would want it, outlining what projects have been approved, who the sponsors were, and what, if any, concrete results have been obtained. I hasten to add, though, that a lot of this kind of research isn't something that after a year or two or three you can say you've got a solution. It's an ongoing sort of thing that may take many, many years before you can really say you've got some concrete results. But I would provide whatever information can be made available to the members, Mr. Chairman, and certainly everything that's there with regard to what's happened in the past.

Mr. Chairman, I think that probably answers the concerns raised, at least in part.

MR. WRIGHT: If I could just ask one very quick question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's at the expense of the Member for Edmonton Centre, but go ahead.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I realize that. Is the research only carried on at the cancer hospitals? That seems to be the name of the board. I don't even know what the cancer hospitals actually are, apart from the ...

MR. M. MOORE: Certainly not. I'm sorry; the only other institution of any significance that relates to the Cross Cancer Institute is a facility in Calgary that's largely a treatment facility. But the application of the research grants can apply anywhere. While I don't have the details in front of me, I would guess that most of the research, or a good portion of it, would have been done outside the hospital itself, probably at the University of Alberta or perhaps in other research centres as well. So there are no criteria that suggest that the research needs to be done at that hospital. It depends upon the proposals that are submitted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Comments, questions, or amendments to vote 1 only, Member for Edmonton Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: If we could just pursue this a bit, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask some questions in terms of the minister's statement that people ask for grants for particular research projects. Who sets the pace in terms of what research projects are given higher priority than others? On what basis are those decisions made? In that regard, I also wonder how this spending and this vote differ from the spending and the research done by the Alberta heritage trust fund foundation for medical research. I don't know if I've got the title of that correct, but certainly a great wealth of money is put into medical research through that foundation. I'm wondering whether some of this research isn't done. Is it a sort of duplicate research? Is it duplicate bureaucracy? Who sets the pace or makes the decisions in terms of the money from the foundation and how their research dollars are allocated?

Moreover, I'm wondering if the minister has given some consideration as to how money spent on cancer research compares to money spent on cancer prevention. I know that the experience in other jurisdictions is that moneys put into research can tend to go down a huge hole, not seeing the results or how that money is accounted for. Certainly a lot of research needs to go on, but at the same time, how

much is set aside for the very important work of cancer prevention? Does the minister have a kind of ethical or political way of making judgments or decisions in terms of spending in those regards?

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, it's just a short comment. Members have already asked whether special research is going on in the field of petrochemicals or chemical waste. In line with what we do in the province, I'd also be interested, and you'll probably follow up — could I get on your list as to what projects are going? One of the things I had in mind was the research of foods, whether the effects of fertilizers or pesticides are coming through in foods and whether those foods in turn are cancer producing. I think that's been more or less answered, or it will be. If you make a note, Mr. Minister, to give me the name and address of who to write to — you suggested that the members could write and find out what particular items are being researched. If you could find time to drop the particular name and address of the department around to the Liberal office, I would be quite pleased to get it.

The second area was that I was wondering whether some of the research is patentable. In other words, is it a possible income producer down the road? Are we keeping an eye on that, particularly in view of the fact that although in Canada we have a tradition of turning over our research and our medical knowledge pretty well as soon as we find it, the Americans are much more acquisitive or financial, whatever way you want to put it, when things are patented there, either in methods or in drugs. I'm wondering whether a watch is being kept to see whether any of the findings we make could be patented and could yield an income to help the foundation.

MR. M. MOORE: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I should provide a little more information with regard to the research panel. I've got in front of me a copy of the annual report for the period ended March 31, 1986. Perhaps I could provide hon. members with that report; it is a public document. The Alberta Cancer Board research committee members number more than 20 people involved for the most part in the field of medicine. The grants panel, which is appointed by the research committee, involves another 15 to 16 people, without question all medical people, who sit in judgment on each application that comes forward. There are a great many applications from a variety of sources.

In answer to the hon. Member for Edmonton Centre's question about what happens, an evaluation of each research project is done by competent medical people, and the Provincial Auditor, of course, issues an annual report on the use of the applied cancer research grants. As to whether or not this is a duplication of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund medical research grant program, I suggest that it may be quite possible for researchers to obtain funds from both sources but there is a very effective method of ensuring that there's knowledge in both areas of who's applying to each organization.

I think it's fair to say that the reason these funds are specifically dedicated to cancer research is that it was our feeling as a government that the right attention may not have been paid to cancer research by the broader program and that it needed a great deal more emphasis than it might have gotten through the \$300 million Heritage Foundation for Medical Research Endowment Fund. So the hon. member is correct in his assumption that it could well have been

done through the broader program, but I suggest that we wouldn't have had nearly the attention paid to cancer research we are now having.

With respect to the comments of the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, the program annual report, which details what they've done in the last year at least, would be useful. I'll provide a copy of that to the hon. member and a copy of the grants that have been provided over the life of the program to hon. members who are interested.

If an hon. member has a suggestion for research that should be done, please put that in writing to me and I'll direct it toward the Cancer Board and ask them what has been done in that field, whether there is any possibility of creating some additional interest in that area. I'd be pleased to do that. I will provide whatever other information is available besides the annual report to the hon. members who've asked questions about it tonight so that they can get further information on the entire program, back to when it originally began several years ago.

MR. TAYLOR: Did I miss something, or did you cover the question of whether we are patenting any of the ...

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I really don't know the answer to that. I'll have to find out whether or not there have been any patented results from applied cancer research. I would doubt very much that there has been. Generally speaking, if we provide government funding to projects of that nature, the patent rights would have to flow back to the government, and when we provide funding for medical research, we're more interested in helping with medical problems not only in our province but in Canada and around the world and don't generally get involved too seriously in trying to protect our patent rights. But I'll have to check on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any comments, questions, amendments on vote 1?

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister a little bit about the — I suppose the word I would use is "luxuriousness" of the new facility ... [interjection] Oh, we're only doing the one vote, the cancer one first?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 1 only.

MR. McEACHERN: Okay, sorry.

MR. YOUNIE: Just one very quick question on vote 1. I notice that every cent goes toward grants. The minister did discuss the procedures by which grants are judged, allocated, and the meetings of the Provincial Cancer Hospitals Board. I was wondering exactly where the money comes from to pay the people who do the meeting, any doctors who might be called in as consultants to advise on which projects might have more merit and so on. If it doesn't come under this, where does the money come from to pay the people who make the decisions as to which grants are allocated and which aren't?

MR. M. MOORE: For example, Mr. Chairman, in the 1985-86 fiscal year the total amount in the program was \$4,829,000. Administration was \$127,053, and that is what is involved in paying the people on the research committee and so on their per diem expenses or whatever. Evaluation

was \$92,000; research equipment was \$63,000; personnel, which is the research scientist, research nurse, et cetera, \$241,000; and \$4,305,000 went into direct grants. So the total administration cost, including the personnel running the program evaluation and so on, is less than 10 percent of the cost of the total program. I don't know if that's what the member is referring to or not.

MR. YOUNIE: In other words, this will be broken down at some future point to provide funds for the administering of the grants and so on?

MR. M. MOORE: That's right.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 1 — Applied Cancer Research \$4,923,000

## 2 — Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Chairman, I would like the minister to walk me through a couple of these budget documents which we've had. Under capital projects some few days ago we dealt with special warrants as well, and as part of that there was something to meet the cash flow requirements for the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre. I don't understand the relationship in terms of approving a budget under what I understood to be the general appropriations for the province and this particular capital fund within the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, so I wonder if he would explain how the special warrants relate to this particular vote.

