

Legislative Assembly of AlbertaTitle: **Friday, May 25, 1990 10:00 a.m.**

Date: 09/05/25

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Prayers

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

Our divine Father, as we conclude for this week our work in this Assembly, we renew our thanks and ask that we may continue our work under Your guidance.

Amen.

head: **Notices of Motions**

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism.

MR. MAIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm rising today to give notice to the House that under Standing Order 40, at the end of question period today, I would request leave to debate an issue of important international significance regarding an incident that occurred last night. I think it's important that on behalf of the mighty Edmonton government caucus and my colleagues in the Legislature, we would recognize the event that occurred in Boston last night whereby the Edmonton Oilers won their fifth Stanley Cup in seven years.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Speaker, the minister and I are of a like mind this morning. On behalf of the majority caucus in the city of Edmonton, I second his notice.

MR. WICKMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, under section 40 I was intending to *serve* a similar type motion, except I would have made some reference to Edmonton remaining the City of Champions.

head: **Introduction of Bills****Bill 264****An Act to Amend the Historical Resources Act**

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce this morning Bill 264, An Act to Amend the Historical Resources Act.

This is a very small Bill. It in essence asks the following: that the board shall not approve a name or change of name for a place or other geographical feature in Alberta except in accordance with the principles adopted by the Canadian Permanent Committee on Geographical Names. This Bill is supported by the Historical Society of Alberta.

[Leave granted; Bill 264 read a first time]

Bill 42**Liquor Control Amendment Act, 1990**

MR. FOWLER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being the Liquor Control Amendment Act, 1990.

MS BARRETT: What's in it, Dick? A secret?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

[Leave granted; Bill 42 read a first time]

Bill 241**An Act to Amend the Limitation of Actions Act**

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona I request leave to introduce Bill 241, being An Act to Amend the Limitation of Actions Act.

This Bill enables any arbitration or grievance board to waive a breach of a formality in a procedure or of a time limit if it is of the opinion that justice will best be served thereby. It also says that the jurisdiction of the courts of justice may never be excluded by contract, though the court may stay any court proceeding to let the agreed procedure run its course.

[Leave granted; Bill 241 read a first time]

head: **Introduction of Special Guests**

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly 39 grade 5 students from the Coronation school, which is in Chinook constituency. They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Tony Selzler and Mr. Brock Crysler; parents Norma Woods, Arlana Glazier, Linda Boychuk, and Joanne Sieger; and also their bus drivers Gerald Lang and Melanie Robertson. They are seated in the members' gallery, and I would ask that they rise and receive the very warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the Legislature 14 very well-traveled students from Guthrie school in the Namao Armed Forces Base in my constituency. They're accompanied by their teacher Grace Yanda and bus driver Larry Grigsby. I'd ask them to stand – they're in the members' gallery – to be recognized by the House in our usual warm fashion. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Career Development and Employment, followed by Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. WEISS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't have the opportunity very often, so it is indeed a privilege for me to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly a group of 14 students attending Father R. Perin school in the community of Janvier, Alberta, located near Fort McMurray. They've driven a long distance to be here. They're grades 5 and 6, and they're accompanied by their teacher Susan Laird as well as the parents and assistants Lena Herman, Mark Jean, and Terry Fontaine. They're on their way to Peace River, I might add as well, to compete in the Northland schools athletic events. They are seated in the public gallery, and I would ask them to rise and receive the cordial welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Jasper Place, followed by Clover Bar, followed by West Yellowhead.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have the pleasure to introduce 26 students from the Holy Cross school in the great constituency of Edmonton-Jasper Place. Holy Cross is the school that my kids attend. They're here accompanied by their

teacher Mrs. Manuela Ferrante. I'd like them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Clover Bar.

MR. GESELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly 35 students from the Pope John XXIII school in the city of Fort Saskatchewan in my constituency. The students are escorted by teachers Mr. Keehn, Mrs. Hart, and Mr. Sheriff. They are seated in the public and the members' galleries, and I would ask them to rise to receive the traditional warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: West Yellowhead.

MR. DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Legislature a person who has been in the province addressing not only our concerns about illiteracy but, being a leading expert in the computer field in combating illiteracy, he has met with school divisions throughout the province for the last week: my brother from Ottawa, Michael Doyle.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly this morning nine students from the Highlands junior high school, with whom I had a visit earlier today. They're accompanied by Leanne Fitzpatrick and Julie Gyurek. I'd ask them to rise in the members' gallery and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

head: Ministerial Statements

Technology, Research and Telecommunications

MR. SPEAKER: Minister of Technology, Research and Telecommunications.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to speak about an event that will celebrate the commercial successes of Alberta advanced technology companies. It will mark the breakthroughs and developments of our scientific researchers and inform students of the challenging and rewarding careers available to them right here at home. I am speaking of Alberta Science and Technology Week, which is being held from May 26 to June 2. This week will be a combination of events ranging from class projects for grade 7 students to the presentation of the first Alberta Science and Technology Leadership Awards. These two events are very reflective of the science and technology community in this province, because while companies and research organizations are diligent in their efforts to grow and prosper, they've also recognized the need to attract young people to careers in science and technology related fields.

In fact, one of the more interesting components of Alberta Science and Technology Week is a project called Corporate Outreach. The goal of this project is to get advanced technology companies to reach out in some way to the schools in their areas. The response has been very positive. Company representatives will be speaking to schools, science classes will be touring

research facilities, and field trips are being planned: all in the name of increasing student awareness of career opportunities available to them in Alberta.

Science and Technology Week is also an opportunity for Alberta to tell our story to the rest of Canada as we host the National Forum of Science and Technology Advisory Councils from May 27 to 29. Alberta is hosting this event because of the initiative taken by our Premier. Participating in this forum of Canada's science leaders will be the newly appointed members of the Premier's Council on Science and Technology: a representative group of Albertans from industry, academia, and the advanced technology community who have come together to advise this government on science and technology related matters.

Further information on the forum, Mr. Speaker, is to be found on each member's desk. I would like to encourage all members to join in celebrating the energy and the ingenuity of our science and technology community by taking part in this our first Alberta Science and Technology Week.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, again, like many other ministerial announcements it's hard to disagree with the print. Obviously, we'd all support Alberta Science and Technology Week.

But, if I may say so to the minister and to this government, Mr. Speaker, actions speak louder than words. If we're going to celebrate Alberta Science and Technology Week, one of the most effective ways that we can develop this industry is through our advanced educational institutions; i.e., the technical institutes, the community colleges, and the universities. I don't need to remind the people in this Assembly that there is a serious underfunding at that level. Over the last five years there's been 8.8 percent less in terms of real dollars going that way. That's not a very effective way, Mr. Minister, to advance this particular industry. If we're going to be competitive in the global market – this government likes to talk about it – the most effective way is through those institutions. You have to fund them, because it makes good sense in the long run in an economic sense.

Now, I'd say to this minister that in traveling around the province, I believe there is a growing crisis in our advanced educational institutions. I point out one example that flows very much from this department: the pharmacy department at the U of A, which is seriously underfunded but extremely important to the future of science and technology. They have real problems, Mr. Speaker.

So I would say that we certainly will join with the minister in celebrating a very important industry, but I would hope that in the future it would be much more meaningful, that there would be some vastly needed funding, especially in those areas of the various advanced educational institutions in the province.

head: Oral Question Period

MR. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition.

Daishowa Pulp Mill

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the Minister of the Environment. The minister clearly has lost all credibility as a spokesman on environmental matters. He obviously has no clout or support in cabinet, as we see the Minister of Energy, the neutral minister, now taking through important environmental legislation. It's taken him a

while, but I think he must realize now – even he must realize now – that this government is not on side when it comes to protecting our environment. Earlier this week he announced his decision to grant an operating licence to Daishowa without even so much as a cursory review as was conducted in the case of Procter & Gamble. It seems that the Minister of the Environment wanted to do the right thing, but instead of saying, "The devil made me to it," he said, "The Attorney General made me do it." Can the Minister of the Environment tell us: is the Attorney General, along with the Minister of Energy, calling the shots now on matters of the environment?

MR. KLEIN: No.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, let's look into it a little more then. In fact, there were two releases printed on the Daishowa announcement. I have both of them right here. They're identical except for one very telling quote. In one release the minister is quoted as saying:

Legal advice provided to the Attorney General's Department recommends that such a process requires more definitive [legislation].

In the other release, Mr. Speaker, the words coming out of the minister's mouth are a little more direct. In the second release he says:

The Attorney General is of the view that such a process requires more definitive legislative authority.

Two different releases, Mr. Speaker. My question, then, to the Minister of the Environment: did the Attorney General force you to change your quote, or is there another reason why there were two releases, besides incompetence?

MR. KLEIN: The question, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, is: did the Attorney General do this or that? The answer is no.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, would the minister, even in the incompetence out of his department, explain why there are two different releases, one clearly saying that the Attorney General said they should change it and the other one saying it was just legal advice from his department? Why two releases on the same day then?

MR. KLEIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, do I have to tell the hon. leader of the socialist NDP another story? I mean, he's had three stories in a row. We'll tell him the story of Daishowa. First of all, with respect to public consultation he might want to take a look at this document. This document represents the public consultation that took place relative to the Daishowa pulp mill project: public consultation that went to something like 25 communities throughout the northwest part of this province, Mr. Speaker.

With respect to the review process. Yes, we did a review process on Procter & Gamble prior to the reissuance of a licence on an experimental basis, and we did it with the full concurrence of the company. It was a good experiment; so good, as a matter of fact, that we're now proposing to put that kind of a review process into the new environmental protection and enhancement Act and to legislate it. [interjections] And to legislate it.

MR. WOLOSHYN: Answer the question.

MR. KLEIN: I am answering the question.

MS BARRETT: You're not talking about the . . .

MR. KLEIN: Listen, Pammy Faye. Okay? Just listen. Keep your mouth shut. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: In summation, Minister of the Environment.

MR. KLEIN: In summation, Mr. Speaker, we are putting in place legislation to allow us to conduct in a very, very formal way a public review of licences before they're reissued. I ask the members of the opposition once again: be patient; wait. Good things are going to happen.

MR. SPEAKER: Second main question, Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Ralphie boy, I guess we know the answer: the Attorney General is calling the shots. There's no doubt about it.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to designate my second question to the Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Forest Lawn.

Liquor Sales in Hotels

MR. PASHAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Solicitor General has announced moves that will allow hotels in smaller communities to sell liquor products over the counter. What he didn't say is that this is part of a larger plan to allow hotels right across Alberta to sell wine, beer, and spirits by June 1, 1991, which will further undermine the government's own liquor stores. To the Solicitor General: will the minister confirm that his department wants to allow more than 500 hotels to become private liquor stores?

MR. FOWLER: If that's the terminology, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member puts on them, as private liquor stores, that'll be his terminology. It is not my terminology. But the content of his statement in respect to the ability of the hotels across Alberta to sell liquor and spirits the same as they have been selling beer for umpteen years is true.

MR. PASHAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's one thing to allow liquor outlets to be created in smaller communities that already don't have an Alberta Liquor Control Board store, but it's quite another to set up a parallel system of private liquor stores that will compete directly with the Alberta Liquor Control Board in every town and city in Alberta. Can the minister explain why we need private liquor stores when we already have a perfectly good system of liquor stores owned by the people of Alberta?

MR. FOWLER: If I was one of those hotel operators that are being accused, Mr. Speaker, of going into competition with the ALCB, I would be a little concerned about it, because in fact, those hotels will be buying at ALCB retail prices and reselling it. So, in fact, the sales that are taken away from the ALCB stores will be at a considerably higher price and I would suggest that in all probability only at a time when the ALCB stores are not open in any of those territories. The rationalization is to give a better service to all . . . [interjections] I'm ready to wait until they're ready to listen to the answer, Mr. Speaker. I have lots of time.

In any event, the liquor stores will not be severely affected, I'm positive, and it's an attempt to give Albertans equal service right across. Further and finally, Mr. Speaker, if any of the members of the opposition have ever stayed in any hotels in major cities, they will find that what's happening is that they have already had for a long period of time that ability to sell liquor of any nature or kind from their own bar. It doesn't even have to be delivered into the room. They give you a little key which you insert into a little cabinet, and all sorts of goodies come out of there at very expensive prices.

MR. PASHAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, in spite of what the minister just said, either one of two things is going to happen. Either there'll be a dramatic increase in liquor consumption or the Alberta Liquor Control Board will lose sales. Since the minister has repeatedly assured this House that he does not want to see an increase in alcohol consumption by Albertans, can he tell us how much it will cost Albertans in lost revenues to set up these private liquor stores across the province?

