

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Title: **Tuesday, August 26, 1986 2:30 p.m.****Canada/Nova Scotia Energy Agreement**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray. O Lord, grant us a daily awareness of the precious gift of life which You have given us. As members of this Legislative Assembly we dedicate our lives anew to the service of our province and our country. Amen.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, today I have the honour to extend on behalf of the members of the Assembly through you a special welcome to a distinguished visitor to Alberta who is seated in your gallery, His Excellency Dr. Adiwoso, the ambassador to Canada from Indonesia. I would ask that he rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

head: **PRESENTING REPORTS BY  
STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

MR. SCHUMACHER: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 93, I have taken the petition of the Board of Trustees of the Canadian Native Friendship Centre Building for the Board of Trustees of the Edmonton Canadian Native Friendship Centre Building Amendment Act, 1986, under consideration and wish to report to the Assembly that Standing Order 89 has not been complied with.

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the annual report of the Grant MacEwan Community College for the fiscal year '84-85.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Legislative Assembly, the chief city commissioner from the city of Red Deer, Mr. Michael Day, who is also a recently appointed member of our labour review committee. With Commissioner Day are three senior people from our engineering department. I'm not sure if they declared it a civic holiday there, but with him are Bryan Jeffers, the city engineer, Ken Haslop, and Pat Grainger. I would ask that they rise and receive the warm reception of this Assembly.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Premier. The federal government has announced the granting of some \$125 million to Nova Scotia for offshore energy development as well as annual payments for a portion of the Crown's share of revenues. This follows on the failure of the Ottawa Conservatives to live up to the signed commitment to provide \$780 million in loan guarantees for the Husky upgrader and of course a continued imposition of that famous four letter word, PGRT. It seems the Conservatives are again taking Alberta for granted.

My question is to the Premier. What assessment has the Premier made of this announcement? Is it not again the thumbing of the nose to Alberta by the federal government and the ignoring of serious problems facing us?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Energy if he has an assessment of the agreement.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the agreement basically replaces the 1982 Canada/Nova Scotia agreement on offshore resource management and establishes a new offshore oil and gas board to administer and regulate all aspects of the offshore oil and gas activities. It does, however, convert a previously established loan of \$200 million to a grant, and some \$25 million will be made available for a particular company to explore and develop offshore. In addition, there is the cost-sharing mechanism between the two levels of government so that Nova Scotia would be involved in revenue sharing and also would be able to set royalties in much the same way as other provinces would be able to.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to see that Nova Scotia and the federal government have reached this agreement. No way do I see that jeopardizing or having any impact on any discussions taking place between this government and the government in Ottawa. Our officials are meeting today to discuss the proposal that we put for them. I understand things are going well, and I'm hopeful of an early agreement.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, we've heard that before.

My question is to either of the gentlemen, whoever is talking for Alberta. I would point out that these grants to Nova Scotia follow talk of \$1 billion of loan guarantees for Hibernia. Have they communicated any specific concern about the similarity of these proposals to provisions of the national energy program which drove investment out of the western basin to the offshore at public expense? If they haven't, why not?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I don't understand what the hon. member is saying, what he's driving at. We are having our discussions with the federal government, and we are happy to see that Nova Scotia is able to reach an agreement. I think the hon. member is wrong in the fact that there has been a Hibernia agreement. I don't think that has occurred yet. It sounded as though he said that. We consider things to be progressing, and we will continue our discussions with the federal government to address the concerns of the energy industry in this province and country.

MR. MARTIN: I could give a lesson to the minister that if there's investment there, it drives it out of here, but he doesn't seem to understand that.

Let me go back to the Premier, who might understand that. A supplementary question. Has the Premier been able to assess why Atlantic Canada seems to be able to negotiate rather successfully with the federal government, while our approach seems to lead, frankly, to failure time after time?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Minister of Energy has just explained, we are in the middle of negotiations with the federal government. There are some things that don't go perfectly all the time, and we'll just work a little harder at them and try to make sure that they do work. I don't think it has in any way any relationship to what is going on in the maritimes.

MR. MARTIN: We all work harder, Mr. Speaker; that's very nice.

My supplementary question, then, probably to the Minister of Energy, but if the Premier wants to answer, that's fine too. Public statements that just came out by the Prime Minister indicate that he believes his government has done such a wonderful job for the west. I'm sure the minister saw that. He does have one point, though, and that is that the Alberta government got everything it asked for in the Western Accord: Has the federal government conveyed to the provincial government that the Western Accord was what this government wanted and that they therefore believe they have lived up to their end of the bargain?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the Western Accord and the natural gas pricing agreement were the results of the federal and provincial governments and industry agreeing to go in a particular direction. The industry responded to those two agreements. It wasn't of course until the prices started to fall that we encountered the industry problems we're having in this country.

As we've repeated over and over again, our officials are meeting today, and I expect to meet with the federal minister. In terms of what's happening elsewhere in the country, there's no relevance as far as I'm concerned to what is happening in terms of our discussions with Ottawa.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. How effective has this government been in communicating the grave state of Alberta's oil industry when the Prime Minister of this country was able to say this morning that Alberta has already received a great deal of assistance?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer for the Prime Minister. He says what he wants to say. I must say that I think we, the Alberta caucus, have made our points with various officials of the federal government very clearly. They know what we believe in, what we stand for, and what is necessary to help the industry in the future.