My second questions is — I'm going to make an assumption, and I hope you will tell me if the assumption is wrong. Are all the costs of building the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre coming from the capital projects division of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund? That is, the total expenditure for that centre is this \$312 million; no other funding or spending under any other budget has gone through this Assembly?

Thirdly, is there some kind of consolidated budget for this particular project? Is this the last year we're going to see a budget for the capital costs of the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre, or is there going to be still more construction in the next fiscal year and even more funding requested under this budget or another to complete that construction?

On the technical end of it, I guess I'm trying to pull together all these budget documents that have come across my desk in these last few weeks, and I'd like some explanation of how they all fit together and mesh as it relates to this one project in particular.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of further points on the Walter C. The first one perhaps I really shouldn't say, but at the same time I can't resist. The fact is that \$33 million isn't that great an amount of money, and I wonder whether their new fund-raiser for the Walter C. Mackenzie — I hear they have a great new fund-raiser. If we're going to mobilize the private sector, maybe it's something she should be raising from the private sector. Nonetheless, here we go, with \$33 million added to the great cost of it.

I must say that I like cathedrals and lofty buildings. It really is quite a monument; there's no doubt about that. I do wonder, though. Every time I go in there, I get the feeling I'm in the Eaton Centre in Toronto. When I was

made aware of the fact that the same architect built both, I could understand why. The same architect — maybe the former minister is aware of this or can explain why — built the McMaster University medical centre, and when he designed that in the late '70s, it was full of all kinds of glorious colours. I like to have bright and brilliant colours. Certainly the McMaster University medical centre has that, but somehow the colours in the Walter C. have been toned right down to sort of very pale and pallid and very soft colours. I don't know if the architects in the room or the health people can explain what's going on there in terms of the colour of the place.

Nonetheless, despite the facts about the aesthetics of it and the dollars, I'm wondering as well if the minister can explain if some of these millions of dollars are going to — what I do not understand — a putting in there of, I believe, over 20 pediatric beds. I'm wondering, vis-à-vis the discussions around the Northern Alberta Children's hospital, if it's advisable at this time to put in further pediatric beds. I take it that the occupancy rate of pediatric beds in the city is still less than 60 percent. How advisable is it to open a whole new pediatric unit at the Walter C? Is this just an interim measure, or are these moneys going to help with that?

As well, I've been talking with a number of nurses in the place, and I too am alarmed and concerned. We thought that the state of the art in terms of beds per nursing unit was 24. I'm told that at the Walter C. they're less than that at 18, which is both difficult on nursing staff and much more expensive to operate, a lower bed per nursing unit ratio. I'm wondering if there's any explanation as to why that's gone on and if any of these new moneys are going to support that kind of, I think, irresponsible policy.

Further, others are saying that with this total of over \$400 million in capital on the hospital there is now a real cut and freeze in operating. Will that in a sense mean an increase of patient loads for nurses and other difficulties that the place has in terms of properly and effectively operating itself, being told that now that they've spent all this money on capital, there's no other increased money, as might be expected for the proper operating of it?

So these are the three areas: the pediatric beds, the nursing units, and other freezes on operating because of the capital money, which I again add could be raised if they had the conviction from the private sector. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Chairman, I started to ask a question, I guess, at the wrong time. You'd switched back to number one, although we started with number two.

It is a rather lovely building, I must admit, but I just can't help raising the fact that the first time I visited there, which was some time ago, I was struck by the amount of space that seems to be in some instances wasted, the space between sections, between units. There are large open spaces, and while that's very nice from the point of view of circulating around the building and being able to see some little distance and not being crowded and pinched in like one often is in hospitals, I can't help but think that that is going to turn out to be very expensive to heat. It's a really expensive design.

Considering that the building went up in cost so much and has cost us so much, it would seem to me that the government should, at least on looking back, reflect that perhaps they have overdone the concept of having a show-piece for the world. Surely we're more concerned with

providing good health care and good hospital service and a centre for research that is functional. Certainly there should be a pleasant atmosphere, but I would like the minister to comment on whether or not he thinks it hasn't become a little more expensive — for instance, if we were going to plan it today, in light of today's budget, would one try to plan it the same way? Maybe it was started when dollars were easier to come by, but I don't think that justifies getting carried away with the taxpayers' dollars and building something for the sake of being a showcase and state of the art when what is more important is providing good medical attention and a good hospital for people.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, this is a building in the constituency I represent and therefore of particular interest. My question to the minister mainly is: is this appropriation to be for the current building project, which is at the north end of the centre and is the research building, as I understand it? There's a big hole in the ground there now with a sign that says "Walter C. Mackenzie Research Centre." I'm just wondering how the appropriation of \$33,500,000 is targeted. Is it the building as a whole, or is it this new building for research at the north end, as it happens where the Alberta Research Council used to be years ago?

When that building is complete, will research be carried on in the rest of the health sciences centre, which is very large, or will that really just become a teaching hospital and no more?

The other question I have is: tucked away in the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre is the provincial laboratory. It used to have its own building, which was torn down to make way for the Mackenzie centre. They are most put out by the fact that they are now tenants where once they owned their building. I wonder whether any provision is being made for them to get their own building back again.

MR. MARTIN: A question flowing from the minister's comments. He said that the \$414 million would finish up — that's estimated for the end of phase 2, I believe the minister said. As I recall, the original estimate was around \$115 million, so we went a little bit over budget on this one, Mr. Chairman.

My question has to do with phases 3 and 4. I believe a phase 3 and a phase 4 are in the architectural plans. I know for sure there's a phase 3. Could the minister tell us what the plans of the government are at this time? Because of the cost, when we get to the end of phase 2, will that be it, or are we looking ahead to phases 3 and 4? If that's the case, when will that decision be made? If we're going ahead with phases 3 and 4, what are the time frames we're looking at for those phases?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Calgary Mountain View asked some questions with respect to the relationship with the special warrant under the General Revenue Fund which was debated a short time ago in the House. I make these observations. There is no permanent draw on the General Revenue Fund of the province for the capital development of the Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre. All of the funds which will go into the capital project will come from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund and this vote here. On the other hand, the operating costs, of course, which have resulted in special warrants because we haven't known when they would come on stream and so on, come from the General Revenue Fund.

There is, however, an exception this year to that comment, and it's simply this. The Legislature did not sit until after the end of the fiscal year, and in order to proceed with the capital project throughout the last fiscal year, we provided \$11.5 million from the General Revenue Fund to the project. The \$33.5 million that I'm now asking for approval of contains \$11.5 million that will repay the General Revenue Fund. So we actually wind up with \$22 million of new funding, which is the projected amount required for the next fiscal year.

The Member for Edmonton Centre and other members made some comments relative to the capital costs, and I dealt with them in my opening remarks. But I was backwards to what we were doing, Mr. Chairman, so perhaps I should explain again. As of today the estimated project costs are \$414 million for the total project. That involves some \$356 million, in round figures, that has already been expended, plus the \$33.5 million we are asking for at the present time, plus a future amount in 1987-88 of roughly \$24.6 million. All of that totals \$414 million. There may well be some small inflationary amount added to the \$24.5 million next year, but that completes phases 1 and 2 of the project. There was envisioned originally a phase 3, but the government has made no commitments whatever beyond phase 2. In other words, at the present time I'm not considering it. That doesn't rule out the possibility that a third phase could proceed at some point in time, but essentially the project will be complete to the end of phase 2 by the end of the next fiscal year, '87-88, at a total cost of slightly over \$414 million plus any inflationary or scope changes we might make in the last stages of the project, which I doubt would be an increase of any sizable amount.