MR. FOWLER: I would hope one day possibly the hon. member can refer me to *Hansards* or quotes where I've made the quotation which he has alluded that I have made. I can't, of course, indicate the cost that he is referring to. I do not expect any loss in sales for the simple reason that every hotel that takes up this advantage has to buy its liquor from the ALCB, at the store, so there will in fact be no loss in sales to the stores, and I hope there will be no great increase in sales as well.

Environmental Round Table

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, sadly, Albertans are not seeing the kinds of initiatives that are needed in the area of the environment, and I think that sadly the Minister of the Environment has either been denuded or 'eunuchized,' whatever the word is. He hasn't got the authority. He hasn't, I guess, taken up the authority to make appropriate decisions on the environment. Even something as simple, as straightforward as the round table on the environment now has the potential to be messed up. This is a round table involving economic development and environment being in sync. Now, Mr. Speaker, my first question is to the minister responsible for economic development. Given that one of the commitments the previous Minister of the Environment made in signing this national task force document was that there should be more ministers as members of the round table than simply the ministers of Economic Development and Trade, and the Environment, is the minister of economic development prepared to commit to the addition of other ministers in an ex officio capacity? Those would be the ministries of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife, and Recreation and Parks, so as to give another balance and a proper balance to this process.

MR. KLEIN: Well, Mr. Speaker . . . Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: The question was to . . .

MR. KLEIN: Oh. No, you go ahead.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, recognizing the question was put to me, I was just going to underscore what the hon. Minister of the Environment indicated yesterday whereby he went through

a lengthy list of outstanding individuals who have strong environmental credentials whom he has asked to serve on this very important Round Table on Environment and Economy so that we can make sure that we do have sustainable growth taking into account the very important aspect of our environment within the province of Alberta. Yesterday the hon. Minister of the Environment did a superb job of outlining those individuals who will contribute so significantly.

MR. DECORE: Well, if the hon. minister didn't keep looking back to find out what the answers should be, to be prompted, perhaps he could listen and answer questions more clearly and appropriately.

Mr. Speaker, the commitment that the previous minister signed in this national task force also alludes to public involvement, that reports should be made public. I want to ask the same minister: is he prepared to commit, as Ontario has and other provinces have, to a process of allowing intervenors, allowing people to submit to this round table and in some cases to have their fees or their costs covered?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, recognizing that the round table deals with the environment and the economy, I appreciate the questions that have been put to myself by the hon. leader of the Liberal Party. But this does fall directly under the responsibility of the Minister of the Environment, who so capably handles environmental issues, and I would defer the response to the hon. minister.

MR. DECORE: I wish they would look at each other so that they could prompt each other and somebody at least would give an answer. Mr. Speaker, my last question is to the Minister of the Environment. It's a good year to be the mayor of Edmonton, I might add, and it's a good year not to be climbing buildings in another city. My question to the minister is this: given that the round table – even the fact that they don't have enough environmental involvement – given the fact that ex officio . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Excuse me, hon. member. [interjection] Whoa, please. Order.

This business of preambles to supplementaries is getting entirely out of hand. It's not a time to keep adding comment after comment, and if all members care to look at *Hansard* they'll see that it's gone beyond the point of reality. So let's have the question.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, the terms of reference for the round table call for certain ministers, the Minister of the Environment and the minister of economic development, to be ex officio members of the round table. Is the minister prepared to commit to allow additional input, to depoliticize this process by allowing ex officio members to attend from the New Democratic caucus and from the Liberal caucus?

MR. KLEIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, just to demonstrate how depoliticized this Round Table on Economy and Environment is going to be, I will continue with the list: Brian Staszewski, from the Environmental Resource Centre; Chris Anderson, a member of the advisory committee on wilderness . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. minister. Thank you. Please table the whole list for the life of the Assembly.

MR. DECORE: And answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, in the whole House. To shout back and forth, "Answer the question," is inappropriate under *Beauchesne*, and the leader of the Liberal Party knows that full well and must stop doing it.

The Chair recognizes Drumheller, followed by Edmonton-Avonmore.

MR. KLEIN: Shame, shame.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of the Environment, that doesn't help matters either, so shame on you.

Meech Lake Accord

MR. SCHUMACHER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the hon. Premier and relates to his unexpected trip to Ottawa yesterday, which necessitated his purchasing a new suit in that city. Can the hon. Premier advise the Assembly what happened to change his travel plans after he had started heading back for our city of Edmonton?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's the last time I tell that guy a secret.

Mr. Speaker, my trip east was a trip that I felt needed to be made because of my concern – and I think it's been expressed in this Legislature – for the future of our country. I hoped that I'd be able to follow up on a special relationship that has developed over the years with Ontario and Quebec and Alberta and, of course, Alberta's close relationship with the western Premiers. Part of my efforts were to try and impress on people the importance of the issue we were facing and that we were actually dealing with such serious problems facing Canada that our country was in danger. In a way it seems to have snuck up on most Canadians. So I wanted to talk with my fellow Premiers in Ontario and Quebec and see if there wasn't some way that we could start a process that was going to deal with the impasse we seem to have reached in Canada, and that was the reason for my trip. Then I was subsequently able to meet with Premier Peterson, talk a great deal with Premier Bourassa, and try and get things going. I think it's fair to say that everybody I've talked to is expressing across this country now that while we may have a kind of a battered nation, we all love it very much.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Supplemental, Mr. Speaker. Can the hon. Premier advise as a result of his meeting with the Prime Minister last night what he believes the process will be towards bringing Canada's constitutional family together by June 23?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I felt the meeting with, first, Premier Peterson and discussions with Premier Bourassa were able to focus on the fact that if the Prime Minister felt there wasn't going to be a first ministers' meeting – and his report from Senator Murray was that there didn't appear to be the grounds for a first ministers' meeting – and here we are less than a month away from June 23, something had to be done. We felt we had to break that logjam, and therefore we did say to the Prime Minister that there either had to be a meeting or there had to be something else start, some other process start, and I must say I appreciated the Prime Minister moving to start a process.

Now, the process which he felt would lead to a First Ministers' Conference, hopefully, is the process of individual meetings with every Premier. We started that process last night. It was, I felt, a very good meeting with the Prime Minister. There's no question about his commitment to Canada and his commitment to try and continue to build a united country. I proposed to the Prime Minister and I hope that this . . . There's no magic to an initiative from any one of us, but I proposed to the Prime Minister an Alberta view of a set of guidelines or principles that we could establish as Premiers and all agree to and sign that would lay the groundwork and be the principles that we would stick to in terms of a second round of negotiations on constitutional reform, which would start immediately after the passage of Meech Lake. These guidelines would, for instance, Mr. Speaker, have the basis upon which we would agree that there must be Senate reform in the guidelines. There must be Senate reform, and I would hope we would get the principles of elected and other principles that we believe in in those guidelines. Other Premiers have matters which they care about, and we are drafting some guidelines that would suit them as well.

Now, if this initiative works, I would hope we could have a first ministers' meeting before the end of next week and that we might be able to agree on passing Meech Lake, have this set of guidelines that allow us to start an immediate second round, be able to really pull the country together, and be able to have a Constitution that works and meets the needs of all Canadians. That's what we're hoping for, Mr. Speaker. I can only say to the members of this Assembly: I sense that Albertans are coming to the view that with our country in danger the first ministers should now show the kind of generosity, tolerance, and loyalty to this nation that is necessary to come up with a solution. That's what we're trying to do.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Avonmore.

Human Rights Legislation

MS M. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My questions are to the Minister of Labour. In 1985 a national Gallup poll found that two-thirds of the people on the prairies believe that discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation should be illegal. Yet the Minister of Labour has tried to excuse her government's failure to protect lesbian and gay people by saying that there is no public consensus on extending that protection. To the minister responsible: will the minister now admit that the consensus does, in fact, exist among the public and that it's members of her caucus who oppose this legislation?

MS McCOY: No, Mr. Speaker, I certainly won't. I do not believe there is a consensus in Alberta to extend that protection in our human rights legislation here. I would remind the hon. member across that she's relying on a poll, which is, of course, only a sampling. However, it was the case when we inquired of our constituents, for example, that there really was not a consensus there at this time.

On the other hand, human rights legislation is the kind of legislation that evolves over the years. Indeed, to look at the inclusion of physical disability in the Individual's Rights Protection Act was a suggestion that was brought forward in second reading in 1972, when the Bill was initially proposed. It was only eight years later when that was finally included in that statute. I think human rights are the sorts of things that evolve over time, and I think that education and understanding grow. I'm

pleased to see that the hon. member across is devoting some of her time to spreading that education and not simply pointing fingers across the floor.

MS M. LAING: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure how one gets a sense of a consensus if they don't look at a broad, general sample instead of probably a few angry and upset people.

The chief commissioner of the Human Rights Commission has said that governments and cabinets and, yes, even human rights commissions are reflections of the population they come out of. It's outrageous, Mr. Speaker, that a human rights commissioner would believe that it's the job of the Human Rights Commission to follow rather than to lead. To the minister: does the minister agree with the chief commissioner that the commission is merely a reflection of the least progressive members of society, or does she believe that the commission should lead in the promotion of minority rights?

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, the role of the commission is primarily that of a mediator and that of an educator. The extent to which our commission is fulfilling that role is quite considerable. As an example, they are now having their monthly meetings in public at various locations throughout the province, and they are promoting the rights and the protection of all Albertans, not only those who are most vulnerable in our society. I think they have taken on that role with gusto, and I commend them in their activities. Education is one that I know they feel very strongly about, and I know they are continuing to foster greater understanding for all members of society, notwithstanding what differences they have.

MR. SPEAKER: Westlock Sturgeon.

Game Ranching

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the Minister of Agriculture. A couple of days ago he introduced Bill 31, moving game farming from Wildlife to Agriculture. This is just the tip of an iceberg, and as you know, I've talked to the minister some before. But what we have here is an indication of a very drastic change in policy, and as we move towards a greener society, with the emphasis on less tillage, natural forestation, untamed rivers and streams, and a different outlook on game farming, I think it's very important that we go about this slowly and carefully because we're going to have to live with it for many years ahead. In view of the gravity of the situation and the fact that a great deal of our public has not had a chance to have input into this decision, would the minister suspend further readings of Bill 31 so a legislative task force could circulate the province this summer and take hearings on the issue from all sides?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I'm not sure what iceberg the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon is referring to, so I won't comment on it. Secondly, it seems to me there's been an ongoing debate on this matter for a number of years now that the hon. member and others have participated in. Many of our farm groups have passed resolutions with respect to the matter, and I would remind the Ag critics present that Unifarm passed resolutions again to this effect last fall. The Alberta Cattle Commission has assessed it and is supporting it. The Western Stock Growers have assessed it and are supporting it. It's been

debated in many political arenas, and I think we're ready for the debate in the Assembly.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, further. The fact that the minister doesn't recognize there's an iceberg here shows how badly out of date he is.

Maybe I could appeal to the Premier then. In view of the fact that it's been an inside discussion up to now – as the minister said, the Cattle Commission, game farmers, wildlife society – but the general public hasn't had a chance to input and it is something we're going to have to live with for years, would the Premier consider having the Executive Council look into the area of suspending further readings on the Bill and giving the general public of Alberta, not the interested groups, a chance to put their information into this before next fall?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture is dealing with this matter and should continue to. He's here, and so is the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon. I'd only say to him that the representatives of the people of Alberta are here. This is how the people of Alberta have input into legislation. I think it's an excellent arena for them to express through their elected members their views, and that's what the Minister of Agriculture intends to do.

MR. SPEAKER: Highwood, followed by West Yellowhead.

Highwood River

MR. TANNAS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the Minister of the Environment. For well over 70 years water from the Highwood River has been diverted into the Little Bow River for domestic stock watering and for municipalities, like towns and villages, along the Little Bow. In recent years increasing use of this water for irrigation purposes has led to ever greater demands for water from the Highwood and has placed that river in some stress. My question today is a request for clarification of the minister's response to a recent question by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place. I'd like to read the response that I'm wanting the clarification to. On page 1180, May 11, he said:

We said that we would use the 1989 guidelines and if the river became stressed we would stop the diversion.

So my question today is: in light of the municipalities and others that are needing the water, what does he mean by "stop"?