#### Labour Legislation Review

MR. MARTIN: I'd like to direct the second question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Labour. While the minister spends time on the phone with his travel agent, prolonged and bitter disputes continue at Gainers, Suncor, Zeidler, and, of course, elsewhere. We were unable to get to this yesterday because we didn't have a budget. Could the minister indicate if there is a ceiling on the amount of money which this committee will be able to spend? If so, what is that ceiling?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, it's impossible as yet to set a figure for the expenditures for the committee. We intend to do the job fully and thoroughly, as the Premier, myself, and indeed the throne speech have said many times in this House. For example, at this time I have no firm itinerary for the committee even within the province of Alberta. We obviously are going to have to pay the members of the committee a per diem for the work they are going to do and the time commitment they are making and that many of them are taking from very busy schedules. Depending on the number of days the committee meets and many other items, I can't give the hon. leader any approaching limit on the figure at this time.

MR. MARTIN: This is a new approach to business: spend whatever you have and take as much time as you want.

A supplementary question. They talked about per diems. Is the minister saying that they haven't even worked out how much the committee members are being paid to be on this committee?

DR. REID: That was not what I said, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARTIN: I like the way the minister is so forthcoming. I guess he's embarrassed, and so he should be.

My question is: how much are these people being paid to sit on this committee?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I think the figure is \$250 per day.

MR. MARTIN: That will be interesting to a lot of people in Alberta. I thank you for that answer.

The final supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. I believe the minister indicated yesterday that the whole kit and caboodle of the committee will visit every country they decide to go to. If we can't get to the budget, how much it is going to cost, my question is: is there any estimate of how many assistants, secretaries, bureaucrats, and other staff will be accompanying the committee on this jaunt? In other words, how many people are we looking at by the time we're finished?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader appears to be under a misapprehension about the purpose of this committee. The committee has been appointed to do a full review of the labour legislation and to make sure that such changes as may be required will fulfill the requirements of fair and reasonable labour legislation; in other words, it will provide a framework for open discussion between employee and employer. The intention is to try and decrease the confrontatory nature of labour legislation and labour relations. The intention is not to go out and spend money unnecessarily. With my accent it would be a little strange if we did. The committee will consist of the nine other members and myself and the necessary support staff, who are estimated to be three or four.

MR. TAYLOR: I'd like to direct a question to the Ulysses of the front bench. In the odyssey he is going to go on through the Old World, could he promise that he would submit a budget to us before he goes on the trip with his entourage rather than after he comes home?

DR. REID: No, Mr. Speaker. I can't make a firm figure. Perhaps I should draw to the hon. member and the other

people on the other side the fact that this is a sincere attempt to address concerns of Albertans, employees, and employers. This party and this government are sincerely interested in the welfare of individual employees in this province. We have made that commitment in the past, we make that commitment again, and we will continue to in the future. The budget will be what is necessary to make sure that the rank and file members of the unions, the individual employers, and indeed all Albertans are well served by labour legislation. That is the purpose. What is necessary to achieve that purpose will be spent.

MR. OLDRING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister of Labour please advise us ... Dave Werlin has done more damage to the labour movement in this province than any other single factor. [interjections] We on this side of the House are anxious to ...

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, what is the supplementary question, without the introductory stuff?

MR. OLDRING: Could the minister please advise us of the status of the membership of this committee, or are people like Dave Werlin still trying to prevent meaningful labour review by discouraging prospective members?

MR. SPEAKER: Sorry. The Chair recognizes the main question of the leader of the Liberal Party.

#### Interprovincial Trade

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, the Premier indicated at the recent annual Premiers' Conference that the lessening of interprovincial trade barriers is a top priority. Has a meeting of provincial intergovernmental ministers been scheduled to discuss the strategies for lessening these barriers?

MR. GETTY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that meeting has been held. As a matter of fact, the Minister of Economic Development and Trade went into some detail about that in the House previously. The hon. member may not have been here or been part of that question and answer, but it has definitely been dealt with in the House.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. I don't think so. What specific initiatives were taken by this government to hasten the formulation of a strategy to knock down interprovincial trade barriers?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, the government of Alberta took a major role in establishing the process that took place in Belleville in June, where the ministers of trade dealt with this matter of bringing down and reducing interprovincial trade barriers. Subsequent to that meeting it was dealt with by the Premiers at the first ministers' conference, where concurrence was sought and obtained by all the governments of Canada. The Premiers instructed their respective ministers to accelerate the process.

There is a scheduled meeting of ministers of trade, I believe on September 10, at which this matter will be discussed. A ministerial meeting is also to be held later on in September in Yukon, where the matter will be further discussed in terms of the process. One of the key elements — it was in the communiqué, if the hon. member had read it — was an examination of all of the existing barriers and an inventory, which is now being done by all of the

jurisdictions. The work will be done by the ministers, to attempt to dismantle those as quickly as possible.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that he said that the Premier is instructing the trade ministers, could the Premier elaborate and say what sectors are slated as the top priorities in negotiating the reduction of barriers?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, it would be in the whole area of interprovincial trade barriers and no particular area picked out. I think it would be unwise to try and select one or two but rather to deal with the whole broad picture.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I question whether that's an effective method.