The Member for Edmonton Centre also asked questions with respect to the pediatric beds there. The member should bear in mind that those decisions were made prior to our decision to construct a Northern Alberta Children's hospital. The dedication of space in that building to pediatrics is small and quite limited as compared to what we envision in the Northern Alberta Children's hospital, and I'm assured that that space can very readily be converted to other uses if a decision is made that those beds are not required for pediatrics in the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre. So I don't regard that as any problem at all.

Nursing units: I certainly don't pretend to be an expert there, but we are dealing with a world-class facility that's dedicated to intensive care, to the kinds of things that aren't normally done in your average general hospital. It's quite obvious to me that that kind of nursing care requires a greater degree of manpower than might generally be the case, and I would expect that you would see fewer beds per nursing unit in that institution than you might on average across the province or in other major hospitals.

The question of private fund raising: I would welcome the hon. member volunteering to head up the committee. There are in fact opportunities for individuals to provide amounts of money to our universities — which incidentally are connected very closely with much of the work that goes on at the Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre — which the government of Alberta for a number of years has matched to provide capital projects. Indeed, many of those dollars have gone to the University of Alberta. We would certainly be able to find a way of accommodating any private donations somebody wished to make to the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre through that channel.

Perhaps the final question, that was the theme of a number of hon. members' remarks, is: why so elaborate?

I don't believe that if we were making the decision today to build that building, we would be as generous as we were with respect to the total structure in terms of its quality and the nature of the facility. On the other hand, I think it was excellent that we were in a position six or seven years ago when we took that decision to proceed as we did to develop a world-class facility.

I say that for a number of reasons. First of all, you cannot attract the kind of people we want in this province and in this city in terms of medical research and medical expertise unless you have first-class facilities. I'm happy that we've been able to move more rapidly than we even thought in being recognized as a leader in medical research across Canada and even throughout North America because of our decision to put \$300 million into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund medical research endowment, because of our decision to build the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre, because of our decision after the centre was built to finance the heart/lung transplant program. Those kinds of things all tied together in a first-class facility are things that are needed.

Rather than dwell upon what we might have done, it's there, and it's first-class. I don't believe any dollars were wasted. Sure, you could have built things smaller and differently, but nobody got away with any money. It's all in that building. I think what we should do as Albertans is hold our heads high and be proud that we did have an opportunity when revenues from the oil and gas industry were high to put it into something as valuable as the Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre, which is going to pay dividends in the medical community in terms of medical research and benefits to our citizens and indeed all Canadians for many years to come. So I put that behind me and look forward now to making sure that we can control the operating costs, which are very important, and get good value for every dollar we put into the operation of that hospital.

Mr. Chairman, I think we've got the kind of people on the University hospitals board and the kind of people involved in the management there so that we will be able to in fact get good value for our operating dollars in the years to come.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ready for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 2 — Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre	\$33,500,000
---	--------------

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

[Motion carried]

#### Department of the Environment

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 8.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. We'll deal with the votes in numerical order.

#### 1 — Irrigation Headworks and Main Irrigation Systems Improvement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm glad you indicated that we'll be going with page 6 rather than page 8 first of all, although the sequential order is only important for those who like order. We can deal with any one of the three.

Members of the committee, there are essentially three votes listed in the 1986-87 estimates. The first of those, of course, is on page 6, irrigation headworks and main irrigation systems improvement . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Page 8.

MR. KOWALSKI: Not in my book; it's page 6.

AN HON. MEMBER: I think you're on 1983.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. KOWALSKI: No matter how it is, the amount to be voted is \$60 million. Of course, the objective is listed in there. The implementation — essentially Alberta Environment administers the program. There are 13 irrigation districts in the province of Alberta, and earlier this evening the Member for Chinook and the Member for Cypress-Redcliff in fact responded to a number of questions that were raised with respect to one aspect of the irrigation programs committed to by the province of Alberta.

Under the agricultural estimate — and we essentially look at those service components that are provided in the 13 irrigation districts — the vote we're looking at right now deals with the headworks and the main irrigation systems that are improvements. The amount of expenditures to March 31, 1985, is listed in the document. Sixty million dollars was expended in the 1985-86 fiscal year. We're asking your approval today for an additional \$60 million to continue this very important program that was announced a number of years ago.

Perhaps a brief overview might be in order. One of the ways one could really give that overview is a schematic I brought showing the part of Alberta that's really identified by the 13 irrigation districts. I'll circulate this, or perhaps with the permission of the Clerk we can just leave the map on the centre Table. We're essentially looking at the part of Alberta that goes from Drumheller south, 13 major irrigation districts. The Member for Chinook alluded to the fact that over 1 million acres of land are provided water services. The program of course is a long-term one to ensure the economic viability of the southern part of Alberta, to ensure the effective and efficient usage of water. A variety of works have been going on for a number of years since 1980 with respect to these 13 irrigation systems, with a targeted date of approximately 1995 to complete the work that was envisaged and identified a number of years ago. Of course, as each year goes on, irrigation districts come forward to the government with special requests for additional types of work.

Perhaps by way of overview comments, Mr. Chairman, I'll stop at that point and look forward to questions that committee members would like to raise with respect to this matter. I'm going to follow the tradition that was so wisely

established earlier this evening by my colleague the Minister of Agriculture and certainly look forward to additional input from our colleagues, particularly those who served on the select Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act over the last number of years. Committee members have had an opportunity to view the 13 districts in question. We've dealt with these estimates, at least in my chairmanship of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee, since 1982. We'll stop at that point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Minister. They're your estimates, and the Chair would appreciate your referring questions that are asked to any member.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I try to stay within the confines of the headings, although when I look at Environment, it appears you only have three pages. I won't number them for fear of confusing them with the document you have. But you have headworks and main irrigation, land reclamation, and Paddle River development. Most of the questions I want to ask don't seem to fit under any of the three, so I don't know whether I'm in the right line. But certainly, philosophically speaking, if there's a limit to growth in Alberta, it's based on water. It's not on our oil and gas, our people, our food, fresh air, or anything else. It's based on water, and irrigation headworks and main irrigation systems are probably the uses for the water.

One of the things I want to ask the Minister of Environment is if in the uses for irrigation, research has gone on, not on talking about basin transfer but on using pipelines to take waters from other basins to the south. There's always the worry in basin transfer that you're disturbing ecology and transferring disease or a type of element from one basin to another basin. Where it was in control in one basin it takes off in another. But when we use a pipeline for transferring water from basin to basin, you can control the volume, the quality, and also make sure that it's sanitized, you might say.

I was wondering if any research is being done on that, because whether we like it or not, this government, through its method of development over the last 15 years, has almost forced us into basin transfer. We profess that we're not going to do it or anything else, but the fact of the matter is that we've jammed a great deal of our industry and population growth into where we have the least amount of water. It was probably done in a cavalier attitude of whether we like it or not, we're going to have to do basin transfer down the road. We should be doing research on the type of basin transfer that is not environmentally destructive and will not contaminate, and I suggest possibly looking at pipelines, which I've seen other areas in the world use.