MR. KLEIN: What I mean by "stop," Mr. Speaker, is that when the river becomes stressed to a point that there is extreme danger to fish and other wildlife, then the flow will be stopped, or it could be adjusted depending on the amount of stress that is occurring. I think the point here is that we've installed some very sophisticated monitoring devices so that we can gauge the flow of the river on a minute-to-minute basis. As a matter of fact, this information is sent from Aldersyde, just east of High River on the Highwood. It's beamed up to a satellite, sent down to Edmonton, and at any time any citizen in this province or in that region can pick up the telephone and get an up-to-date reading on the river flow. So it's this kind of technology and this kind of instrumentation that we're using to determine on a minute-to-minute basis whether or not the river has become stressed to a point where we would stop the flow into the Little Bow. But we can make adjustments from time to time, certainly.

MR. TANNAS: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is again to the Minister of the Environment. Would the minister be prepared to consider alternative sources of water other than the Highwood River to provide a reliable source of irrigation water to the people on the Little Bow?

MR. KLEIN: A couple of weeks ago I met with representatives of the lower Highwood water users group, and Mr. Harvie submitted to me a proposal to pipeline water from the Travers reservoir. We don't know what that's going to cost or what the engineering problems are at this time, but we have given the lower Highwood water users an undertaking that we would give that proposal serious consideration.

Rocky Mountain Rail Society

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, as the date draws nearer for the decision on the lease of engine 6060, *Bullet-nosed Betty*, the volunteers who restored that engine, Harry Home and the Rocky Mountain Rail Society, are increasingly worried about being left out in the cold by this government. These volunteers were very happy to devote their time and money for the love of railroad-ing, but they certainly didn't expect to see their efforts sold off to the highest bidder. I'd like to ask the Minister of Tourism: why is the minister treating these volunteer groups just like any other business in negotiating?

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, there have been several nonprofit groups over a number of years involved in the storage, the restoration, upkeep, and occasional use. Very definitely the group you're talking about has had a lot of good input, and we thank them for it.

They along with many others have been asking for a long-term plan for the use of 6060, and it was with that in mind that the department put out and asked for proposals from each and every one of them as to how best to make use of the locomotive for the purpose of benefiting Alberta tourism and with a minimal cost to the province. We would hope that they get together – and there are groups trying to get them together – to make one good proposal on the future use. We're asking them to look at telling us what they would like to do as far as use, what types of excursions, a management plan, a marketing plan, an operational plan, and a financial plan. We can't continue to just ad hoc the use of that engine.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, what the minister doesn't seem to understand is that you can't treat volunteers just like any other business. I've had many calls from volunteer groups who are concerned that they're going to be treated in like fashion, that their volunteer efforts will end up as nothing but free labour for Tory corporate buddies. This government's commitment to volunteerism is nothing but a sham. When will the minister switch his policy and finally get on the right track?

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, there are many, many volunteers that have done a lot of work throughout the province on many items, and I would hope that each and every one of them look at the economics of what they're doing and how they're operating and not just ask for government handouts. That's the course we're taking. We're trying to get these groups to look at the financial responsibilities they are asking us to be involved with. I would hope that Harry Home and his group put in a

good request and spend some time on their proposal, that they would like to see the future operations of this.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Highlands, followed by Calgary-North West.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, the minister to whom I was going to ask the question seems to have left for a moment. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.
Calgary-North West.

Cormie Ranch Sale

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It appears that the sale of the Cormie ranch was imminent until the government obtained an injunction against three one-quarter sections of land owned by Mrs. Cormie. Now, the absurdity of this injunction is shown by the fact that the lawyer for the Principal Group investors chose not to pursue an application to the courts to freeze the assets of that particular piece of land. It is clear also that this injunction is now the major stumbling block preventing the sale of the ranch. It's my belief that this injunction that has been obtained is motivated more by political and personal motives than by logic. My question today is to the Minister of Tourism. What is the minister doing to eliminate or overcome the barriers that have been created by the Provincial Treasurer and instead help facilitate the sale so we can get going on this tourism development?

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, this matter has been handled by the Provincial Treasurer, and I would defer the question to the Provincial Treasurer.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the province of Alberta has made its position very clear over the past three years; that is, that we want to protect the interests of the contract holders and the taxpayers, who have an awful lot of money at risk here. One of the major assets which still exists and is under a series of claims under the court actions is this piece of real estate west of Edmonton.

Now, you've heard the ministers of Tourism and economic development speak in favour of the project, as have I, but at the same time we have to balance that interest with the interest of the contract holders and with the taxpayers. What has happened is the following. Number one, Mr. Speaker: Mr. Cormie, speaking on behalf of himself and a variety of other interested parties, has agreed to a consent order to transfer into trust the proceeds from the sale of that property minus some transaction fees, and the income from that capital will accrue to the benefit of the contract holders and the taxpayers, subject to adjudication of the courts always.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, because Mrs. Cormie was named in the Code report and because she is one of the family that is involved in the Principal Group question, and then we also have an action against the Cormie family for over \$239 million, yesterday the court – the court – granted the right to the proceeds to be held in trust. Now, what has to be put on the record is this. The court – Mr. Justice Berger in his own hand put forward the following note: that if Mrs. Cormie wants to apply to the court, she may be able to use the proceeds in part or in whole to accommodate normal living expenses. What has

happened here is that it's not the province involved. We have simply protected the contract holders and the interests of the taxpayers. It's now in the court's hands, and the court itself has spoken specifically with respect to how those proceeds will be dispensed with.

Remember there are a variety of claims here, Mr. Speaker. The government is protecting its position and the contract holders' and the taxpayers' position, and the courts will adjudicate what happens. Whatever happens to the transaction is between the purchaser and the seller. I would also note with respect to the contract holders' position that in a note written in the *Edmonton Journal*, May 22, 1990, by Mr. Penniford – and I quote from this letter he wrote:

We, the investors, must stand up for our legal rights, and if the end result is that Cormie scuttles the proposed sale of his ranch to the Japanese, that's his problem.

Mr. Speaker, this is a quote directly from a letter by Mr. Penniford to the editor of the *Edmonton Journal*, May 22, 1990, which sets out the contract holders' position, which is roughly the same as that of the province of Alberta.

MR. BRUSEKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's one quote, but there's another quote which says that they're prepared to allow the sale to go ahead.

Again to the Minister of Tourism: yesterday in response to my question the minister said that although there had been no specific studies done on this project, in fact the benefits were well known to cabinet. I wonder if the Minister of Tourism has made any representations to the Premier pointing out how illogical, absolutely illogical it is on one hand to give \$65 million to Daishowa which has all kinds of environmental repercussions, yet on the other hand to create roadblocks, as the government is doing, that might prevent the creation of a \$1 billion environmentally sound tourism development. What's going on?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, that's absolutely wrong – absolutely wrong. I've explained the process. The member should listen carefully. But he's dead wrong in his assumptions, and the people of Alberta know darn well that the province is protecting the interests of the contract holders and the taxpayers and it's the court that'll adjudicate this issue, not some frivolous comment from someone across the way like that. It's the court; the court's going to adjudicate it, and the court will unfold the way in which the proceeds are handled. What is done now is a consent agreement from Mr. Cormie and the purchaser of that land. What unfolds will be a normal development process which has been provided for by other pieces of legislation. Let the record be clear on what has happened here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Lloydminster.

Agricultural Assistance

MR. CHERRY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Some two weeks ago I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question regarding farm aid from the federal government, and during this past week he and his provincial counterparts plus the federal Minister of Agriculture met in Toronto. My question would be to the Minister of Agriculture. Would you explain to the Assembly the progress you made, if any, in your meetings?

MR. TAYLOR: You're moving like a snail, Ernie, moving like a snail.

MR. SPEAKER: Through the Chair, hon. minister. I can see the temptation in your eyes.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Toronto meeting did result in an agreement in principle that had the following components in it. We agreed on how the money should be subdivided between the provinces. We agreed to move away from the demand of the federal government for total cost sharing in new dollars and that they would recognize the existing programs which contributed to the 1990 bottom line of the farmers. And we agreed that further discussions would occur on a bilateral basis, province to federal government, to determine whether or not there would have to be any topping up of existing programs. Those discussions have been proceeding this week, and I remain confident that within a matter of days we will reach a conclusion.

MR. CHERRY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. A question: was there any discussion regarding long-term safety nets rather than these ad hoc programs that we appear from year to year to be getting into? Was there any solution to a long-term program that we could put in place?

MR. ISLEY: There is considerable work going on, Mr. Speaker, carried out by one of the committees under the ag food review to look at overall safety nets. That committee reported to the Toronto meeting, is continuing to work, and will be reporting to the annual meeting in Moncton in August.

MR. SPEAKER: Vegreville.

Game Ranching (continued)

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday when I raised concerns about the legalized sale of elk meat and suggested that the government might want to look at an environmental impact assessment of the impact of that industry on wild populations in the province of Alberta, the reaction from government benches was not surprising from a government that has refused to allow the public input on important things like Daishowa and Alberta Energy Company developments at Slave Lake, Weldwood, the Oldman dam, and the list goes on. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order in the House.

MR. FOX: But I would like to appeal to the Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife, whose change of heart on this issue has apparently been a recent one, to agree to pressure his cabinet colleagues for a full and open environmental impact assessment of this industry on the wild populations of game in the province of Alberta, so that the hundreds of thousands of Albertans represented by the Fish & Game Association, the Alberta Wilderness Association, and the Environmental Network can be heard and represented on this important subject.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, it's a sensitive issue, and we all want to make absolutely sure that wildlife is protected in this province and put at no risk from game farming or game ranching. We have assured that in the Bill. It'll receive debate. That's a full public hearing within this Chamber, and I think that's the fairest approach to use.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, if the government is so confident that they've got all the angles covered, and if they're so confident that the game industry has dealt with all the problems, I don't know why they're afraid of public hearings on this issue. I'd like to ask the minister who is responsible for wildlife: given the fact that this Bill will put a price on the head of animals in the wild – elk can be worth up to \$15,000 or \$20,000 – what assurance can he give the people of Alberta that this will not lead directly to an increase in poaching in the province of Alberta?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, making that kind of silly statement just doesn't make any sense. Number one is that you're assuming something: that because of having game farming in this province, which has been here for many years, all of a sudden when you make a change to allow meat sales that are controlled so tightly through the Department of Agriculture, it's going to lead to poaching. That's ridiculous. The other side of the coin is that there are a lot of people saying it will decrease the amount of poaching that will take place because there will be an opportunity for licensed sale of meat that's adequately inspected and carried out.

And, Mr. Speaker, I don't think you need a public hearing on everything. That's why we're elected; that's what this Chamber is for. There will be a full debate. He'll have the opportunity, as all members in this House, to review the legislation and put in amendments if they think it needs to be strengthened even more. Mr. Speaker, that's the democratic process.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair would like first to ask the House for unanimous consent to revert to Introduction of Special Guests.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

In this order: Clover Bar, Edmonton-Avonmore, Vegreville.

head: Introduction of Special Guests
(reversion)

MR. GESELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise for a second time this morning to introduce a group from my constituency to you and through you to the members of the Assembly. I have 28 students from the Uncas school in the constituency of Clover Bar, and they are escorted by their teacher Mrs. Pat Hughes and teacher aide Mrs. Loretta Nicholson. They're also escorted by parents Mrs. Carrie Brodie, Mr. Walter Morgan, and Mrs. Dianne Sibbald. I would ask the students, teachers, and parents who are seated in the members' gallery to rise to receive the traditional warm welcome of the Assembly.

MS M. LAING: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to members of this Assembly 28 parents and children representing Christian Home Educators. They are seated in the public gallery, and I would ask that they please rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Vegreville, followed by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly on behalf of my

colleague the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre 48 students from the Bredin institute. They are accompanied by their instructors Cheryel Goodale and Cathie Olsen and an interpreter, Bonnie Megley. These people are seated in the members' and public galleries, and I'd like them to rise and receive the warm welcome of members of the Assembly.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly my nephew who's visiting us today, Kris Robichaud, and my wife, Barb, who are in the members' gallery. I'd ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Points of order. We'll deal first with the one which arose in question period today. Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That is, in fact, the only point of order that I wish to raise. I wasn't sure if you'd heard me when I rose at that point. It relates to a response by the Minister of the Environment in response to questions posed by the Leader of the Official Opposition.