Nevertheless, would the Premier like to tell the House when he expects a Canadian body similar to GATT will be in place to reduce interprovincial trade barriers? When would you forecast that moment?

MR. GETTY: As soon as it's possible to work one out, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Recognizing that this is a very difficult area because provincial governments are going to tend to look after their own jurisdictions, is there any assessment by the Alberta government on whether this has helped us or hurt us in terms of the barriers, specifically in Alberta in an economic sense?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, earlier in the House I referred to an examination of this situation that the government has undertaken over the past three years and also our consultation with the business community in terms of their access to opportunities in other jurisdictions. The assessment, not so much by the government but by the business community, was that they felt that the opportunities for Alberta business to participate in the economic opportunities across this country would be enhanced by a lowering of barriers, as opposed to Alberta getting into the situation where we erected our own trade barriers. That was the premise from which we moved in order to urge other governments to dismantle their trade barriers.

We continue to hold that view because the economies of scale that can be established by companies, manufacturers, and businesses having access to opportunities nationwide, as opposed to within a restricted environment of their own jurisdiction, are attractive, particularly to Albertans who continue to have that entrepreneurial spirit.

#### Gleichen Industrial Waste

MR. YOUNIE: Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of the Environment. The town council of Gleichen is faced with the cleanup of West-Taylor Industries in that community, but they are rather cautious of the danger to their employees and possible costs of cleanup. By unanimous resolution, council asked me yesterday to try to convince the government that they have a need for assistance in determining safe cleanup procedures of this abandoned industry.

To start with, what testing has been done to identify what is in the numerous barrels of chemicals which have been left behind in this abandoned business on the main street?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that research undertaken by the Member for Edmonton Glengarry indicates that there is really no chemical in the barrels in Gleichen, Alberta, that would cause any danger to anyone. I'm not sure either that the research of the Member for Edmonton Glengarry has verified that in fact it is an abandoned site. If the gentleman has information that conclusively proves that it is an abandoned site, I would very much appreciate receiving such. Thirdly, it would seem to me that there are provisions under the Litter Act for any municipal official in the province of Alberta to cause their local bylaw officer to take immediate action to rectify the problem identified hypothetically by the Member for Edmonton Glengarry.

MR. YOUNIE: After a little over a year they are concerned that it has been abandoned, especially when correspondence was ignored by the business involved.

I am wondering about the word the company got that because these chemicals were in barrels, they weren't in the environment and therefore it wasn't the Environment department's policy to test them. I'm wondering how this policy applies to the rusty, open, and dented drums that were left in this unfenced field bordering the main street of the town.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I checked incoming calls to my office earlier today as a result of a newspaper article with respect to some drums that are stored in Gleichen, Alberta. I have no knowledge of any contact from any official with the town of Gleichen asking me as the Minister of the Environment to undertake any action with respect to this particular matter. It's not my understanding either that any contact has been made with the Pollution Emergency Response Team, which is on standby 24 hours a day with respect to such items. If this matter is of the magnitude identified by the Member for Edmonton Glengarry, I would like him to know that earlier today I directed Alberta Environment officials to go to Gleichen and undertake an immediate review of the matter.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that I would have done that on any day since May 26, the day on which I became Minister of the Environment, but until today had no knowledge of such matters. So if the matter was of an immediate, emergency kind of situation, I only wonder why there was such hesitation in the eyes and minds of certain elected officials in Gleichen in not bringing this matter to the attention of the government and having the government basically learn about it by reading a newspaper article.

MR. YOUNIE: I appreciate that response.

I might ask then what the minister plans to do about the official who visited there, cautioned them if there were a fire, not to be downwind of it, and seemed quite concerned and about the other official who later phoned and said that nothing should be done. These officials should certainly have apprised the minister. According to the entire council, they were there. Will the minister guarantee to check into that as well?

MR. KOWALSKI: If the Member for Edmonton Glengarry would be so kind as to give me the names of such officials in the Department of the Environment, he can be assured that the Minister of the Environment will have a talk with these particular individuals to find out what transpired from their perspective. If it turns out that anyone was derelict

in their duties, they'll have more than simply a talk with the Minister of the Environment.

MR. YOUNIE: In view of the fact that three sons of the owner died in the facility and that the deaths were caused by chemicals that the owner has admitted are still there, will the minister guarantee that he will, as the council has requested through me, advise them on the best and safest cleanup procedures so that they can continue behaving responsibly, as they have?

MR. KOWALSKI: That advice is always available, Mr. Speaker, and it was available before the date on which I became the Minister of the Environment. If this is a matter of great concern to the council of the municipality of Gleichen and if this matter has been around since 1981, then someone is derelict in their responsibility in not bringing this matter to the attention of officials at the provincial level and individuals within Alberta Environment. I repeat again, I have no knowledge of any contact being made.