Secondly, I don't know whether this comes under the heading, but I think the best way for the Minister of Environment to create water, as I've seen in many areas, is not dams and holdback methods as much as reforestation of your headwaters. That system, which not only holds the snow and ice longer, apparently breeds the manufacture of snow, water, and ice to hold water cycles, so that idea of water in the upper stream — this is something even the ancient Persians used a thousand years ago. I don't see any mention here of whether we're doing any kind of research along that line. The headwaters of our streams and the tree planting reforestations of our Rocky Mountains slopes, particularly in the south, could have a lot to do with water down the road.

Thirdly, I don't understand the word "grants." If you're improving irrigation headworks and main irrigation systems, where do the grants go? Listed under the summary by object of expenditures is \$20,050,000 to grants. I don't know quite how grants fit into the thing, and I'm sure you can enlighten me on that.

Lastly, in the research of water and water use, would it possibly come under this heading that any research done to attract future growth in industry into those water surplus basins — in other words, instead of slamming petrochemicals into the Red Deer River drainage, if there is any future growth, is any thought being given to putting it into the Athabasca drainage, even in the town of Barrhead, in that general direction or north or Fort Assiniboine, in areas where we're not robbing the water in the Red Deer and South Saskatchewan areas that could be used for higher purposes than manufacturing? Does that fit under this heading? I was wondering if any kinds of studies have been done to see how we could attract water consuming new growth in Alberta, whether manufacturing or population, to the Athabasca and Peace River drainages rather than letting them concentrate and concentrate and thereby forcing us even more quickly into a policy of basin transfer in order to bring water to the south.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair would request that the members read the objectives of the vote we're dealing with and attempt as far as possible to keep their comments within that vote.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, the first question the member for Westlock-Sturgeon talked about was one dealing with pipelines. Included in this program in the past and identified on the graphs of a schematic map of the province of Alberta is one project that in fact is a pipeline project. It's the Sheerness water supply project that was completed in 1984-85. A pipeline was built from the Red Deer River to the Sheerness power plant and constructed in association with several utility companies. Alberta Environment included, in terms of funding under this appropriation, dollars for increasing the size of the pipeline to ensure an increase in guaranteed water supply. In addition to that, the construction of the 14-mile concrete-lined canal to the Carolside reservoir blowdown canal was essentially completed as well in the 1984-85 fiscal year. Total commitments to July 31, 1986, for those projects were some \$9.6 million. So in fact, Mr. Member, that kind of system and that kind involvement is already under way, and it's part of the whole program that you're asked to approve and vote tonight.

The second question the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon raised dealt with interbasin transfers. I'm not sure, Mr. Chairman, that follows under the purview of the discussion tonight. It certainly doesn't come under the whole business in terms of the identification of irrigation headworks and main irrigation systems improvement. But I would like the hon. member to know that the part of the world I happen to represent has a uniquely different problem than the kind of problem we're dealing with under this particular appropriation in this particular vote. We have a surplus of water, and as the Member for Chinook talked about, that water comes at various stages of the year, and it just simply goes down the so-called pipeline, the canal system.

MR. TAYLOR: What interests me is where the surplus water is [inaudible].



MR. KOWALSKI: No doubt at all about that, and that's a very important objective and certainly happening within the constituency of Barrhead. It's unfortunate perhaps some of this can't go everywhere, as the hon. Member for Peace River has talked about.

A third item dealt with reforestation in the headwaters of various streams. There are not to my knowledge any dollars committed to that headwater area under this particular program. What we're attempting to do is maximize the utilization of the water, but the point the member makes is an interesting one, and it's a good one. I'll certainly take it under advisement and see what we can pursue in that area. There's no doubt at all, of course, that when those headwaters come — there are forests in terms of the land that's being acquired in the Oldman River dam site and upstream from that. There are plans to use some of the surplus lands that have been purchased from individuals. Mr. Chairman, I'm straying from what we've got here at hand, but by way of an example, some surplus stands there will be used for activities other than basically farming if they are surplus to the basic intents.

The last question the member raised was basically one dealing with grants. The way the program has been administered — and I've talked about it in my opening comments. In essence, Alberta Environment administers the program. Dollars are made available to the various irrigation districts, which would then put the tenders out for the various projects. So if you looked at the various papers in the province of Alberta, you would have seen over the last several months, as an example, that the St. Mary's irrigation district put out tenders. They would receive dollars by way of a grant basis from the Alberta government and in fact would use those to conduct the works that are in place.

One of the other items. We talked a little earlier about innovative approaches in maintaining water and reducing seepage in a variety of canals in the southern part of the province of Alberta. Included in these estimates is a grant of \$1 million for fibreglass canal lining research, and that's a form of investment as well that comes under this particular vote.

MR. YOUNIE: Mr. Chairman, I will try to stay on the topic. I tried before to figure out a way to bring interbasin transfer in under one of these topics and couldn't find one, so it wasn't my intent to talk about it.

A couple of points, though, on irrigation. We seem to have had either a flood or a spray of information on irrigation tonight. Certainly it seems that as we discuss expenditures of the province, it's never a trickle of information or expenditures.

I would be concerned at some point if in fact we couldn't be given a total of exactly how much money per year under all the departments, under all the different ways the government thinks of spending money, is going toward irrigation and all of its many forms. In terms of this one I did have a question that was alluded to but not totally answered on the administration of the tenders, that they do in fact go to the irrigation districts. I'm wondering if the environment department has any overall control over which bidders get the contracts or perhaps control over the policies by which the decision is finally made on who gets it. If there is a policy, is it just lowest bidder, or does it involve any conditions for performance, preventing cost over-runs, meeting time lines, and so on?

In terms of subproject 4, water resource development projects, that comes close to \$40 million. I'm wondering,

seeing that the Oldman dam is mentioned in point 3, how much of point 4 would be related to the Chin Coulee reservoir and upgrading it to assist in providing the 170,000 acres that the minister said will be irrigated by the Oldman dam. As far as I can ascertain through any sources I've got, that will only be reached with some moderately costly — almost a minuscule cost compared to the dam itself, but still moderately costly on an ongoing basis — upgrading of the Chin Coulee reservoir to assist in that. Otherwise, it will only be 57,000 acres.

With that I'll await answers.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'd be happy to respond to the questions that were raised. First of all, members of the committee, we're not talking about spending dollars, we're talking about investing dollars for the long-term viability of the southern part of the province. From the perspective that I put forward, I think it's very important. This is a major investment, a major ongoing investment to the people of southern Alberta.

In terms of the bidding process, yes, the hon. member should feel assured that there is a very sophisticated process of cost-control mechanisms that are followed by the 13 districts in question. Certainly Alberta Environment is very vigilant about this sort of thing. For all intents and purposes, unless there is a basic reason not to follow it — and I can't recall one; there may have been an example in the past — in essence, the low bidder will obtain the bid, all things being equal. If there were a situation where perhaps there was an Alberta bidder — this is an extreme example — and a firm from, say, Australia bid on it as well and both came in at exactly the same amount of dollars, I would certainly suggest to the district in question that it should be awarded to the Alberta bidder, all things being equal. I think that answers the question.

MR. SHRAKE: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple questions for the minister regarding the western irrigation development system, which comes off the Bow River by Calgary. Since we took over this system from WID some years ago, we built the new weir across the Bow River. I think about eight people so far have died at this site. I know the minister has tried very hard to work with the city of Calgary to correct this problem. We have a chain, we have floating barrels, we have signs all over the place, and we even have a place where you can bypass the weir. But if you do go over the weir, the boat inevitably spills, and people cannot escape this type of current that's formed there. I wonder if we are still monitoring this situation. I wonder if the minister would consider working with the city of Calgary, doing a study to see if there's any way, without an outrageous cost, of ever correcting the design of that weir or if there are changes that can be made on the one side of it. I think there are some possibilities.