The Leader of the Official Opposition asked questions about two separate news releases issued on the same day on the same broad subject matter. The response by the minister I think is in violation of *Beauchesne* citation 417, which reads as follows: "Answers to questions should be as brief as possible, deal with the matter raised and should not provoke debate." The critical reference here is "deal with the matter raised."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that the Environment minister likes to engage in his predictable monologue about a certain book that he has still not tabled with the House, I'm sure. Perhaps he has the opportunity to do that either in Tabling Returns and Reports or in debate on any Bill that he or the Minister of Energy, whichever case it might be, happen to be sponsoring related to the environment. On the other hand, it seems to me that it's inappropriate for him to day after day refer to this particular book, but especially in the context of answering a question about an entirely different matter. I would rest the case at that point.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The Chair assumes there are two points of order involved in that. One is with respect to the brevity of questions and not provoking debate. That, of course, is true, and it applies also to the questions as well as the answers. Once again, reviewing *Hansard*, we see that we've gone into this process of having longer and longer preambles in the main questions as well as in the supplementaries, and indeed that applies also to the answers. In both cases there are provocative statements made in the questions, the preambles, and oftentimes that in turn invites provocative response. The Chair hopes that all members of the House have listened attentively and, starting next Monday, will indeed adhere to those principles as outlined in *Beauchesne*. [interjection]

Forgive me, hon. member. The House had been admonished before about nattering, if you will, at the Chair while the Chair is in the process of speaking.

With respect to the second point of order, the Minister of the Environment has indeed waved around in the air that particular document on two days, and the Chair now orders that it be tabled with the Assembly.

With regard to the point of order raised yesterday, Edmonton-Highlands and then the Deputy Premier. Additional comments to be made? Thank you, Edmonton-Highlands. Deputy Premier, no additional comments. The Chair has reviewed the Blues. The Chair cannot, of course, determine the true meaning of any member's actions, and this matter represents a disagreement as to facts as described in *Beauchesne* 494. The matter was somewhat further complicated because it alluded to alleged comments made by individuals outside of this Chamber.

The Chair would also point out that from time to time calls have been made across the House alleging secret deals, for example, to have taken place. When comments like that occur over the course of a sitting, there's an accumulated frustration, I'm sure, on behalf of the government benches that there's no chance to sort of make response. So I assume that when comments are made from one side of the House, in time the Chair is likely to hear some other frustrated comment occur in response; it might be belated response. And so it is that the Chair reminds hon. members of the sense of decorum in this House and that members should not take umbrage when they have similar comments thrown back at them. But I'm certain that all members of this House, because all now are experienced members, will indeed come back to that traditional parliamentary form of using moderation in debate. So again the Chair does remind all members to exercise caution in interpreting the actions of other members.

Thank you, hon. members.

head: **Motions under Standing Order 40**

MR. SPEAKER: We now move to a situation of Standing Order 40, a rather unusual situation in the sense that the Chair has received three requests under Standing Order 40. Starting last night at 8:17, the first one was received. The second one was received at 8:52, and then another one this morning at 9:17. The Chair directs that all three notices actually will be dealt with under the first one as received.

Standing Order 40 request, speaking briefly to the urgency of the matter, Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism.

MR. MAIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course, we do have before us this morning an urgent matter, as I said earlier, of international significance that does require the immediate attention of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta.

Last night, Mr. Speaker, in stunning fashion the Edmonton Oilers completed their sweep through the Stanley Cup play-offs. They showed determination, speed, skill, ingenuity, enthusiasm, and cunning. Last night their final game, a 4 to 1 victory over the Boston Bruins in the fifth game of the final series, resulted in Edmonton's professional hockey club in the National Hockey League winning its fifth cup in just seven seasons, truly a remarkable achievement for this, the City of Champions. Now, of course, there is some consolation to some other members of the House who may, in fact, still be in mourning.

MR. SPEAKER: The urgency of debate.

MR. MAIN: It's urgent that I make this remark or else I may not get unanimous consent: this represents the sixth Alberta Stanley Cup in seven years, five for Edmonton and the remaining one for Alberta's other professional team. Therefore, Mr.

Speaker, I would urge all members of the House to put aside their petty regional differences and agree that the Legislative Assembly of Alberta offer its heartiest congratulations to the Edmonton Oilers on their victory in the Stanley Cup finals and the remarkable achievement of winning five Stanley Cups in seven years.

MR. SPEAKER: There are times that it's very difficult to be totally unbiased in this position of Speaker.

MR. MAIN: I can see it in your eyes.

MR. SPEAKER: Gotcha.

We have, under Standing Order 40, a request to have unanimous consent for this urgent matter to proceed. All those in favour of granting unanimous consent, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Let the record show it unanimous.

Moved by Mr. Main:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly of Alberta offer its heartiest congratulations to the Edmonton Oilers on their victory in the Stanley Cup finals and the remarkable achievement of winning five Stanley Cups in seven years.

MR. SPEAKER: Speaking to the motion, the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Speaker, on the motion. I feel that the Calgary Flames should be congratulated on their excellent season, and I'm sure they'll be a formidable force in professional hockey for many years to come, including next season.

But for the moment we're sharing some thoughts about the 1989-90 Edmonton Oilers, which is a very special hockey club in my opinion, beginning with goaltender Bill Ranford, who faced adversity, wasn't expected to play in the play-offs, and was absolutely rock solid in goal, backed by an incredible defensive team. And I think that may be one of the untold stories: how they got those rebounds out of there and managed to keep the goaltender and the team out of trouble. You can't forget the Kid Line, of course, Gelinac, Graves, and Murphy, who absolutely terrorized the Bruins every time they were on the ice – they didn't always score – with things that were not expected; the so-called checking line of MacTavish, Klima, and Buchberger, who came through when it really counted with some very important goals, especially in overtime. The Kurri line: what can you say about the Kurri line except that Tikkanen was my candidate for the Conn Smythe Trophy? He shut down all the big scorers and scored himself on many occasions. Kurri won a game by himself, and Lamb. Of course, the first line – Captain Messier, Anderson, and Simpson – did what they do best, and the Oilers organization must be congratulated for putting them and all the players in the position where they could do what they were supposed to do and win the cup.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. TAYLOR: You forgot Pocklington.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Whitemud. Westlock-Sturgeon later, if needed.

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me say at the very outset that Stanley enjoyed his visit to Calgary but is happy to be back home where he belongs.

Mr. Speaker, more seriously, winning the Stanley Cup, even being in the Stanley Cup, is not only good for Edmonton; it's good for Alberta. It's good from the point of view that it focuses attention not only on Edmonton but on Alberta. The eyes of a good portion of the world are upon the Stanley Cup. It's good from an economic point of view as well.

Now, when we look at this particular year, I think it was very, very interesting in that at the very outset there were many that wrote the Oilers off, that said it couldn't be done. I think here is a classic example of a team fighting back, overcoming those odds, overcoming those negative waves that were out there at times and people saying it couldn't be done. They had a mission. They had something to prove and they proved it. It also proves to us, at least those of us who live in the city of Edmonton, that Edmonton is truly a City of Champions.

There are a number of players, I guess, that could be singled out. The Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place has focused on a great number of them. Bill Ranford, a constituent of Edmonton-Whitemud picked as the most valuable player, I thought was a very, very worthy choice. Another person that I feel we may someday see in this Assembly making a major contribution to Alberta life, who is now making a contribution to Edmonton as a hockey player, is Kevin Lowe. I think credit has to go to the other players as well, without mentioning them all, because it is a team effort, and I think Bill Ranford said it the best when he was awarded the cup as the most valuable player: it wasn't his cup; it was a cup that belonged to the team. So credit has to go foremost to all the players for overcoming the odds that they were up against, and of course credit must go to the coaching staff as well.

We in the Liberal caucus wholeheartedly support the motion as put forward by the Member for Edmonton-Parkallen.

MR. SPEAKER: Summation, the Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism.

MR. MAIN: Just speaking briefly to the point of urgency, the Edmonton Oilers arrive in championship form this afternoon at 3 o'clock. We do not sit again until Monday next. I would, then, urge all members to approve this motion as presented to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair would do the unusual thing of making a brief comment before putting the question.

The Chair was greatly impressed last night by the classy comments made by the captain of the Oilers, Mark Messier, when he, on behalf of their team, in accepting the Stanley Cup not only on behalf of Edmonton and Alberta, also said: this one is for you, Gretzky. The Chair would like to point out that the only NHL sweater that I own – half of it is Calgary Flames, and half of it is Edmonton Oilers. That's my attempt to try to be as impartial as possible in this. But on the back of the sweater it says number 1, Alberta, and that's what really matters.

All those in favour of the motion, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. The motion carries unanimously.

Orders of the Day

[On motion, the Assembly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole]

head: Government Bills and Orders Committee of the Whole

[Mr. Schumacher in the Chair]

Bill 40

Appropriation (Alberta Capital Fund) Act, 1990

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any amendments, questions, comments to be offered in respect to this Bill?

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate the opportunity to make just a few remarks this morning on Bill 40 in committee, in particular the section that deals with construction of water development projects. Unfortunately, we didn't have an opportunity to get to this during the Committee of Supply, so I'd like to place a few remarks on the record and perhaps seek some information at a later date from the various ministers who are responsible.

My concern centres around the \$92,240,000 appropriated under this Bill for construction of the Oldman River dam project. This construction is proceeding despite the existence of a Federal Court of Canada, Court of Appeal judgment which heavily criticizes the provincial government of Alberta for the failure to provide a proper environmental impact assessment on the project. In fact, I could not imagine more critical language coming from a court at this level dealing with very poor environmental laws in the province of Alberta. These matters have been discussed in the Assembly before, but I think it deserves emphasizing, that portion of the judgment which states:

The laws under which the public input process was carried out placed much less emphasis on the role of the public in addressing the environmental implications than does the guidelines order. Secondly, nothing in those laws guarantees the independence of the review panel in any discernable measure.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very important matter, because when we deal with projects like dams which are controversial in their nature, in which some people benefit while other people pay, in which there is heavy environmental damage, there are going to be conflicting claims and counterclaims made repeatedly. We've seen that already in recent months; over the past year, in any case. For example, in February this year a report was prepared by Dr. Robert G. Greggs of Greggs & Associates Geological Consultants Ltd. in Calgary arguing that the basement tectonics of the site make it a candidate for subsurface instability which may in fact cause some concern over the structural soundness of the dam. It was a suggestion that the situation might get as bad as the Grand Teton dam in the United States, which, as most people in this Assembly know, failed, causing enormous property damage and the loss of life. That in turn was debunked, or certainly an effort was made by the department to refute the suggestions made in the Greggs report. More taxpayers' money was spent to do another report to refute the Greggs report, and now we have two reports that say contradictory things about it.

Now, the reason you have a public review and an independent scientific review of these projects is so that there's somebody somewhere who sorts out these conflicting claims, people with

scientific expertise. I mean, it's very difficult for most members of this Assembly and members of the public to sort out concepts dealing with photolineation and the problems of basement tectonics, because it's not a field that most of us are educated in. That's why we desperately need independent scientific review of the claims that are made by project proponents and sponsoring governments. In this case the sponsoring government and the project proponent are one and the same, so in fact they've prepared their own studies; they've examined their own studies. They're essentially one side of the fence only.

Now, in recent days, the Friends of the Oldman have released an engineering report prepared by Nigel Skermer, a Vancouver engineer, who, according to the information I have, has very good credentials in the field of engineering of water management projects like this. Mr. Skermer states that the design characteristic of the dam is such that it's uncomfortably close to the margin in terms of the minimum value for the type of unstable clay and shale bedrock encountered in the Oldman valley. They feel that there's little or no data on the difficult to detect, thin geological seams that have a tendency to slip and shear, weakening the dam structure. The suggestion is that perhaps the slope of the dam is too steep, that it should be made more stable at the base, and this type of improvement would cost a hundred million dollars or so.

Well, I have no doubt that the engineers in public works are already at work commissioning another report to counter the Skermer report, and we will sooner or later be discussing the merits of the two engineering opinions in this Legislative Assembly. Perhaps Albertans will be debating them in other forums. But we're not equipped to resolve a dispute like that because we are not engineers; we're not basement tectonics experts. We are, in fact, representatives of the people. So it is incumbent upon us to demand not that we sort these questions out – which are not in the end political questions but engineering, technical, scientific, environmental questions – but that we set up laws in such a way that there is independent expertise available to sort these things out and so that governments, when they build these dams, have to go somewhere to get their claims approved, so that they have to make their case, because otherwise the government can come along and say anything it wants to.