It does not go unnoticed whatsoever that one of the councillors in the town of Gleichen was a defeated NDP candidate. I just wonder why games were being played if safety is a matter of concern to the individuals who live within the municipality of Gleichen. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. NELSON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister saying that there has been no formal request to the minister or his department by the municipality of Gleichen for assistance or an investigation relevant to this item brought forward? If the minister is to take some investigation, would he also consider investigating the reasons it was not brought forward, if it is a matter of danger?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I would like to repeat to the House and to all members that to my knowledge there has been no contact with my office since the day I became Minister of the Environment, and that's a fact. If this is a matter of major importance to the individuals who live in the town of Gleichen, I think it's a matter for them to evaluate in the next six weeks, as all municipal councillors will be seeking re-election.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. It's commendable that he keeps a record of all complaints coming in to him, but does he not have the administrative talent to keep the same policing for complaints that would come in in other sectors of the province? Is calling the minister the only way you can make a complaint? What about these other regions around the province?

MR. KOWALSKI: Absolutely not. The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon obviously wasn't listening. I indicated a little earlier that we have in place on a 24-hour service basis to all of the people of Alberta, listed in all of the telephone books in the province, a telephone number that will access something called PERT, which is the Pollution Emergency Response Team. It works 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 52 weeks a year, 365 days a year.

Furthermore, to the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon: yes, the Minister of the Environment receives on his desk every morning a complete listing of all the calls that were made to the PERT system in the previous 24 hours, and

yes, the Minister of the Environment reads every one of them.

### **Tolerance and Understanding**

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. Last Friday this House showed commendable leadership in promoting tolerance and understanding by passing a unanimous resolution on the subject. However, there's much more important work to be done in this province on a regular and not just a once-and-for-all basis. Can the Premier tell this House why the government has not followed the Ghitter committee recommendation of December 1984 to establish a permanent standing committee of this Legislative Assembly to promote tolerance and understanding?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, in every report that the government receives there are recommendations of one kind or another. Some are followed up; some are deemed not to be necessary. Not having been here at the time the report was received, I will check into the reasons for following up on some and not others and, if I can, give the reply to the hon. member.

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Speaker, to what degree has the Premier demonstrated some personal leadership on this matter by involving himself in questions of promoting tolerance and understanding and a review of the Ghitter report recommendations? That is, if he has read the report.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure myself plus all members of the government caucus express our views and become involved in every way possible in matters like this.

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Speaker, has the matter of promoting tolerance and understanding even been discussed in the cabinet since the Premier took office?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I don't go into the details of cabinet discussions, but the answer is yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The question was indeed out of order under *Beauchesne* 360(2),

... seek information about such matters which are in their nature secret, such as decisions or proceedings of Cabinet,

but please continue.

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Speaker, the question was not with relation to the content but merely the general topic, but I'll pass on.

The Keegstra affair is now three years old. Will the Premier promise some early action on the issue by moving to set up a standing committee of this House on tolerance and understanding and by taking other positive measures to promote tolerance and understanding, and if so, when?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I answered that question originally in my first answer to the hon. member. The government has moved in a variety of ways, and I think that in this province we have outstanding leadership in this whole area.

### **Native Venture Capital Co. Ltd.**

MR. SIGURDSON: Mr. Speaker, my questions are directed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs regarding the appointment of Milt Pahl. The province has a 34 percent equity interest in Native Venture Capital corporation, which is

three times as many shares as any other of the shareholders. I'm wondering if the government has issued any policy direction to their representative on the board about the propriety of appointing a former Minister of Native Affairs as the chief executive officer of the corporation.

MR. CRAWFORD: No, Mr. Speaker, no suggestion was made to the directors as to what they should do when the position became vacant.

MR. SIGURDSON: Mr. Speaker, the advertisement for the competition for the position of president appeared in the *Edmonton Journal* on April 26 while Mr. Pahl was still minister. What assurance can the minister give this Assembly that Mr. Pahl did not receive information as minister which may have given him a special inside track on the appointment to the job?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has already pointed out that the matter of the competition was so public that it was advertised in, I would assume, the career section of one of the daily papers.

MR. SIGURDSON: April 26, Mr. Minister. How many others of you were looking?

Given that the taxpayers have an initial equity in the corporation of some \$2 million, will the minister advise the Assembly as to the salary Mr. Pahl will receive?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should know that the structure of the Native Venture Capital corporation is that of a private company. It in no way is controlled in any respect by the government. The government, it's true, has one member, as I understand it, on the board of directors. The other shareholders are represented to a significant degree in the sense of the total board being something like 12 or 14 members. The private-sector investors — and that's what they are; this is a company created under the Business Corporations Act — I would think do control the board and the naming of directors to that board. My judgment would be, having heard all there is to hear on the subject from the hon. member just now, that that judgment of the board was exercised independently.

MR. SIGURDSON: A final supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. Did the government establish any policy for the director on the board of the merits of appointing a native person to this position, and if not, why not?

MR. CRAWFORD: In appointments of significance in the public service, Mr. Speaker, one thing the government can try to achieve is to look at the prospects for native people and see that those prospects are advanced. I've already explained in respect to the Native Venture Capital corporation that it is a private corporation under the Business Corporations Act, and my understanding is that after the competition was advertised and closed and the interviews were held, no native person, to my knowledge, was a finalist.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. This is to the Premier. How can he reconcile this appointment of an ex-cabinet minister, when to questions from the Opposition less than a month ago he assured the House that he would consider a year's cooling-off period before ex-cabinet ministers would be appointed to anything?