The other question I have for the minister is again regarding the WID. As it leaves the weir, the fast-flowing water has a lot of silt in it. Within the first three-quarters of a mile it has slowed down very considerably, and of course, it deposits its silt. The WID canal for the first three-quarters of a mile coming out of the Bow River has silted up so that there's very little capacity left. I wonder if they thought of dredging that canal to increase its flow and, if we do ever do this type of work, if we would have a certain rapport with the city of Calgary parks department, the adjacent communities, and the people who use that as a recreational facility.

Thank you.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that the first question really falls within the purview of what we're talking about tonight, but as it was raised on behalf of the public interest, I think it deserves an answer. The hon. member will know, and perhaps 1986 is as good an example as any to recognize what has happened along the Bow. Public warning after public warning was issued by every responsible leader in the city of Calgary with respect to individuals taking their lives into their own hands. The program of warning to people even included our buying testimonials from that very famous Calgary Flames hockey player, Doug Risebrough, to advise people and to warn them. That program, of course, is a safety program that will have to be continued as long as people decide to take their lives into their own hands and do things that are really, utterly very stupid. Perhaps those are the kindest words I can use with respect to people who would fall into that kind of a situation.

With respect to the Western Irrigation District, the main canal work was initiated in the 1985-86 fiscal year on the replacement of some existing road bridges and the implementation of minor remedial works. We're looking at a final decision with respect to canal design capacity and pending that will not initiate the type of work the hon. member has raised until that decision has really been finalized.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Where are the land assembly costs for the Oldman River dam found? In this vote?

MR. KOWALSKI: The Oldman River dam is not part of this vote. The Oldman River dam is covered under the General Revenue Fund of the province of Alberta. These are the estimates of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Chairman, I'm curious then, because under the special warrants there were \$7.2 million to reimburse the capital projects division of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund for expenditure incurred in purchasing land associated with the Oldman River dam project. If it's not in this vote, where is it found?

MR. KOWALSKI: Such items may in the past have been funded under the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, but beginning with the fiscal year April 1, 1986, the Oldman River dam is funded entirely under the General Revenue Fund of the province of Alberta.

[Two members rose]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, Calgary Forest Lawn. I believe the Member for Calgary Mountain View wants to continue. Or would you rather it the other way round, Calgary Mountain View?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Chairman, this is the first year I've been in these estimates debates, and so if these questions are not — they're asked seeking some basic information here. I'm not clear how this heritage fund capital division operates. Where does that \$7.2 million show up when it comes back to this division as a reimbursement? How is that accounted for? If it's not in this budget, this

vote, where could I find it? I don't know that you, sir, would be able to tell me that, but is there somebody who can give this Assembly an overview that would explain how you trace that kind of money back into this division?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The minister is suggesting the Public Accounts Committee, but perhaps if the Member for Calgary Mountain View doesn't mind a short interlude ...

MR. HAWKESWORTH: No, that's okay.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, some comments on main canal works, the future growth of irrigation, and the future use of water in certain areas. In the areas where it is dry and there are high heat units — and the best combination is dryness and high heat units — you can produce a good crop with the use of water. It shows when we look at our irrigation areas in extreme southern Alberta compared to the irrigation area around Outlook, Saskatchewan, where they've constantly had a problem because the heat units aren't as great there and it's a little further north where they get more rain, so they've had more problem in showing the difference created between irrigation and dryland.

Two, Mr. Chairman, land assembly costs that are related to this vote. In the areas of the main canal expansion in St. Mary's and some of the other districts where reservoirs were constructed, the irrigation districts themselves have to provide the land for that expansion, whether it be a widening of the canal or in such cases as Forty Mile reservoir the land is provided by the irrigation districts.

Mr. Chairman, while I'm on my feet I would also like to again invite members to come down and look at any irrigation areas. I would be glad to take them on a tour. There are many irrigation district chairmen and directors that would also gladly take them on a tour of the area so that they could see it on the ground and see how it actually works.

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Chairman, I was very interested in the minister's response to the question from the Member for Calgary Millican. The second question had to do with if a dredging project had to take place where the irrigation canal leaves the Bow River, would the minister consider co-operating with the city of Calgary Parks and Recreation Department to consider developing that area for recreational purposes for the communities along that part of the canal? Perhaps the minister answered that question; I don't know. There's too much noise, and I didn't hear his answer. I wonder if he'd mind repeating it.

MR. KOWALSKI: The member should appreciate that there would be a co-operative effort between Alberta Environment and the city of Calgary.

While I'm on feet, perhaps I might just clarify for the Member for Calgary Mountain View the answer to the question of where did the \$7 million-plus go? These estimates we have tonight deal with the fiscal year 1986-87. In the past the original plan was essentially to have the Oldman River dam funded under the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. When the decision was made to transfer it to the General Revenue Fund, a special warrant was raised to buy out or pay off that \$7 million and effect the transfer. So in the past it was in fact under the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. It's now funded under the General Revenue Fund. A special warrant was raised to cancel that particular

debt and ensure that the dollars were transferred from one budget item to the other.

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

MR. WRIGHT: I take it that what the minister has said is that the approval of the special warrants in effect functions as an amendment of the previous year's capital project budget for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, and that's the way we look at it.

Mr. Chairman, it wasn't until the conclusion of the remarks of the hon. Member for Chinook that I realized that in fact the appropriation of \$30 million under the Department of Agriculture section of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund's capital budget for irrigation was for the feeder system and that the main canals are \$60 million in this part of the budget under Environment. So I repeat, in effect, my question to the Minister of the Environment. Is it the case that the grants for the renovation of the main canals specify the latest sort of technology — namely that the canals when renovated will be impervious, either because that's the nature of the soil or because of vinyl or whatever the medium is that's put in the ditch to make it impervious — to meet the problems of excessive wastage of water by seepage or salinization of the irrigated ground?

MR. KOWALSKI: That's certainly the objective. Whether or not that happens will in fact depend on a variety of factors, including the type of soil, change in conditions, and the like, and, as the Member for Chinook pointed out, on the size of Alberta that we're talking about. It's an enormous part of the province. When you look at it, there's a tremendous variety of soil conditions and the like. A lot of research has been done. A lot of research is going on in the particular area.

Included this year under these estimates is \$1 million to look at this fibreglass lining. I'm not sure that will be the state of the art delivery system, that that will be the most practicable one for everybody involved to use, but undoubtedly there's a cost factor attached to it. One would have to weigh and each irrigation district would have to weigh what is the most efficient and effective usage of what type of lining they would have within the various canals they have within their own districts.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, it's just a short question. I'm making a suggestion to the minister that the heading "grants" is quite deceptive. I gathered from the explanation from the minister that that is really moneys that are spent on manpower, supply services, and purchase of fixed assets, only it's spent by the irrigation district rather than by the government directly. Wouldn't it be better and clearer to those reading the reports and easier for the opposition to query if you broke the grants down in the same breakdown that you have managed in breakdown of the government's own money; in other words, manpower, supplies and services, and purchase of fixed assets? It's surely deceptive to see grants there and then get told that it is used partly for research and partly for construction. It's a little difficult to follow.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I have absolutely no difficulty at all with the suggestion that has been put forward by the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon. I'm just a simple country boy who tries to get things done, and we have to depend on a whole bunch of chartered accountants and a

few other people involved here. I'll certainly take the advice as being for clarification, because there's nothing that's more important to me than to simply respond to a question that's being asked. That's a good idea.