In fact, you can have the minister of public works, who has gone through southern Alberta and created incredible hysteria about potential water shortage In fact, he has said in this Legislative Assembly that people in southern Alberta may go without water, that they may not be able to flush their toilets, that all kinds of chaos and catastrophe may ensue if this project does not go ahead. Well, of course those claims are utter nonsense; they're the furthest thing from the truth that I can possibly imagine. What we have in Alberta is an iron triangle of dam building bureaucracies in the Department of the Environment and in public works, of politicians wooing votes via pork barrel projects and beneficiaries, who in this case turn out to be a relatively small number of irrigators, contractors, merchants, local politicians, and sundry opportunists who stand to benefit from this type of project. I see the Deputy Premier shaking his head. I guess he must be one of the sundry opportunists.

I believe that the water needs in southern Alberta have to be addressed honestly and openly and in a forum where the government has to make its case. The Deputy Premier is not one who wants to make his case before an independent body. Therefore, they don't have public hearings. Therefore, they

don't put their claims before an independent scientific panel. I think that's the signal failure of this government on all environmental issues, and the Oldman River dam is nothing more nor less than a case in point.

Because if we go back and look at the time when a public hearing was held on water management problems in southern Alberta, and when people who didn't have an axe to grind or a dollar to make or a vote to try to cash in looked at it, they determined that an on-stream dam is not required at this time or in the foreseeable future. But more importantly, they said the least preferable on-stream site – do you hear me, Mr. Deputy Premier? – the least preferable on-stream site is the Three Rivers site, since the environmental and soil impacts are much greater; only the Brocket and Fort Macleod sites should be considered. The Three Rivers site would involve flooding 5,800 acres with extensive social and environmental damage, the largest and most intense of these on-stream sites. Mr. Chairman, in other words, the government took a project which may not, of its size and scale, be necessary, and they put it in the worst possible place anywhere in southern Alberta.

Now, how are you going to get a deal like that through? How are you going to get away with building an unnecessary project on the worst possible site. Well, there's only one way I can think of doing that, and that's to hide from the people, that's to hide the information, that's to do absolutely everything in-house, that's to prepare all kinds of information that appears to support your case but never once allow that material to be reviewed by independent scientific experts, never once allow that material to withstand the cold light of public scrutiny in a public hearing process. For that, Mr. Chairman, the government has been heavily criticized by the Federal Court of Canada, appeals division, and their permit has been removed.

Now, the government takes the position that that doesn't mean anything; they don't have to stop work. They would like to be ordered by the courts to stop work. Well, how would it be, Mr. Chairman, if everybody in our society took the view that they would have to be ordered by the court to obey the law? Of course, the law would be in total disrepute. Law enforcement would be nonexistent in our province. Nobody would do anything they didn't want to do because it wouldn't be possible for the government or a citizen or anybody else to go to the court and seek an injunction every time we wanted somebody to obey the law. I mean, if the Solicitor General had to seek an injunction to prevent every single individual from drunk driving, of course lots of people, if they felt like it, would continue to drive drunk.

[Mr. Jonson in the Chair]

But we're not talking about drunk driving; we're talking about construction. Construction of a project could involve somebody deciding to put a slaughterhouse in your neighbourhood. Normally they would require a development permit for that, but if they took the view that "Gee, we're not going to seek this permit unless somebody goes to court and gets an injunction, a stop-work order, and then we'll take this matter seriously," it would be absolute chaos. The system of development permits would not exist. People would be building slaughterhouses next to residences. They would be building anything wherever they want.

What would happen if Alberta-Pacific Forest Industries Inc. took the same view as the government of Alberta, including the Minister of the Environment, on this particular project? What

if Alberta-Pacific took the view that they didn't need one of these permits to construct unless they were ordered to get one by the court? You know, I guess that would be good for the lawyers, but it would be absolute chaos in terms of the rule of law, in terms of the way the Environment department likes to do business. Now, the Environment department can be criticized in the same way that this minister can, because the Environment department ultimately was the one that set in place the process to get the Oldman River dam in place. I know that the Minister of the Environment has never once publicly supported this project, and I don't blame him, because most of Alberta is nowhere near certain that they should be paying half a billion dollars, or whatever the final price tag will be, for the benefit of a relatively small number of proponents, politicians, bureaucrats, opportunists, and assorted hangers-on.

The reality is that there is enough water in southern Alberta to support sustainable economic activity. There is enough water to support cities many times the size of the communities that are there already, and any claim to the contrary is hysteria. I hope the Deputy Premier does mail *Hansard* around, and I hope he has the guts to mail the entire context of my remarks so that people can see the kind of con game that's gone on.

Mr. Chairman, they don't even have the guts in their application for a licence on this project to state that it's an irrigation project, because they would have to go through some further public scrutiny to do that. There's been a misrepresentation of the purpose of this project, and there's certainly been a misrepresentation to the people of southern Alberta that they are going to suffer dire consequences if this project is not built. I say that if you believe those things, if you believe the things you say publicly, if you believe the things in your reports, if you believe your own rhetoric, then you should put it to the test. You should do what I'm asking and what all kinds of Albertans are asking: submit your technical data to an independent scientific review, submit the whole works to a public hearing. If it passes muster, then it's worth taking half a billion taxpayers' dollars and building a dam on that site. But not until you do that, and for that reason I'm opposed to the appropriation of these funds.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, we've had some very interesting remarks from the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place related to the construction of the Oldman River dam, a number of interesting points put forward which I believe require some other comments from other quarters in this Assembly. He refers to reports commissioned by the Friends of the Oldman River Society and a most recent report that there's been newspaper speculation regarding the safety of the structure of the Oldman River dam. I find it absolutely incredible that a study which is reported in the newspapers to have cost some \$1,200 to \$1,500, conducted by an engineering firm from outside the province that has not been on the site of the Oldman River dam and has not done any geotechnical work itself, none whatsoever, can come up with the conclusions it does and be used as evidence by the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place in this Assembly regarding the construction of the Oldman River dam and its safety.

The facts are that the province of Alberta has hired competent engineering firms, Underwood McLellan Associates, who we have paid not \$1,200 to \$1,500 but probably the engineering bill on this structure is going to total in the order of some \$20 million. Some \$20 million is probably the cost of the engineering advice the province has received with regard to this structure. The Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place will take the

work of a consultant from Vancouver at a cost of \$1,200 to \$1,500, with no geotechnical support by that individual on the site, and make these suggestions. I find that absolutely incredible. It's just beyond belief.

With regards to the review process on the construction of the Oldman River dam, we also have an international review panel of independent experts, not persons directly associated with Underwood McLellan, who review all the engineering work and make judgment with regards to the plans made by Underwood McLellan, the government of Alberta's engineers in this project. So there is an independent review process of three well-known international experts with regards to dam construction, who review the engineering reports put forward by the government's engineers and make adjustments, suggestions, and corrections and provide that advice to ensure that this structure, the Oldman River dam, meets the engineering criteria of the international scientific community. So I find it just incredible that we have these statements from the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place and the Friends of the Oldman River Society with regards to this structure; just absolutely incredible.

Also, Mr. Chairman, we have the opinion of the Association of Professional Engineers, Geologists, and Geophysicists of the province of Alberta who, in a provincewide advertisement, stated their belief, representing the 25,000 engineers in this province, that it is a necessity to continue the construction of this dam to completion. That's the opinion of the professional engineering body in this province. That's another point that must be made in this process.

With regards to support for this project, in a nonpartisan way which includes members of the New Democratic Party and the Liberal Party in southern Alberta, in the body of the southern Alberta water management committee representing every municipality in southern Alberta, every chamber of commerce, every irrigation district, a broad body representing some 200,000 southern Albertans is fully in support of the construction of the Oldman River dam. All the citizens of southern Alberta are requesting *is* to have the same type of storage capacity which benefits the citizens of Calgary, who have seven dams upstream from the city of Calgary to benefit them in terms of water management, and the city of Edmonton, which has two structures upstream from it, the Brazeau and the Bighorn dams, which benefit the citizens of Edmonton and northern Alberta in terms of water management throughout the year in terms of quality of water issues. That's all the people of southern Alberta are requesting, in an area which is much drier than northern Alberta or central Alberta. We are just asking for equality in terms of water management, and the body of opinion which has been expressed by all these representatives of city and town councils, of chambers of commerce, recognizes the importance of water to the lifeblood of southern Alberta. There is unanimous support amongst those groups in the communities in southern Alberta for this project.

With regards to economic benefits, the studies have shown that there will be a \$2.17 benefit for every dollar expended on this project. So from a cost/benefit analysis point of view, Mr. Chairman, those benefits are there.

With regards to water supply in southern Alberta, I don't know where the hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place can state that there's sufficient water in southern Alberta to meet the needs. I know, and I'm sure the chairman of the Alberta Water Resources Commission knows, there are about eight times the applications for water use in southern Alberta as there is available water supply. Even with the construction of the

Oldman River dam, there are limits with regards to supply of water in southern Alberta. The Oldman River dam is very important in terms of water management issues in southern Alberta, and we must also realize we have commitments under the Prairie Provinces Water Board agreements, the South Saskatchewan water basin agreements, which require us to pass 50 percent of the flow of three rivers, the Bow River, the Red Deer River, and the South Saskatchewan River, at the Alberta/Saskatchewan border. We must pass on 50 percent of the flow of that water to benefit our neighbours in Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, we must recognize that 60 percent of the water from the Oldman system flows through the system in the spring flush in May and June. In six weeks in May and June 60 percent of the water flows through. So we must capture that water if we are to make beneficial use of that water for southern Albertans and also meet our commitments at the south Saskatchewan border. In terms of this project, we must remember that each of those rivers must make up a portion of that 50 percent passing of water into Saskatchewan. This project is just as important for the people who live in the Oldman River basin as it is for the people who live in the Bow River basin, the citizens of Calgary, people who live in the Red Deer River basin, and the citizens of Red Deer. Because if the Oldman doesn't make up its fair share in terms of that apportion agreement to pass water on into Saskatchewan, that means the deficit must be made up from the Bow River system and the Red Deer River system, placing limits to growth on the economic development of the city of Calgary, the citizens of Red Deer, and the citizens of that central part of this province. So this structure is important not only for the people who live in the Oldman area, for their use of that water, but also for people in Calgary and in Red Deer, because without the Oldman dam, those river systems must make up a disproportionate share of passage of water into Saskatchewan. That's a very important part of the strategy in terms of water management for southern Alberta and for all Alberta.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make some other comments with regard to the need for the Oldman River dam. The Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place suggested that it's just an irrigation project. Well, it's a multipurpose project. It meets our commitments with regard to Saskatchewan and the South Saskatchewan River basin agreements in terms of passing on 50 percent of the flow. So that is more than an irrigation project. It meets the requirements in terms of interstream flows for fisheries downstream from the Oldman River dam structure. Anyone who's been there in the summertime just has to realize that you can walk across the Oldman River at the city of Lethbridge without getting your feet wet in the middle of the summer. What the Oldman River dam will do is provide assured flows of water, minimum flows, so there will be water there for fisheries in the low-flow summer periods. We store that water in the spring flush, and we can release it throughout the year to provide minimum flows. That is more than just an irrigation project. It provides minimum flows in terms of water quality downstream from the city of Lethbridge and downstream from other communities whose sewage effluent now goes into the Oldman River. With increased maintained minimum flows, we'll have a greater dilution effect than we would have without the Oldman River dam.

Mr. Chairman, you only have to look back to the 1950s here in the city of Edmonton. Before the construction of the Brazeau and the Bighorn dams, the North Saskatchewan River in the city

of Edmonton, without dilution in the wintertime by the minimum flows that are provided by the Brazeau dam, was becoming a dead river because of the sewage effluent what was being put into the river without minimum flows in the wintertime. That is part of water management: to provide minimum flows so we have these dilution effects, so we have healthy river systems. Dams upstream from the city of Edmonton have benefited the citizens of Edmonton and northern Alberta because of that dilution effect. Similarly with the city of Calgary. So we are only asking for equal opportunity.

Also, Mr. Chairman, this structure of the Oldman River dam is going to provide recreation benefits. We must also recognize that the irrigation system and the dam system in southern Alberta provide benefits to over 50 communities in terms of municipal water supply and recreation. Without these types of developments in southern Alberta, there would not be recreational opportunities, there would not be economic development, and there would not be the type of society which has developed there and is very dependent on water.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to comment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Member for Calgary-North West.