MR. GETTY: First of all, Mr. Speaker, the government was not making an appointment. This is a hiring by a private-sector group. I see no comparison whatsoever. There was no discussion at all about whether or not someone who serves this province as a minister or as an MLA should somehow not then be able to be hired in the province in some area controlled by other than the government. As a matter of fact, I find the whole line of questioning shows a remarkable degree of a lack of class by the hon. member. [interjections]

[The Member for Edmonton Avonmore rose]

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, the Chair will recognize you when your front benches settle down.

#### **Beanstalk School**

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Education. In light of four years of police investigation of the Church of Scientology in Ontario and the laying of charges in Toronto in 1984, can the minister advise this Assembly what steps she has taken other than accepting the written assurances at face value to ensure that Scientology techniques have not and will not be taught in the Beanstalk school?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, we have dealt with this matter in the House on at least three occasions, and as I have indicated, the Beanstalk school is operating with the permission of the Department of Education as a category 1 school. In order to do that and in order to ensure that a portion of provincial funding flows to that school, the school must meet the standards of curriculum set by the Department of Education and employ certifiable teachers.

I have also indicated in this House that the Beanstalk school has offered an affidavit which states that they will not be teaching Scientology within that Beanstalk school. As to other steps which I may be considering, I can say that one of the questions I am seeking some advice on is the matter of the affidavit and whether or not the commitment made not to teach a certain religion within a school system is in fact an infringement on the rights protected in the Charter of Rights. I am looking at that question currently.

MS LAING: Given the minister's concern about the school, Mr. Speaker, why does the minister refuse to make inspection documents on the school public, given that Scientology has a consistent worldwide reputation that British Justice Lathey has called "hypnotic and anesthetic processes" which educate children on a "lifetime allegiance to a cult"?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, as with all schools which are monitored in this province, including public and private schools, I have said in this House, and I repeat, that I will not make public internal reviews by the Department of Education. Where that review becomes a formal process under the Department of Education Act, there is ample opportunity for that report to become public.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, can the minister explain what evidence she has to support her assurances that the school is meeting the approved curriculum? That is, are the inspectors there every day?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: No, they are not, Mr. Speaker. I guess one of the questions one has to look at here is that

the resources of my department, which are applied to the monitoring of all schools in this province, are finite resources, and I do not propose that all of those resources be channelled toward the review of a certain type of school. In this case, as I have indicated in this House, the school is meeting curriculum standards and is employing its certified teachers. I am satisfied now that the school is meeting those requirements. If I weren't, my answer would be different.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. Between June of 1985 and '86 the Workers' Compensation Board provided \$8,000 to Education Alive for tutoring contracts, while the Department of Manpower between January 1985 and April 1986 gave Education Alive over \$7,000. As the head of the government, responsible for all of these departments, can the Premier advise why this government seems to insist on giving money to this educational offshoot of the Church of Scientology?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the matters raised by the hon. member, and I will look into it and advise her.

MRS. HEWES: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Education. Can the minister confirm that members of the board of the school and teachers of the school are also members of the Church of Scientology?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: No I can't, Mr. Speaker. A board of directors of that school, which is constituted to hire staff, is set up. As I have indicated, the teaching staff must meet certification standards in order to be a category 1 school. With respect to who that board of directors hires, that is clearly a matter within their jurisdiction.

#### **Rosehaven Care Centre**

MS MJOLNESS: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Community and Occupational Health. The minister stated on August 14 and again on August 18 that a decision on Rosehaven institution in Camrose had not yet been made. I will remind the minister that a letter was written by the Minister of Social Services on April 7, 1986, that specifies where Eastrose patients will go upon being discharged. Will the minister now admit that a decision on the closure of Eastrose ward at Rosehaven has been made and was in fact made prior to his aforementioned statements?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I believe a decision was proposed. The plan to change the nature of Rosehaven was proposed. Any action on that proposal was not to take place until the then Minister of Social Services and Community Health had visited Rosehaven. That visit was rescheduled shortly after the appointment of a new Minister of Social Services and a new Minister of Community and Occupational Health.

I had the good fortune to visit Rosehaven about 10 days ago with the Member for Camrose, and I have had the benefit of a very good review of the facility and discussions with officials and my colleagues since. I look forward to making a decision on that matter in the days ahead.

MS MJOLNESS: To the minister. Further to the additional funding of \$175,000 for the Rosehaven day program, has the department finalized any contracts with Camrose residents

for provision of approved homes for future day program participants?

MR. DINNING: No, Mr. Speaker, that has not been done, and that is one of the obstacles to making a final decision. It is our hope that we can place residents of the Eastrose wing of Rosehaven who are able to live on their own in a residence within the community, in an approved home, or in any other kind of residential situation like that — place those people in a setting where they can live comfortable, satisfying, and productive lives. The priority of quality care is just that: it is our priority.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for question period has expired. Might we finish this complete line of questioning?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MS MJOLSNESS: A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister satisfied that clients in any ward at the Rosehaven institution will be able to move into the community at this or any other time, despite the fact that some of the clients are between the ages of 65 and 80 years old and have lived in institutions up to 40 years of their lives?