MR. YOUNIE: Just to repeat a question that I think the minister missed because somebody nearby distracted him while I was asking it. It was a fairly quick question concerning subpoint 4, water resource development projects, for approximately \$40 million. I was wondering what portion of that, if any, was related to the Chin Coulee reservoir upgrading, the reason for that being that I'd been trying to find out how many acres of land the Oldman dam will in fact provide irrigation for. Any source I could find only agreed with the minister's figure of 170,000 acres if the Chin Coulee reservoir were given a fairly expensive upgrading or improvement. I'm wondering if this is part of it.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I think I'm going to ask one of my colleagues from the deep south to get involved in this particular thing. The Oldman River dam is located on the extreme western part of the province of Alberta, and the Chin Coulee reservoir, to my knowledge, is located in the extreme eastern part of the province of Alberta. In between there's a distance of all the width of Alberta. If the Member for Cypress-Redcliff would perhaps amplify, I would find it helpful, because we've got an enormous distance of perhaps upwards of 100 to 150 miles, and I'm having difficulty following the connection, hon. member. No disrespect; it's probably my fault.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Chairman, the minister earlier made reference to the fact that the Oldman River dam had originally been under the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I presume it was this division. Was it this particular vote 1? I wonder if the minister could give us some of the policy considerations as to why that project might have been taken out of the capital projects division and made part of the general fund expenditures of the provincial government.

Thank you.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, the estimates we're looking at tonight are the estimates for the fiscal year beginning April 1, 1986, terminating on March 31, 1987. The questions the hon. member wants me to deal with this evening are not part of these particular estimates. Traditionally the select Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund would meet with the ministers of Executive Council who have responsibilities for the funding of a variety of these projects, and we'd review with them the activities that have occurred in the previous fiscal year. That would be the 1985-1986 fiscal year. In addition to that, there's an opportunity under the Public Accounts Committee for an individual such as myself to come forward and answer questions about decisions that have been made in the past. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, that would be the appropriate occasion to deal with questions of that matter, one of those other two meetings that are set for that. The estimates we have tonight deal with the 1986-87 request being made.

MR. McEACHERN: Did you finish your series of questions? Are you okay on that?

MR. YOUNIE: I did want to elaborate on a question that wasn't answered.

MR. McEACHERN: I will let him finish the question he was going to get some help with before I ask mine, okay?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am taking them in order.

MR. YOUNIE: I don't mind.

MR. McEACHERN: Okay. Consider this a rookie question, I guess. Perhaps some other people would like to help you out on it, maybe the Minister of Agriculture or some of the people from the area who have more knowledge of these things.

In terms of agriculture, not looking at sort of environmental concerns so much or in terms of water management as such but more in terms of the payoff for agricultural production — and that's because in looking at what budget I've had a chance to look at this year and watching it at other times, a lot of the agricultural budget through the years has been to do with dams and irrigation. I know some of it has been under Environment and so on. It's a costly kind of agriculture. What I'm wondering is how carefully and how closely we are monitoring the payoff from that. When you change the kind of agriculture you can do in an area because you put in irrigation, are we looking at the benefits of that? Because it is an expensive sort of process. I wonder if we could get some comment on that, maybe from the Minister of Agriculture, although I realize he's new. Perhaps some of the people that live in the area and are involved in that kind of farming might be better able to tell us.

MR. KOWALSKI: I'm not sure, Mr. Chairman, if the Member for Edmonton Kingsway was asking someone to supplement my answers or someone to supplement his questions. But in terms of the benefit the hon. member is raising, I simply have no disagreement at all with the recognition of the fact that this particular province of ours — and I must admit that the question the hon. member has raised would allow one to respond over several hours. Agriculture is very fundamental to the southern part of the province of Alberta, and fundamental to the success of agriculture in the southern part of the province is wise utilization of water. Water in southern Alberta is of limited supply. The Minister of Agriculture, the Member for Chinook, earlier this evening the Member for Cypress-Redcliff, and other members have talked about the need to maximize the usage of it.

We can talk about the costing factor to do certain things, and I suppose when we built up the final model or the final scenario, we would have to take a whole variety of things into question. As an example, it may cost X number of dollars to provide water on a per acre basis to the southern part of the province, and that would have to be dealt with and weighed in terms of the cost of drainage in another part of the province of Alberta. I know from experience in another phase of my life in the past that it was a heck of a lot easier and cheaper to build a road, as an example, in the deep southern part of the province than it was in the constituency I represent; it was one-third cheaper. That is part of the scenario that would have to be built into the whole question as well: the number of roads you would need to service the farms, the availability of service centres and what would be included, demanded, or required as part of it.

I have simply no doubt at all in my mind that when you take a look at the large amount of agricultural produce

developed, raised, and grown in the southern part of the province of Alberta — and we're now talking about that part of Alberta that essentially goes from Drumheller south. Physically and geographically we are in the southern part of the province here in the city of Edmonton, so we're talking about one restricted area and the quality and kind of life, the number of towns, villages, communities, and cities, and the way of life and the integrity of the people in that part of Alberta.

While this may very well be a rather large investment in the eyes of some, I wonder what that part of Alberta would be without the availability and continuation of water. Surely all members will have to remember that it was less than a hundred years ago that part of that part of Alberta was simply written off by Palliser and defined as useless land in the history of the day when the early explorers came west. When they drew the maps of western Canada and identified that area of Alberta that eventually became known as the Palliser Triangle, they simply wrote it off as being useless land for eternity. That is simply not the case. Today it's a fantastic breadbasket. It's one of the most productive areas of North America. With a continuous water supply and a continuous availability of water, its potential for improvement not only will ensure and safeguard the agriculture that we have there today but would see an expansion of agriculture and lead to industry, population growth, and the like and is very important. I think that if we look at the history of Alberta over the last several decades, we have seen people move from the rural areas to the urban areas and then a stop in that in the mid-1970s. Hopefully, in the years and the decades to come, we can see a reversal of that if there are opportunities for people in certain parts of Alberta. Water is crucial to that development in the southern part of the province.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, if I can attempt to answer the question of the Member for Edmonton Glengarry about whether under sub 4 there are any moneys being spent on Chin Coulee reservoir, I stand to be corrected, but I don't believe there's any money on Chin Coulee reservoir this year. That Chin Coulee reservoir expansion was part of the Oldman River study. It was something that was recommended for a number of years hence as the canal gets bigger and certain things happen. It's still down the road from now. It's not in this year's expansion, and along with that comes a pump-out out of the Oldman River tying into the main canal and all high-cost items and something that are a number of years down the road.

MR. YOUNIE: Mr. Chairman, I think that does go some distance towards substantiating what I was saying, which was that in fact the project at Chin Coulee — I wondered if any of it was being funded under here — is an expansion of the Oldman River dam or an expansion of its ability to irrigate southern Alberta, that in fact the dam alone will provide irrigation for about 57,000 acres that are downhill from the dam, and that for the remainder to reach the 170,000 figure often quoted, that water from the Oldman River will have to be pumped uphill and, I believe, go into the St. Mary's irrigation district, which is serviced by Chin Coulee — although I could be wrong on the name of the district — and that will then provide the rest of the 170,000 acres. I was just wondering what percentage of this particular vote, if any, was dealing with that.