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, would like to raise a few questions, I guess more than anything else about Bill 40, in particular vote 5, the construction of government facilities. Again I reflect that it's unfortunate we didn't have time under Committee of Supply, so I'd like to put forward a couple of questions about this particular vote at this time, if I may.

Under the construction of government facilities, we see that there's some 16 and a half million dollars allocated to the construction of the Remington museum and the Reynolds museum, two very fine projects. The question I have with respect to that particular vote, however, is rather what is not in there. One of the commitments that had been made by the government, both by the Premier and by the Member for Banff-Cochrane, was an allocation of funding for the development of the Western Heritage Centre, some \$5 million. I don't see any allocation of funding for that particular development, so my question really is: how is the development of that particular centre going to be funded? It seems that there is a commitment from this government. It's not mentioned in the capital estimates. I didn't see it under the Heritage Savings Trust Fund estimates. So I'm wondering where the funding is going to come from for that particular development. Or, alternatively, is the question of the Western Heritage Centre now sufficiently contentious that the government has decided not to fund that particular project? Or is it on hold? Is it in abeyance, or whatever?

So with respect to vote 5, just a simple question with respect to the Western Heritage Centre. Is the project going ahead? If it is, why is the funding not in this particular area? I wonder if either the Provincial Treasurer or the minister of culture might be willing to address that particular issue.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Calgary-McCall.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, I've been prompted to speak, because I guess over the years there have been some very disparaging remarks relevant to the Oldman dam. Well, as a resident of the city of Calgary I appreciate the fact that we in Calgary have some eight dams on the Bow River that provide us

with a continuous supply of water, and the management of that system is such that we have some of the finest drinking water in the country, plus we are able to remove our waste without overly damaging the ecosystem in the river downstream. I guess some people would like to have those dams removed and maybe even remove the dams on the system in the North Saskatchewan near Edmonton to ensure that we have free flow of the water and, of course, damage the ecosystem downstream also, and not allow for the good citizens of these cities to have in their hands the quality of drinking water and water for different uses that we need to provide life for our citizens. How narrow some people's visions are.

The Oldman River provides water and resources for some 40-odd communities, including Lethbridge and many others – Medicine Hat, Brooks, some of the larger communities in that southern part of the province – not just for farmers who have irrigation needs within their community but for domestic and industrial use for those good citizens in southern Alberta. It's all right for some narrow-minded individual member of the Commie party to suggest . . .

MR. GIBEAULT: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McEACHERN: Get hold of yourself.

MR. GIBEAULT: That's clearly out of order, as indicated by the Speaker this morning, Mr. Chairman, and I ask you to have this member withdraw those remarks.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, all hon. members. Please proceed.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Chairman, I'm asking for a ruling on that. That's clearly unparliamentary language, and I ask you to ask this member to withdraw those remarks.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will recognize the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods if he has a citation to refer to.

MR. GIBEAULT: The citation is the Speaker's memo of today's date, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: It's not there.

MR. GIBEAULT: It certainly is there.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Calgary-Fish Creek.

MR. PAYNE: Well, speaking to the purported point of order, Mr. Chairman, the citation given by that member I think properly is the document circulated to the members this morning by the Speaker. I would like to clarify that the reference to which the complaining member is referring is "card-carrying Communist," apparently a decision made by the Speaker on August 19, 1986. That is hardly what the Member for Calgary-McCall said in his remarks.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Chair will review lists of unparliamentary language and advise later, but at the moment, would the Member for Calgary-McCall please proceed, with temperate language.

MR. McEACHERN: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. There's a rule about unparliamentary language that the Speaker has cited to us several times in the last few days. I don't remember the number, but you know and he knows. I wonder why the member can't stick to the facts and quit throwing in such language as that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please. There is one rule in the House, hon. members, and that is that before one enters into their speech, they are to be recognized by the Chair. That was not the case, and I ask the Member for Calgary-McCall to please proceed.

MR. NELSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I was indicating, we in Alberta have to deal with these issues as Albertans. Some of the regional differences that we may have in the province must be set aside to ensure that those people who wish to continue and have the quality of life others have . . .

MR. McEACHERN: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I've found the citation. It's "abusive or insulting language," Standing Order 23(j), which suggests that the members of the Assembly should not use the kind of language he was just using.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any further comments on the point of order?

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, I was having trouble following it because one party is taking umbrage at it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you. One party is taking umbrage at the accusation of being called "Communist." I don't know whether it's two ounces of umbrage or three ounces of umbrage, but they're upset about it, and I can see that. But what's puzzling me is how the member that uses the word that represents an organization that controls the highest selling drug in the province, which is called alcohol, and is totally owned by the government, pushes it . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Relevancy.

MR. TAYLOR: This is what I'm getting at. A true Communist society gets control of the drugs and then pushes it on people, and that's what the hon. Member for Calgary-McCall represents. [interjections]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. members, no, no. Not right now. Hon. members, the Chair has indicated that he would check for the particular word in dispute in *Beauchesne* and will come back to that.

Earlier today in regular session the Speaker advised the Assembly of his wish that debate be orderly and temperate, and I think we should keep his advice in mind and Calgary-McCall should proceed with his remarks.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, as usual, I will keep my comments very temperate.

Mr. Chairman, in dealing with the issue of the Oldman dam, in particular relevant to the Bill that is before us, the govern-

ment of Alberta has put into place some tremendous water management systems throughout the province. Certainly over those periods of time we've developed many dams, and I guess some of the more recent ones, the Paddle River and the Dickson dams, have created controversy. Yet at the same time, once those dams were completed and into full service, they created tremendous opportunities for recreation and wildlife within the province. They've also generated a circumstance up in the north, on the Paddle River in particular, where there's been less flooding, less damage to the environment, and less damage to the communities of those areas.

There's too much emphasis being placed on these water management systems being put into place with regards to irrigation. Certainly there is irrigation needed within the southern part of this province to provide economic diversity and economic opportunities for our citizens and our young people who are being educated. So, Mr. Chairman, to suggest that the Oldman dam does not fit within that system within Alberta, the water management system, and the development of the southern part of our province in a positive way to enhance economic opportunities, enhance our wildlife opportunities and our recreation opportunities for tourism and otherwise throughout this province, I think is demeaning to the government and those citizens of southern Alberta who so much need a consistent supply of water for their needs.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before proceeding to the next speaker, the Chair will rule on the point of order that was brought before it. Referring to expressions that have been ruled unparliamentary by Speakers of the Assembly, we have reference to "card-carrying Communist." I would rule that the abbreviation Commie is in the same category and respectfully request the Member for Calgary-McCall to withdraw the remark.

MR. NELSON: So done, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and also congratulations on a very statesmanlike decision.

With respect to water, the Oldman dam, I was going to let it pass, but then all I heard was the question of whether or not the dam should be built. What bothers me here is that it's not whether or not southern Alberta needs water or should have water, because as one born and raised down in southern Alberta, I know how important water is; it's whether the system that is used, dams, are the way to do it. Certainly, as an old hydraulic engineer many years ago, dams were the only method I saw, at least up till about 30 or 35 years ago, but there have been so many other methods developed since then, Mr. Chairman, that the Oldman dam has become a monument to the past. It's almost as if we ran out there and built a pyramid, hoping that somehow we're going to reach the sun and the heavens faster than we would under any other method of living our lives. So it's not the question that the dam will supply water to southern Alberta but whether or not, number one, we haven't done it at tremendous cost; number two, we've excluded all other alternatives; and number three, we may bring on other developments in the future that would come about if we had not developed the dam.

To illustrate my point, I'll take a few . . . First of all, it's generally conceded around the world – and I know; I've operated quite a lot in Africa and the Middle East – that off-stream storage is a much better way of holding water than a dam, because (a) it puts the water closer to where it'll be used and (b) it does not attract industry. One of the faults of a dam – I remember being in Egypt when the Aswan dam was under way. It was going to be a great thing for irrigation, as the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest says the Oldman will do for southern Alberta. It did not turn out to be that way. It was great for irrigation the first year, the second year. It slowly depleted, so that 25 years after the Aswan dam had been built, there was not one acre irrigated in one particular year. Why? Because the demands of the hydroelectric industry, which had been developed in order to develop aluminum smelters to employ people, suddenly took all the water. In other words, putting the water into a dam quite often attracts industry and population.

It's not by accident that the city of Lethbridge, which the hon. member represents over there, sometimes not too well but nevertheless does represent . . . He occasionally brings out the facts: how much industry it's going to bring; what growth in population. This is what happens. Under the normal priority of events, a society develops. Water's number one use becomes to flush the toilet and to drink, not to put on the land, and if you trap your water in such a way that you bring a larger population in, you ultimately defeat the purpose of building the dam in the first place. In other words, as has happened in Egypt, as has happened in some places in California, the population comes in and takes all the water and the farmer ends up with nothing. So the point is that why you built it in the first place becomes lost.

Consequently, what we should be developing in this province is incentives to put the population in the north, not because it votes Liberal . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: It doesn't.

MR. TAYLOR: . . . and is likely to continue to do so, but because that's where 80 percent of our disposable water is. I'm not saying to denude Lethbridge or shut down Medicine Hat, much as I might criticize the way they vote, but I am saying that the logical slow process of development in a water-short area has to be watched. Consequently, heavy industry has to be attracted to the north. There are some things like pottery and Tories that should be developed in Medicine Hat and restricted to Medicine Hat, because that's where the clay for both comes from. But the fact of the matter is that when you try to put industries into the south that are going to use the water, that's one of the misuses made of the dam.

Let's go on a bit. I've mentioned off-stream storage. How much have we done in southern Alberta to save water? Do you realize that that government over there has stood silently by while 40 percent of the population of this province still allows their sewers to overflow and go down the farmers' creeks and streams? How much better if you'd have put some of the money that's going into water management here into a tertiary treatment so that water would be completely recycled instead of dumping your sewage out into the farmlands. How much better would it be for saving water if you put meters on the irrigators? Not that the irrigators are wasting water, but you then have a selling point, a publicity point to the rest of Alberta that is

beginning to wonder at the huge cost of water development in the south per acre: whether we're gaining anything from it or whether we're gaining enough. At least if we had metered the water, we would be able to sell to the nonirrigating public that waste isn't taking place.

You ask somebody living in a city to meter their water. They can't water their lawns night and day under the guise that: "Oh, no. Who would water too much? Your lawn will turn yellow." One of the representatives in Lethbridge and Medicine Hat will try to tell you, "Oh, well, they don't use too much water; it'd turn the broccoli yellow." Well, that is not an argument. Why not put meters in?

Also while we're saving money, what does that government know about aquifers? Aqua: Latin for water. Fer: meaning bear. They know more about gas and oil and gravel, but they have no idea about the aquifers, except that they passed a law here just about a month ago – order in council did very little; it didn't sneak through; it came through Environment – saying that the oil companies can be allowed to take 50 percent of an aquifer. Isn't it nice if you're sitting there on a farm and you see the old oil company wander in with the big Esso sign on it, drill the water, and they say, "Don't worry, Zeke; we're going to leave you the last half." Well, nobody's told you how much is in there in the first place.

So the oil companies are allowed to come in and take the first half of the aquifer, and yet this government has no idea how much is half or how much is full. Yes, the oil company has to turn measurements out every year to let you know what the downward pressure is, but anybody who's dealt with aquifers knows that sometimes if you draw an aquifer's pressure down 50 percent – the hon. Member for Highwood is sitting there. I want to see what he thinks after Cargill draws down their aquifer 50 percent, because quite often that's it. So you get salinization and the attraction of neighbouring beds that don't have potable water into your aquifer, but there are no studies of that at all.

So we've got a dozen ways that we can be saving water and using alternatives, and yet this government marches along to an antediluvian attitude that started at the time of Moses: putting dams across the river with the idea that that is the only way they can get water. Now, I congratulate him for recognizing the fact that there is a water shortage in southern Alberta. That's like discovering the sun is going to come up tomorrow or, to this government, that the earth is round. But the fact that there's a water shortage does not countenance and does not justify dams in themselves. There are other ways of doing it. There are cheaper ways of doing it, and some evidence should be shown on this government's part in conservation, not exploitation.

Thanks.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to put a few comments on the record on Bill 40. Bill 40 is the summation of the Capital Fund estimates, and the Capital Fund estimates book shows five different votes, but the Bill only shows four.

AN HON. MEMBER: Go ahead, Alex. Nobody listens anyway.

MR. McEACHERN: I realize that, but at least if I could have quiet to say it, it would help.