MR. DINNING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am convinced that some of the residents of the Rosehaven home can move into the community. I can show the hon. member a very good example, a home that I visited in Raymond on Wednesday last. We were able to assist the community of Raymond to provide residential housing for six former residents of the Raymond home now living on their own in a lovely home down the street from the Raymond care centre. Those women had amongst them 275 years of institutionalized care. Today they are happily living in their own home with their own bedrooms, very proud of that facility, which the Member for Cardston and I had the honour of participating in the opening of

MS MJOLSNESS: A final supplementary. Can the minister tell us if his position is shared by the majority of the professional staff at Rosehaven that work with these residents on a daily basis?

MR. DINNING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In discussing with both the management staff and members of the union of that facility I believe they would help the medical people in our department in working with the medical staff at Rosehaven. Yes, I believe they could identify some of the residents, particularly some of those in the Eastrose wing, who could live in an approved homelike setting within the community of Camrose.

MRS. HEWES: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In light of the considerable uncertainty and anxiety that obviously surround this decision, I would like to ask the minister if discussions not only with the staff and board but with the community and families are continuing to be held.

MR. DINNING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there are ongoing discussions with the community. Just as the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder was asking in her question, it is our hope that we will be able to find approved homes or sponsors within that community, within Camrose, who can

provide that kind of residential setting for those people to move to when they leave Eastrose.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. BOGLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a privilege to introduce today to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, Mr. Frank Spanbauer from Barnwell. Mr. Spanbauer is head of the pulse growers in Alberta. That was one of approximately 20 commodity groups that came together a year ago to provide some advice and input to this government on programs that could be developed to help the agricultural sector, particularly in terms of the financial stability of fixed interest loans for a long period of time. As well, in the last couple of weeks the Associate Minister of Agriculture appointed Mr. Spanbauer to the committee that is reviewing the Agricultural Development Corporation in Alberta.

I would ask members to join with me in welcoming Mr. Spanbauer to our Assembly.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would move that Question 169 and motions for returns 158, 163, and 165 stand and retain their places on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

### head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

203. Moved by Mrs. Koper:

Be it resolved that the government investigate ways to encourage private businesses, in conjunction with their employees, to establish employer-supported child care centres.

[Adjourned debate June 24: Mrs. Cripps speaking]

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to make some comments relative to Motion 203 moved by the hon. Member for Calgary Foothills. I've read the *Hansard* debates on this motion, and I'm very encouraged by the very positive comments by most members of the Assembly.

I would like to make some comments not only directly affecting the motion but perhaps relative to what has led up to the motion. In reading *Hansard* for the contributions by the various members, I was quite taken on reflection — for example, it's amazing what inaccuracy seems to stand out. For some reason the Member for Edmonton Centre made the comment that the Member for Lethbridge West says that the funding of day care centres leads to an increase in divorce. I haven't been out with the hon. gentleman after hours; I don't know where he could have picked it up. I searched through *Hansard*; I can't find the comment. I would appreciate it if the Member for Edmonton Centre

would, after the House has risen, perhaps point out where I said that funding of day care centres leads to an increase in divorce.

Mr. Speaker, so be it. I want to mention the following points to the members of the House. It would be interesting to do a poll within this Assembly and find out how many of us as individuals are products of day care centres. I look across the way at some of the younger members; indeed, they may have come out of day care centres. I don't know. I think it would be very interesting.

I recall last January about 7:30 in the morning — this happened on several occasions, but always about the hour of 7:30 — coming down 99th Avenue and seeing a car stop on 99th where there wasn't room to stop, the steam from the car almost obscuring the car and a mother — I presume it was a mother because a little toddler got out of the car all bundled up and ran into a day care centre. The mother had a bundle in her arms; I presume that was an infant. I presume it was a day care centre because that's what the sign said on the door. Think what experience most of us have missed, Mr. Speaker: being carried into a day care centre for the first four or five years of our lives and in effect being divorced from our family or our parents. Not for one day — we're not talking about a visit to grandmother now; we're talking about a way of life for many people in our society. That's their initial impression of life. I often think how shocking it must be for many of us who have never experienced a day care centre ourselves to try and sit in judgment of those people in our society who are growing up and that's their view of society.

In many ways that's got to be equated to institutional living. I along with other members have read the Social Care Facilities Review Committee report. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker was the chairman and the Member for Cypress-Redcliff was on that committee. I've read the reports about those day care centres. Although I think that on balance they're very well operated, it still must be to the young people involved, to those toddlers who grow up experiencing no way of life other than a day care centre, whether in the basement of a Chinese restaurant or on 99th Avenue next to that separate school, a very unique experience.

I want to address some comments relative to that, Mr. Speaker. I think we should ask ourselves what the purpose of day care is. I don't think it's been adequately addressed in this House. Is it to allow parents an opportunity to work outside the home? Is that the purpose of it? Is it an economic measure to allow parents to pursue their careers — to quote the psychologist of the '60s, "the do your own thing syndrome," to have children and think it's perfectly correct to put those youngsters into day care centres as opposed to parenting through a normal day? Or is it because you sincerely believe, because of your psychology degree, it is the best thing for the children?