MR. KOWALSKI: There are no dollars at all in this particular vote for the Chin Coulee dam. It exists.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 1 — Irrigation Headworks and Main Irrigation Systems Improvement	\$60,000,000
--	--------------

## 2 — Land Reclamation

MR. KOWALSKI: Just a couple of brief comments, Mr. Chairman. The land reclamation program was first established in 1973 and in 1976-77 funding from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund was approved to March 31, 1982, and there has been renewal since that time. Over the years and to March 31, 1985, some \$23.5 million has been invested.

The amount being requested this year is \$3 million. It's one program that I think is just very, very important. It's extremely important in terms of statements that I've made as the Minister of the Environment in recent months, and it's one that I think applies to a great number of members in this particular Assembly.

One of the things that I would like to do in the ensuing months is provide some specific information to all members of the Assembly to identify various projects that have been undertaken in their particular constituencies with respect to appropriations voted under land reclamation, vote 2. Not a great deal of money, but a very important vote of all the votes that are under the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund and, in fact, one that I would like to see expanded in the years to come.

MR. YOUNIE: Just a couple of small questions. First, I may have missed it in the minister's initial remarks, but does this have to do with land that was disturbed prior to 1963 when legislation was brought in requiring that the person who then disturbed the land had to do the reclamation?

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes.

MR. YOUNIE: Okay. In that case the minister has hinted that in fact there is still some considerable amount of work outstanding in this area in that he has said he'd like to see it expanded. I would just be concurring with him on that, in that in terms of job creation, its value down the road, and economic improvement, land reclamation is a very valuable item that I would support. I would urge that if there's that much land left to be reclaimed that was disturbed that many years ago, maybe we should get about the job of doing it.

MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you very much, Mr. Member.

MR. EWASIUK: Mr. Chairman, I too want to say that I agree with the minister that this is an important part of the program to reclaim the sort of land that has been disturbed. The countryside's been scarred up over the years and needs to be reclaimed and put back to some productive means.

The perception I have of reclamation is that usually backfill is hauled to a cavity, then the overburden, if there is any left, is graded over it, there's some seed put on it, and it's left for some other purpose. Of course, in the city of Edmonton we use old gravel pits for landfill sites. Before that happens, we use them for mosquito production.

The most important one that I'd like to bring to the minister's attention is the reclamation program at the old Dodds coal mine, where the mine pits have been restocked with trout and the area has been turned into a recreational facility. I wonder if we have other projects like that in the

province and if part of the reclamation program is indeed that type of program, that we are preserving some of the old sites, the old mine shafts that would have some historical value but can also serve as a recreational facility as well.

I must say that I am delighted to know there is legislation now that prohibits people scarring up the countryside and then simply walking away from it and leaving either the government or some municipality to look after that, to reclaim those kind of lands. Around the city of Edmonton we have too many of those. My question to the minister is: are you looking at using some of the scarred up gravel pits, coal mine shafts that still have not been reclaimed for the purpose of recreation, as we have in the Dodds mine area where we plant trout and the thing is used as a recreational facility for the neighbourhood.

MR. KOWALSKI: The response to that question is yes. Just by way of information, under this program for this year, while there's only \$3 million allocated, it'll include a reclamation program that will include 82 landfills — garbage dumps — 11 sewage lagoons, five gravel and sand pits, two water reservoirs, and eight that might be identified as other types. They tend to be very small in area. Where there's an opportunity for multi-use or new usage, recreation, fish holes, and what have you, by all means I think that's a great idea and we should do it.

MR. McEACHERN: Just one quick question. In trying to resurrect or, if you like, reclaim some of the problems that were created before 1983, has the minister considered ... [interjections] Sorry, '73. If it takes it back that far, it takes away a lot of the impact of my question. I was wondering if you would have done any work in trying to reclaim from the people who had destroyed or misused the land in any way, but I was thinking in terms of '83, so that would have been more recent. I suppose if you go back to '73, it's pretty hard to start tracking somebody down, although some of the firms may well be around and I suppose there are some that you could help to get some of the cost from and stretch your dollars further.

MR. KOWALSKI: There's no doubt at all about the fact that if you can use your good offices to embarrass somebody publicly about doing something — it has already occurred once during this legislative session — then go and do it. The difficulty, of course, is that you've put your finger on the vast majority of items that have occurred: maybe a small, one-person, one-family operator who had a little gravel pit; they may have been deceased, moved away, or closed the business down and to ask them to put \$20,000, \$30,000, or \$40,000 in gravel pit reclamation that may have occurred in 1937 — it's highly unlikely. We're dealing essentially with those projects that were developed in Alberta prior to 1973. Of course, legislation since that time just would prohibit this from occurring.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 2 — Land Reclamation	\$3,000,000
---------------------------------	-------------

## 3 — Paddle River Basin Development

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of brief comments with respect to the Paddle River basin development. Several days ago when the question was raised about the Paddle River, I indicated to all members that there were some great speeches in *Alberta Hansard* covering

the whole history, the historical development and perspective of the Paddle River basin and the Paddle River dam. In my humble view, the Paddle River dam has proven its worth in terms of what it avoided in 1986, in the worst flooding that has ever occurred in the area of Alberta that I happen to live in. The amounts that you are being requested to approve tonight, today, this week, this session, are \$1,050,000 that essentially bring the Paddle River basin development to a successful conclusion. I would really appreciate your support with respect to this particular item.

MR. YOUNIE: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of minor points. On the minister's suggestion I did in fact drive up to the area and talk to some farmers, and it does relate directly to questions about these expenditures, if it is going to bring the whole dam project to a conclusion — no pun intended there. I would make it very clear that one farmer stressed he was happy that he only had 100 and some acres flooded because, with a dramatic sweep of his arm, he said, "Had it not been for the dam, I would have been flooded from here to there." So I never intended to say that the dam didn't stop any flooding at all.

On further questioning he said that people within the Environment department had told him that the flooding that did happen, what there was of it, was the result of the spillway gate not being completed yet. I said, "Well, why wouldn't it be completed?" It seemed to me the dam had been completed. He said: "They told me that they're waiting for it because it's an earth-fill dam and takes a long time to settle. They're waiting for settling to finish, and once that is done they can build spill gates that will hold and seal properly, and obviously it would be unwise to build them before the point when the settling is finished because they might give way if some settling happens unexpectedly." I thought that a terribly logical explanation and wondered why I didn't get it in question period and why I had to drive that far to talk to one of the local farmers.

I'm wondering what portion, if any, of this particular project, which also refers to a dam, I was amazed to see — it will be the cheapest dam in the history of Alberta, even if it does go two and a half times over budget, based on this — goes towards the completion of the spill gates. I also ask that because I don't know how fast they can get the water out after they've held it in for a while to prevent flooding. When I went to look, it seemed to me one might have almost called it the "Puddle River" dam, considering the smallness of the lake behind the dam compared to what I'd expected if it were being used entirely to stop flooding. It seemed to me that if it had gone to the top of the construction and the spill gate rather than the bottom, there would have been no flooding whatsoever. In fact, once the spill gates are completed the minister may be right in saying that it will prevent flooding.

I also wonder if there's been any comparison of how well the dam worked in comparison to how well the alternative three-reservoir system that was suggested by the ECA would have worked with the weather conditions of this summer. I imagine that may be difficult or impossible to ever determine. I'm not sure.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, first of all, in perspectives. I'm glad the hon. member did go and visit the Paddle River dam. I really, truly am. I think that's very important. Every time an individual from the city of Edmonton goes out and sees what's happening in the wild countryside, I really do appreciate that.