Anyway, I wanted to point out that one of the votes that got dropped between the estimates and the Bill, of course, was the one for zero dollars for Construction of Economic Development Infrastructure, and I just wanted to make the comment that I agree that that's a good idea. Last year, in '89-90, there was 1 and a half million dollars put forward from the economic development department, I gather, a project to be built under the capital projects division. My suggestion for the government is that they keep the capital projects division fairly small and not get into the habit of building things in all the different departments.

One of the problems that I see with setting up the Capital Fund – and in some ways I don't object to the idea of your building something that is going to benefit people over a long term. Maybe you want to set up a special fund and borrow money and pay it back based on long-term thinking, whereas yearly budgets are sort of one year at a time type of budgets, so capital expenditures under the regular budget side have to be paid for all at once in the one year, in the year that the construction takes place anyway. So while the Capital Fund has some merit, I think that the Treasurer would have to admit that it also is a way for the government to hide, to a certain extent, some of the expenditures of the government. You note how the Treasurer uses the Capital Fund very conveniently; for instance, he claims that the budget will have a deficit of \$780 million, and that's the number that's banded all over the province and the big hullabaloo when he brings in his budget: how he's reduced the budget and this is a deficit reduction budget.

[Mr. Schumacher in the Chair]

Then when he has to bring in Bill 21 and ask for \$2 billion in borrowing power and we start to say, "Well, why do you need \$2 billion in borrowing power if you've only got a \$780 million deficit," he says, "Oh, but there's the Capital Fund." You know, he's right. There's over \$300 million in the Capital Fund. But it's a very convenient game of numbers that the Treasurer plays, using them when he wants and when he finds it convenient to back up some particular spurious argument that he wishes to make. So I just want him to know that we on this side of the House are onto his games of manipulating numbers, and we'll keep track of what he spends in what sections – and where and why and how – and point that out to the people of Alberta.

Now, I did want to spend a little time on some of the other details of Bill 40 and particularly talk a little about the Oldman dam project and the implications. I listen to the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest every year, and he does do a good job of defending the dam. I commend him for his rational thought and analysis and his explanations and his willingness to debate the substance of the issue. What I would like to say, though, is that maybe it's time the government stopped to think a little bit about whether or not they are really on the right track with this whole business of building dams. The Member from JP made some good points . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: From where?

MR. McEACHERN: Jasper Place.

Edmonton-Jasper Place and the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon made some excellent points. I won't try to reiterate them all, but I'd like to put them into an even bigger context, if I might. I am reminded of some of the history of this province, and I've seen a fair bit of it myself. The farm we had in the

Peace River country just south of Beaverlodge, where I was born and raised, had a creek running through it that I can remember flooding for two weeks every spring when I was a young boy. My father said he could remember when he came into the country in 1917 as a nine-year-old lad that that creek ran until the middle of August. It would start with the flood in the spring, in the April/May sort of period, and that creek ran until the middle of August.

As I got a little older, that creek only flooded for about three days. Just last summer I went back and visited the old farmstead, and the neighbours that now farm that land have built a road across the dam part. The creek widened in one place, and we'd call that our dam. We'd put a little earth dam down below it to flood that part so we would have water for the cattle. If it was deep enough, we would have enough water over the winter. Now the part that was the deepest and was the dam has got a little bit of a gravel bed on top of the dam bed itself and is the road that they use to get across the creek to the other side. They don't even need a bridge anymore.

Now, that story illustrates what we've done in this country. We came into this country – and even in the north, where the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon says we should develop resources around the water and move our people into the north where the water is, things have changed dramatically and incredibly because we've cut all the forests and turned what was forest into farmland. Now we treat water like it's a nuisance. We want it to run off in a hurry because it's in the way. It gets in the way of planting crops, so you drain the swamps and turn them into croplands. We've done so much of that that we've actually altered the climate of this province, and we've started ourselves on a road that we don't seem to be able to get off.

I think that building a dam exemplifies that problem. I think it's time that the government just backed up a little bit and stopped to think about whether that dam should have been built in the first place or not. The Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest was strong on saying, "Well, the engineers of Alberta think it has to be completed." Well, I guess if it's 70 percent done, maybe for some engineering reason it needs to be completed. I don't know what that is, what the rationale is behind that, but that's a different question from deciding whether or not you should have started it. Perhaps what this government needs is to stop and think a little bit about whether they should have started that dam in the first place.

Certainly it has some negatives, one would have to admit. For one thing, it disrupts a whole river valley that is used to a certain style and kind of flooding every spring. That water comes down from the mountainous areas in the western part of the province and through that river valley, and certain animals and plants grow and flourish based on that kind of spring flooding and whatever water remains there over the summer. You have a whole ecology that is getting more and more rare all the time as we build more and more dams. Had the government stopped to think that they might have built a reservoir up on the flat rather than damming the river, it might have been less disruptive. Certainly it wouldn't have flooded all of the archeological sites of some of the natives who lived in that area in the past.

The Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest likes to spout this number: that for every dollar spent this dam project will return \$2.17. I guess I would like him to elaborate a little bit on that. Who is going to get the \$2.17 return, and when are they going to get it? How long does it take? The numbers are kind of meaningless by themselves. It takes a little more explanation to show that that's a good economic investment. If I hear some of

the other things that this project *is* going to do right, I would like to say to the government that you probably can't begin to calculate all the various returns for fisheries, for recreation. Of course, you can't measure in dollars the importance of meeting our commitment to let 50 percent of the water flow on to the next province. I assume that the member was talking strictly about the irrigation project, and I'm wondering if it's the farmers who use the irrigation water that are going to get the \$2.17, or is the government going to get it back? Is this what the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest is saying?

Now, of course, he also hasn't stopped to consider the environmental costs. I mentioned the change in the ecological system of the river valley itself as just one example. What about the salinization that's caused by irrigation? What other alternatives were there, the aquifers that the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon talks about, the reservoirs up on the flat? There are a lot of things that the government could have considered before going into this project, and they didn't. Also this project stands as a monument to a government that once they've decided to do something like this, intends to go ahead regardless of the illegalities of it: the licensing and that whole business about whether or not they have a licence to go ahead. I find that extraordinary that a government would break the law and think that that's perfectly okay.

There is another aspect of this dam building that bothers me. It isn't just the individual dam itself and whether there are alternatives to that dam, but the fact is that we've built a series of dams and seem to be continuing to build dams that lay out a nice, neat network for starting interbasin transfers of water in this province. With the free trade deal I don't think there's any doubt at all that the Americans would like to have access to some of our water, and I'm afraid that that's the direction we're probably heading. I know that this government has stood up and denied time and time again that there is any intention ever to export water to the United States on that kind of a scale, but I've just got to say that I do not trust this government. I mean, we've heard time and time again from the members of this government that they had no intentions of bringing in game farming and allowing game farmers in Alberta to sell their meat, and yet we just got a Bill introduced yesterday that allows that.

So the assurances of the government that that is not the intention is of no comfort to those of us who look at the ecology of this province and recognize that what we have done with this province is more and more turned it into a man-made province instead of man trying to live with the ecology of this province and trying to fit into it in the least disruptive manner possible. I know it's a little late for that in some areas, but surely it's time to stop and take stock. We've just exploited this province in the most gross manner, both in terms of agriculture and the watersheds. We've done it with oil, and now we're turning around and doing it with pulp mills. The government never seems to learn. At some point surely you've got to say that we've got to live on this planet Earth, or at least our children and our grandchildren do, longer than just the next 10 years or so, and that exploitation has to be replaced with working within the ecology in some sustainable sort of manner. I just see no evidence of that from this government. I guess that's what bothers me most about the Oldman dam, because I think it exemplifies, along with the pulp mills, the attitude that this earth is here to be raped by mankind, and other animals and other plants don't really matter; they're just for our use and consumption, and if we don't have enough of our own, well then, we'll just help ourselves to the resources of the Third World as well.

What Canada should realize in that regard is that we are more and more like a Third World. We're moving into a free trade arrangement with the United States and Mexico that's going to see cheap Mexican labour cut the jobs of Canadians to lower and lower salaries, and they're going to use that to exploit Canada's cheap resources. Canadians are being treated like a Third World nation. That's part of that same attitude of just exploit for the sake of exploitation, with no sense that we have a long-term world that we need to live in here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was just going to come and see how far down I was on the list.

Mr. Chairman, in the context of this Bill most of what needs to be said I think has been said. But one question remains – and it's a question that I could not have raised under consideration of the estimates – and that is related to something that has happened since we debated the estimates, although I think it's in order, you know, during committee reading of this Bill.

Two days ago I had the opportunity to visit the faculty of pharmacy at the University of Alberta, and I know that a number of requests are put forth with respect to building funds for advanced education institutional purposes. I can think of no greater need at the U of A right now than the replacement of the pharmacy faculty building itself. It is actually shared with the Faculty of Dentistry. From the outside it looks really beautiful. It's an old brick building. It's covered with ivy or the equivalent thereof, you know, that will grow in Alberta and stay alive during the winters. Everybody thinks: oh, what a charming building. Well, you go inside, Mr. Chairman, and it's quite another story. It's very old. There is no ability to renovate it in any cost-efficient manner which would accommodate the purposes for which it is being used. These people are dealing with a lot of chemicals, and there is no ventilation system. It cannot be installed in any cost-effective fashion. The people working there are not only working in unbelievably crowded circumstances – I was really shocked. I've seen some pretty crowded university environments, but this is the worst. They're working with chemicals, some of which are dangerous, right next to each other with barely enough elbow room. This is students and faculty alike. They have to breathe in the fumes. Their animal-testing lab has had to be closed down because it is not fit for use. In other words, for health reasons it has had to be closed down. There is no extraction available. It's extremely hot in the summer, extremely cold in the winter. They can't open the windows to clear out the fumes or they'd freeze. In the summertime they can open the windows, and they just get hotter. The air, of course, doesn't move very much unless there's a lot of wind outside. So, really, an entire faculty with 120 students and 58 faculty members plus support staff are working in an extremely unsafe environment, as far as I'm concerned.

It's not their fault. The university has asked for money over the years to have a number of facilities replaced including this one. But in the context of the committee reading of this Bill, the Bill which commits heritage trust fund dollars to certain capital funds, I would like to make the case that the Minister of Advanced Education go to the drawing board immediately and see if it cannot be worked out for next year to have a set amount of money put aside for the replacement of that building. No one would ever, ever argue that it's going to be cheap to do that. That would be foolish. The ventilation systems required

would be those required by a number of industrial locations. They're not cheap to do.

On the other hand, if there is any substance to the comments made by the Minister of Technology, Research and Telecommunications earlier today in which he cited the importance of technology and science, surely the Alberta government could find the wherewithal to support those statements and find the money that will encourage not just the sustenance but the growth of Alberta's only faculty of pharmacy, so that it can not only serve the pharmaceutical needs of Albertans and Canadians, not only the research needs of the academic milieu, but also the needs of the scientific and technological industries, which are bound – and I mean bound in the real sense of the word – are certain to become more important to our economy and society.

So I leave those remarks for the minister's consideration and hope that by this time next year the Bill will contain a specific reference to a commitment to immediately replace that building. Beautiful though it is, it should be used for offices and not the purposes for which it is currently being used.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to express a few brief comments. Hi, Dick. I'm on.

I'd like to express a few brief comments of concern with respect to both the existence of a Capital Fund and the distortion which such a fund imposes on the public accounts process. Now, this fund was set up for the first time in 1986. To my knowledge, Mr. Chairman, it's the only one of its kind in the country, and the effect of setting up the Capital Fund is, of course, that expenditures which were previously reported as part of the General Revenue Fund have been shunted off to the side and reduced the reported budgetary expenditure. The capital expenditures are amortized over a long period of time and are not reported as expenditures on an annual basis, as they were in the past. Now, that is the effect, and I believe that is indeed the intent of the Provincial Treasurer. There is, accordingly, an underreporting of the amounts being expended by this province in relation to what is spent and reported by other provinces. As I stated, this is the intent, I believe, of the government in establishing this Capital Fund.

Another aspect of it, of course, is that expenditures being made since the Capital Fund was established are not truly comparable to the manner of reporting expenditures prior to 1986. Thus when the minister compares in his annual budget document – and he has highlighted this for the last several years – when he states that our expenditures have increased a very minimal percent over the years since 1986, the fact is that the 1985 base year includes the capital expenditures. The current base year doesn't. He's taken a tremendous amount of expenditure out of the base year, and the percentage is not comparable. So I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the distortion and the misleading quality that a change in reporting of this nature brings into the equation.