We have five children and six grandchildren, and very often we're required to babysit. Our youngest just turned five on Sunday. They're very smart, very clever, today. One of them had to be disciplined by my wife because that girl wasn't doing whatever it was she was supposed to do or was doing whatever it was she wasn't supposed to do. My wife attempted to chastise her, and the five year old, who wasn't five then, said, "Grandma, you're not qualified to babysit me." Where else could a youngster have learned that except from some of the philosophy floating around Alberta today in terms of so-called day care standards, where the establishment, the universities and institutions,

seems to know what is best for society, where the parents no longer — they're obviously qualified to have the children, because biologically that's what happens, but they're not qualified to raise the children.

I get concerned, Mr. Speaker. I often wonder if we ever consider that day care should be in the best interest of the youngster concerned. We get so wrapped up in the system that we forget why the system exists. Surely the system should exist to create a better atmosphere, a better environment, a better learning experience so that individuals, be they three months, one year, five years, or whatever, can face life with some degree of certainty in terms of normalization on the one hand and being accustomed to meeting other youngsters on the other hand. Unlike Manitoba we don't have a kindergarten system, because we think ECS is the best. Heaven help you if you're not one of the 25. Your kid is left out there somewhere until they get another group of 25.

Mr. Speaker, I recall the Honourable Lieutenant Governor being in this House from '75 to '79 as minister of social services. Certain things seem to remain with individuals; this one remained with me. I recall Her Honour quoting from a Senate committee on youth — that's a long time ago now; that's 12 years ago — and indicating that eight out of 10 youngsters aged 16 who were in conflict with the law had very clearly discernible learning disabilities, to the extent that they were identifiable at ages two, three, four, and five. I'm sure the hon. Member for Edmonton Avonmore is aware of what I'm talking about. Many of those youngsters who followed that era are today either in day care centres or exposed to day care centres. One has to wonder what experiences they are having.

I recall one of my daughters, who's now 27 or 28, in our school system, which is obviously the greatest in the country. Every province tells us that theirs is the greatest in the country. I assume ours must be. This daughter had a serious problem learning and was disciplined by the teacher because she wasn't learning at the proper rate and wasn't paying attention. We took my daughter to an optometrist, and it was discovered that she was blind in one eye. She sat at the back of the room expecting to see the blackboard. Obviously, she couldn't fathom anything. Once the optometrist had covered that eye and the youngster was moved to the front, within three weeks she was a straight A student. I often wonder: do we have youngsters today in the system, the so-called day care system with the high standards, that is best for the child?

I have some trouble, Mr. Speaker, when I look at — we're spending some \$5 million a month on day care in this province. That's about \$2 per month per youngster. Two years ago, until we unlocked that treasury of lottery money, we spent 31 cents a month for amateur sport; now we fund amateur sport to a very high degree. But we have to ask the question: for a \$60 million a year expenditure are we really getting the best out of the system, not in the interest of us as legislators, not in the best interests of the parents but, indeed, in the best interests of the youngsters concerned? I don't know that I am qualified to say that we're getting the best from the system.

I recall debating the goals and objectives of education in this House in '78-79. At that time the Member for Cardston pointed out that the typical family in the Cardston area, being of the Mormon faith, had family night as a major item in their faith; they think a lot of family. He was quoting an example put to him by a school principal in the Cardston area. They had, I think, some 25 students.



It was interesting as this principal related the activities of the students within his class and the number of times they saw their parents. Because of our modern society and the way the family structure has changed, they didn't spend three hours a week with those children. So how can we believe for one moment, Mr. Speaker, that changes in society, with the high expectations of society and television in society, haven't also reflected in a dramatic shift in the priorities we allocate to the so-called family structure, thereby I think being reflected in our attitudes toward raising our children and putting such a high importance on day care or what I would call the absentee parent carrying out that role?

Mr. Speaker, when I look at the motion of the Member for Calgary Foothills, I am very encouraged. I think back to driving down 99th Avenue in the darkness of 7:30 on a cold winter morning, watching these young parents on their way to work stopping to bundle these kids at minus 20 or 30 or 40 into in many ways a foreign environment every day of their working lives until they are ages five, six, or seven. Surely that can't be positive. When we look at the motion, the hon. member is saying: why can't we encourage the private sector as an inducement, as they do with pension plans? Let's not think that employers are benevolent and have pension plans; they are strings to attract employees. It's like workers' compensation waives the rule of litigation in the event of accidents. Why can't we come up with some system, as the motion clearly states, to "investigate ways to encourage" the private sector, particularly those who have employees on site, to have day care centres within their establishments?

Mr. Speaker, I'm strongly in support of that. I want to close by making a couple of comments as to where I think we should be changing the present system. Several years ago I was fortunate or unfortunate — I don't know which — to serve on the Calgary school closure committee, a committee of the caucus of this government. The proposal at that time was to close 32 schools, followed by 60 schools the following year. I'm a strong believer in community schools. I've always thought that if the law states that youngsters in this province must attend school until age 16, why don't we give more thought to having day care centres in school buildings? Heaven knows they are fireproof, they have playgrounds, they are secure, and they have all the infrastructure built into a school necessary for a day care centre. Why can't we see our way clear to saying to those who are interested in operating day care centres — not the public but the private sector — would you consider leasing two classrooms for a day care centre?