The member should know that the water in the reservoir rose 15 metres during the acute time of water intake into the Paddle River. The water did not go over the spillway. The dollars that we're talking about in here have to do with some conduit gates that were always planned to be completed in 1986 and were not planned to be completed in 1985. The member is quite correct. The answer to his question is yes. The dollars that are being asked to be looked at in here would successfully conclude that. We'll do it, and it was planned to do it in the fall of 1986. That had always been the plan, to bring it to a successful conclusion.

The Paddle River dam. In terms of the latter question the hon. member raised in terms of how you really compare, I don't know how you really can compare. All I know is that I lived in the community and the town of Barrhead in 1973 when the town of Barrhead was virtually inundated with water, when a lake essentially existed from the town of Barrhead upriver to where the Paddle River dam is today. I know the tremendous turmoil that occurred, and literally hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of farmers — flooding has occurred in the Paddle River going back to 1906 when the first settlers moved into that particular area.

The Paddle River is not a big river, and the member should not be bemused. You cannot compare it to the North Saskatchewan River. In fact, the Paddle River today is not much wider than from these desks here to those desks over there and not very deep either, but at the time of acute water intake it rises and it rises and it rises. Perhaps, again, a visual is always important to put things into perspective, and I brought one with me here tonight. It's very difficult but I'll circulate it. It is two satellite pictures, one taken on September 22, 1983. It's very difficult, I appreciate, for everybody to see from here. But this is the Pembina River, this squirrely thing that goes over in there. You cannot see the Paddle River, because it's that small.

This is a map taken from a satellite on July 20, 1986, the day in which we were having some discussions in this Assembly. What you see, this aqua blue, is the water as the crest moved down the Pembina River. Here is the town of Barrhead over here, and there is where the crest was at a little place called Manola. It had not yet gone towards Westlock and Rossington and in that direction, but you cannot see any flooding at all on the Paddle River, none whatsoever. None is detected. But I thought it was an important visual to amplify once again that the Paddle River dam has been a dam of great importance to the people who live in northwestern Alberta.

I really want to thank my predecessor for the tremendous amount of work he did in convincing his colleagues of the day of the merit of the Paddle River dam. All I know is that today a whole bunch of people are saying, "Thank you very much for the distinguished members of this Assembly in years gone by making the correct decision." Certainly as the MLA for the constituency of Barrhead I'm just really pleased that I don't have to come here and say that we need \$20 million or \$30 million or \$40 million to pay for the damages to all the farms and the land that would have been caused by the flooding of the Paddle River. I think this is a good visual that all members might want to take a look at.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I have the opportunity to say a few words in regards to the Paddle River dam. I want to go back to 50 years or so, in the 1930s, when the people of that area requested support of the government

of the day for flood control on the Paddle. Of course, that carried on for a number of years until just recently when the flood control was built at the Rochfort Bridge dam.

I wish the NDP member that was there would have come with me on Friday 18, 19, and 20, because he could have seen exactly what was taking place. He says in his news release that there was flooding directly downstream from the dam. That's right, Mr. Chairman, there was. But he must remember that there are two rivers there: the Big Paddle, which has a dam, and the Little Paddle, which flooded. The Little Paddle flooded in that area where the rivers join, and that's directly downstream. He can shake his head all he wants but I was there. He wasn't. He should have come, because it's just a bunch of nonsense that he's got in this news release.

[Mr. Gogo in the Chair]

He went there, talked to some people, didn't even tell them who he was, and then when he got done he said, "Oh, by the way, I'm the NDP critic for Environment in the House." [interjections] I'll tell you that's ...

MR. YOUNIE: On a point of order. I would like to point out that what was just said about me was completely and totally inaccurate. I identified myself in my initial phone call to the farmer I visited. I identified myself to the councillor for Lac Ste. Anne whom I talked to, and both of those people said that their information that it was water that came over the dam because of gates that weren't closed were people within the Environment department.

One of them, in fact, phoned the Environment department because she is on the dam committee and has been for years, and she knew she would get lots of phone calls. She wanted to have accurate information, and as far as I'm concerned, she got accurate information from the Environment department; I did not get it from the minister. I think that the House just did not get the accurate truth about what I said and what I did, and I hope I've corrected any wrong impression that the hon. member was trying to create about what I did and why I might have done it.

MR. KOWALSKI: I'm really trying to be a kind of nice guy tonight, but there was a statement made there about misinformation provided to the House. I hope that's not what I heard, because there certainly was not misinformation provided to the House. I'm going to ask the member to rephrase his thoughts before I go on, because if he said that I'm going to go on.

AN HON. MEMBER: What are you getting so excited about then?

MR. KOWALSKI: There was no misinformation provided to this Assembly by the Minister of Environment with respect to flooding on the Paddle River.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, the Chair is unaware which member you're referring to.

MR. KOWALSKI: The Member for Edmonton Glengarry.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I'm glad that the hon. member got up, because I talked to the lady that he talked to and he didn't identify himself until after he got done. I don't know whether he wants that to be his version of

it or the lady that I talked to. But he's got to remember that I was there on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. I watched that river, I've seen the flooding, and it was the most dramatic flood I've ever seen. I was there in 1944, which was the worst flood until 1986, but as the Little Paddle came down and joined the Big Paddle, they met and the water went upstream from the Big Paddle and that caused the flooding. But if he went to the dam and watched the water coming out of the dam and the Big Paddle, it wasn't even running a third full. I was there and I saw it. Now that member saying that I don't know what I'm talking about is just nonsense. That's what he should have done, come and seen it with me.

Mr. Chairman, the people of my constituency, the people of the Barrhead constituency are grateful for the dam on the Big Paddle, but they can't control the flooding of the Little Paddle. The dike is not high enough and it overflowed in two or three places. I know the land of Mr. Schatz, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Burki. I've been there.

I want to ask Mr. Minister if he would consider additional flood control on the Little Paddle because it's necessary if we want to do a complete job. The next thing I'd like to ask him to do is to consider flood control on the Pembina, because the Pembina river, as shown on that diagram — there was dramatic flooding.

I want to go back to 1973 when I flew that area with Dr. Home. Downstream from where the two rivers met, the flooding on the flats was four to five miles wide in areas. This year that never occurred, not a bit, because of the Paddle River dam. There wasn't one farmer downstream where the flooding was severe. Down at the Lamoureux' and all that they got a bit of water, but they got it in that area where the two rivers met. Now if the hon. member had come down there, he'd have seen it, he could have reported accurately to the people of Alberta in this House.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, there were two questions raised by the Member for Whitecourt. One was dealing with the Little Paddle River, and the response to his question is yes. The second one dealing with flood control on the Pembina River: the answer to that question is yes.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 3 — Paddle River Basin Development \$1,050,000

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I would move that the votes listed under Alberta Environment in the estimates under the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund be reported.

[Motion carried]

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and beg leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration the following resolutions, reports as follows, and requests leave to sit again:

Resolved that from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund sums not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1987, for the purpose of making investments in the following projects to be administered by:

Agriculture: \$5 million, Farming for the Future; \$905,000, Food Processing Development Centre; \$30 million, irrigation rehabilitation and expansion.

Hospitals and Medical Care: \$4,923,000, applied cancer research; \$33,500,000, the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre.

Environment: \$60 million, irrigation headworks and main irrigation systems improvement; \$3 million, land reclamation; \$1,050,000, Paddle River basin development.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report, does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, if any? Carried.

[At 10:39, on motion, the House adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]