I'd also like to express some concern and question the minister about how it is that projects get into the Capital Fund stream as opposed to being reported as being the capital portion of the main estimates and dealt with as part of the main budget. For example, I note that the government capital estimates for 1991 on page 11 refer to total capital expenditures of \$1,203,000,000. Now, in that there's an item, for example, of \$683 million on Transportation and Utilities, of which a large portion would be

roads. Now, why is it that roads are written off as a current expenditure when they last some period of time, and other items are reported as capital expenditures in the Capital Fund? Is it that the moving of large amounts or the . . . Most of that \$1 billion over there would be too much of a fudge even though it would fit within the principle of justification being presented by the minister.

I would like to hear from the minister on that, if I might, Mr. Chairman, as to just what are the principles which determine whether or not an expenditure comes under the Capital Fund as opposed to being written off on an annual basis. Perhaps the minister could also enlighten me as to which other governments in this country report their capital expenditures on this basis. Perhaps he could also tell us whether when he compares the percentage increase in expenditures since 1985 he is using a base which factors out the capital expenditures. Or is he using a bit of a fudge on that, as I suspect?

Finally, a few concluding comments with respect to the Oldman dam simply to say that, you know, I do share a number of the concerns which have been raised here today with respect to that dam, particularly with respect to the decision about the location. I'm concerned about a totally inadequate review process and a rejection of what review there was by the Environment Council of Alberta. I'm concerned about the inability to get information with respect to many of the internal studies which have been made with respect to the dam, in particular the structural aspect. We recognize, Mr. Chairman, the need for more water in southern Alberta. Need is not the question; that is acknowledged. The real issue is as to method and whether this government is making the best and the wisest decisions. Based on many of the other decisions that we've seen over the past four years since I've been in the Legislature, there's a great deal of question about the wisdom of their judgments. Many of them have not been wise, and I think there is every cause to question the process and the common sense of the government in making this particular judgment.

The unhappy result of the failure of the government to deal with the dam, to have adequate procedures in place prior to approval is that concerned groups are forced into the courts. Now we find the Attorney General's department taking a position where they refuse to allow the province to be hauled before the courts to answer with respect to certain charges under the Fisheries Act relating to the impact of the dam on fish.

These are only some of our concerns, Mr. Chairman. We would certainly like to see a total disclosure of all of the documentation that's available. There will be a federal review of some of the federal jurisdictional issues, and we hope that will result in full disclosure of all aspects of the dam and many of the questions that still concern public-spirited citizens, who do acknowledge and recognize and want to meet the needs of southern Alberta for water but do feel that in the spirit of democratic process there is not merely a right but a duty to constantly ask proper questions about this decision, particularly when we look at the people who have been making these decisions.

Thank you.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I felt moved to get back into this discussion on the Oldman dam this morning, given the subsequent comments of the members for Westlock-Sturgeon and Edmonton-Kingsway and Calgary-Buffalo.

First, I would like to debunk this suggestion that somehow we could achieve our requirements for water in southern Alberta by

off-stream storage. We've heard the members allude to the Environment Council of Alberta report. For the benefit of the hon. members, the government of Alberta has constructed almost all of the off-stream storage options which the Environment Council of Alberta report recommended, including the Forty Mile Coulee off-stream storage project, the Crawling valley reservoir off-stream storage project, the Badger reservoir off-stream storage project, and the expansion of the Keho Lake off-stream storage reservoir. Now, that only leaves one other option which the ECA suggested, which was the Mud Lake off-stream storage reservoir.

Mr. Chairman, one of the fallacies about the off-stream storage argument which must be put out very clearly: if we are going to construct a reservoir and we want to ensure the maximum benefits, my analysis of the off-stream storage reservoir option leads me to conclude that it would fail the requirements for water in southern Alberta two out of every 10 years. Surely we're not going to invest public funds to ensure a failure of the system two out of every 10 years, which would be caused by the off-stream storage option.

We must look at what are the requirements for water. The Oldman dam would store some 400,000 acre-feet of water. The other off-stream storage projects would store much less than that. We must realize that in order to get this some 400,000 acre-feet of water to an off-stream storage reservoir, to store that same amount, you'd have to build massive diversion works to achieve that, to store that rush of water in the six weeks in which that flush comes down in the spring of the year, in May and June. So you have to have massive diversion works to get that water there.

Now, let's talk about environmental impacts. Mud Lake option, which has been recommended, would store water to a depth of some 10 feet. In order to store 400,000 acre-feet of water, you'd have to have an off-stream storage reservoir which would cover an area of some 62.5 square miles. Now, talk about environmental impacts: 6,000 acres affected by the Oldman dam in terms of inundation versus off-stream storage of some 62.5 square miles. If you raised the requirements of Mud Lake, say to store water to a depth of 20 feet, you'd only be covering some 31 square miles – still a tremendous environmental impact.

So the off-stream storage options were looked at. The ones which were economically feasible, ones that made sense, which were recommended by the ECA, have been built, as I have talked about: Forty Mile, Badger, Crawling Lake, and the expansion of Keho. Mud Lake just did not make sense. The off-stream storage option would have been very expensive, would have inundated an incredible amount of territory, as I've indicated, to get the same storage capacity, which would have had much greater environmental impacts than the 6,000 acres covered by the Oldman dam. So that's the off-stream option. These were considered very carefully, Mr. Chairman, and we had to opt for on-stream storage.

MR. McEACHERN: The point I wanted to make really is . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, hon. member. Order please. The hon. Member for . . .

MR. McEACHERN: That's what I'm asking for, Mr. Chairman. Instead of prejudging what I'm going to say . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You don't have the right to say anything, hon. member. The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest

has the floor. If you would like to ask a question of the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, you can do so at the conclusion of his remarks.

MR. BRADLEY: So, Mr. Chairman, I want to get very clear on the record this question of off-stream storage that has been discussed. The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon said that somehow we weren't considering all the options, that we were looking at yesterday's options. Well, I think I've discussed why we have to go with an on-stream storage reservoir. There's a short period of time in which to capture this water. The size of the works to capture the same amount of water by off-stream would just be almost inconceivable to achieve and extraordinarily expensive, and then you have the question of the ability to release the water from an off-stream storage reservoir to get it to where you want it, when you want it. Only on-stream storage provides you that ability. On-stream storage allows you to let that water flow down when you need it in the river system, where you need it, to get all the other benefits besides the irrigation benefits. The off-stream storage idea would cover some of the irrigation benefits but wouldn't give you the multipurpose benefits which you require. So that covers the question and the fallacy of the arguments that have been presented by three or four or five hon. members opposite regarding off-stream storage versus on-stream storage. These matters were very carefully considered.

With regards to the cost/benefit analysis, I said that the benefit was \$2.17 for every \$1 invested. That economic benefit analysis, Mr. Chairman, has been filed here in this Legislature on many occasions dating back to the mid-80s. So it's there; it's on record . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the members of the committee please come to order so that the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest can be heard.

MR. BRADLEY: Further, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Calgary-Buffalo suggests that there are some studies, some information, some reports that he doesn't have available to him regarding the engineering aspects of the Oldman River dam, and other aspects. My understanding is that every report that has been commissioned by this government, every study – I'm sure it would fill a half-ton truck or a full-ton truck. The piles of paper, the volumes of study that have been filed and are public information for all the people of Alberta are just mind boggling. All those engineering studies are public, so I'd just like to clear up his mind that somehow there are some hidden reports, that there's something that's not accessible. All that information is available to the public. Every study commissioned by the government is there and available.

Now, let's get back to talking about process in terms of how these decisions were made. There was a planning stage with regards to the Oldman River system, flow regulation on the Oldman River. It started back in 1974, commissioned by this government. Previous to that the federal government had done some studies back in the mid-60s. So this process has been ongoing for some time. As a follow-up to that first-phase study there was an Oldman water management committee appointed, with representatives from southern Alberta on that management committee, which reviewed the first-phase planning reports. Then those reports went to public hearings by the Environment Council of Alberta in 1978, basinwide hearings in the Oldman River basin looking at what the options were. For the hon.

members to say that there haven't been public hearings on this subject – there certainly have.

That was followed by a government decision in 1980 that said, "We believe we have to have an on-stream storage reservoir," for some of the reasons which I've clearly enunciated today, the reason for on-stream storage versus off-stream storage, and very careful consideration as to which would be the best site for that on-stream storage, which was the subject of public reviews. That was followed by the South Saskatchewan River basin hearings which looked at the bigger part of the South Saskatchewan River basin and the need for water storage in southern Alberta.

With regard to the impacts of the Oldman dam and the local area of Pincher Creek, where citizens are most affected, we appointed a local advisory committee with some subcommittees of some 40 citizens from that area who've reviewed every possible impact, from archeological to fish and wildlife to historical to recreational to agricultural to transportation concerns. The local community directly affected by this project, Mr. Chairman, is satisfied that their legitimate concerns have been addressed through this process. But now we have, formed in 1987 mostly by citizens from outside of the area, a group called the Friends of the Oldman River. Nineteen eighty-seven: some 13 years after the first study started, some nine years after the public hearings, some three years after the formal decision was announced, and a number of years after construction actually started. Late in the game.

There's a process that's been followed with full public consultation with regards to this. I cannot begin to tell you about the number of public meetings that have been held over that period of time requesting public input on this project. It will number in the couple of hundreds, Mr. Chairman, in terms of the opportunities for public input and review on this project, in terms of getting the best project possible.

I wanted to also talk very briefly with regards to the benefits of this project. Getting back to the Member for Edmonton-Kingsway, does he realize, do the members opposite realize that in terms of agricultural production only 4 percent of the agricultural land in this province is under irrigation? Four percent is under irrigation. The arable land of this province that is under irrigation produces close to 20 percent of the total agricultural product of the province of Alberta. If that isn't enough economic information for the hon. members opposite to realize the importance of irrigation to this province, I cannot give a better statistic to them. Four percent of the arable land produces 20 percent of the agricultural product of the province. That's the type of benefits that we get from irrigation.

Then I wanted to get to the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon discussing conservation of water and that no efforts have been made to conserve water. Well, the people of southern Alberta realize it's a very precious resource and that we must do everything possible in terms of conservation of water and in terms of the irrigation systems. If members look at other votes in this Legislature with regards to this question, they will find that over the period 1980 to 1990 some \$500 million have been invested in upgrading and rehabilitating the existing irrigation works to ensure that we have the best possible use of that water. That has increased the efficiency of use of water in southern Alberta immensely. The members and the citizens of southern Alberta are very conscious of that effort to upgrade and improve to ensure that we have the most efficient use of that water in southern Alberta. That has been a tremendous contribution out of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund: to ensure that we make the best use of our water.

Then, Mr. Chairman, when all else fails in the logic of the arguments with regards to construction of the Oldman dam, the members opposite bring up the bogeyman of interbasin transfer of water, some sort of massive diversion of water to the United States. I don't know how many times that issue has been debated in this Legislature. But let me assure the hon. members in terms of his arguments that the series of dams that have been built – and they always start with the dam on the Red Deer River. It always intrigues me with regards to these arguments, because the dam on the Red Deer River is some 800 feet lower in elevation than the Oldman River dam. In order to get water from the Red Deer, the Dickson dam, to the Oldman River dam, you'd somehow have to pump this water up some 800 feet in elevation. The other thing, as I've said earlier, and the hon. Member for Cypress-Redcliff will attest to that in his capacity as chairman of the Alberta Water Resources Commission: southern Alberta is a water deficient area. In terms of the South Saskatchewan River basin hearings, there were some eight times the demand for water requested as to the water available in terms of the needs of the people in southern Alberta. There's eight times the demand for water versus what is available. With regards to . . .

Bill 39
Appropriation Act, 1990

Bill 40
Appropriation (Alberta Capital Fund) Act, 1990

Bill 41
**Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund,
Capital Projects Division) Act, 1990-91**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, order please. The Chair

really regrets having to interrupt, but pursuant to Standing Order 61(4) the Chair is required to put a single motion to the committee to this effect: does the committee approve all appropriation Bills that have been referred to it, being 39, 40, and 41, and report same to the Assembly?

[Motion carried]

MR. HORSMAN: I move that the committee rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.
The hon. Member for Ponoka-Rimbey.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration certain Bills, and the committee reports the following: Bill 39, Bill 40, and Bill 41.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Having heard the report, all those in favour, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Carried.

[At 12:46 p.m. the House adjourned to Monday at 2:30 p.m.]