I don't know that we've ever approached it that way. It seems to me that as long as the law says you must attend school until you're 16, what better way is there to acclimatize youngsters than attending day care within their own community? When they're five years of age, they'll be going to school in the same building. With respect, Mr. Speaker, I think there is a lot of merit in that suggestion, compared to the basement of a Chinese restaurant, yet I have not heard it before. Within those 20-classroom community schools that are only occupied to the extent of five or six classrooms there is no reason why, with 180,000 senior citizens, we couldn't make one or two of those classrooms available to senior citizens and one or two to service clubs or community groups.

Why is it that we equate schooling with education? Frankly, I have difficulty understanding why one relates to the other. If our school system is so great, why do we

have three out of five marriages ending up in divorce? Why do we have such a high number in our jail system? Obviously, we as a society are not educating. We may be schooling. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps we could review the role of the community school and have community schools throughout Alberta, and within them we could have day care centres. I think there would be a lot of merit.

I want to close, Mr. Speaker, with a final thought. It seems to me that we as legislators seem to know best what's good for everybody. We fund the oil industry when it gets into trouble. We fund small business when it gets into trouble. We fund all kinds of things when they get into trouble. Everybody knows that if you live in a certain part of Edmonton, you're going to be flooded out with great regularity. Yet we find \$20 million, \$30 million, \$40 million, or whatever number of millions of dollars to help out. We don't seem to do much other than help out. Yet when we look at the role of the family, we all concede that we wouldn't be here unless we had a mother; that's a given. When we look at the way this province was built, with the family unit working together ...

We have to ask ourselves today: if we as a government say that your importance to our society is based in direct proportion to the amount of money you're paid — it tells you something about MLAs in this House — if your importance to our society is reflected in your paycheque or the amount of tax you pay, then what do we as a society think of a homemaker or mother? Here is a person who spends 12, 14, or 16 hours a day becoming an active part of society in raising children, yet in my view we see time after time that mother or homemaker really not being recognized in any way. We don't have a Family Day in this province; we don't have a Family Week to my knowledge. We have Agriculture Week, we have Cancer Month, we have all this, but we just don't seem to pay attention. Maybe that's society. Maybe society says, "Forget the family." I can't believe that. Family is still the cornerstone of our society.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, that we as a government could go a long way in making the future much brighter for the young people today who go daily to day care centres if we would say, "The family is important to our society, and we will do the following to encourage that." One of those ways is not relying on the artificial form of day care centres for building our society, but if that's the wish of the parent, then we should do everything we can to encourage a very positive environment.

Mr. Speaker, I very much support the hon. Member for Calgary Foothills' motion that we should investigate ways of encouraging mothers and fathers, or parents in general, to be able to have day care centres at their places of employment. Thank you.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the motion, I must say I speak in favour of it. Both the mover of the resolution and the most recent speaker, the hon. Member for Lethbridge West, have restored my faith or at least given me some feeling of thanks or understanding of why the word "progressive" goes in the words "Progressive Conservative." They truly are progressives, and I am glad they are over there. My only regret after listening to them and cheering them on is that they're not on the front bench rather than back a few. Nevertheless, I guess we should be thankful for small mercies and realize that with that type

of thinking on the government side, they're not going to be all bad.

In supporting the motion that the Member for Calgary Foothills put forward, I think she certainly outlined it better than I could. As somebody that has run a number of corporations in different parts of the world, I think one of the main things that needs to be given is not so much money — and this wouldn't cost the government that much — as leadership to the corporate sector. I think the corporations would take very little convincing indeed to be told that their employees would be better employees if a day care were close by so that the parents could check in from time to time, at lunch or even a coffee break. Maybe a co-operative — maybe a company wouldn't be big enough to do its own day care, but they could co-operate in other ways.

I have a feeling that it would be very low cost indeed if you'd give some leadership to the corporations, maybe to the extent of locating an area where the day care centre could be located, maybe putting together the co-op amongst the corporations, maybe putting all the companies in a particular high rise together to work on it. As an employer for some years and in some different jurisdictions, I don't think I need much convincing that a good day care centre that's handy and close to the place of work is actually an economic asset for the corporation and you get much better work out of your employees. It's just that half the time you're talking to somebody in a corporation that may be very good at manufacturing widgets or drilling oil wells or fighting law cases, but when you tell them to put together a day care centre, they are going to throw up their hands and say it's beyond them. So I think it's something that could be done quite cheaply, and I want to compliment the minister from Calgary Foothills — a Freudian slip — the Member for Calgary Foothills for bringing it forward.

I might also mention that in a day and age of traditional conservative or liberal, a good many politicians speak about preserving the family unit. At one time day care was thought of as breaking up the family unit, because after all it allowed the lady of the house to get out and get a job and maybe tell the old man where to go if he was a little too tough. Now I think day care centres in fact strengthen the family unit, because we have so many single-parent family units today. To try to pretend they don't exist or try to force it back into the old-fashioned type of family unit, which has nothing wrong with it, ignores the fact that many of our families today are being brought up by single parents. Both men and women are becoming single parents. Let's support the family unit. Let's realize that where a generation ago, or maybe even two or three generations ago, supporting a family unit might have meant making it tough for day care centres, making it tough for divorce, making it tough in other areas, it has changed today to where supporting a family unit would actually be helping out in day care situations.

I know the hon. Member for Lethbridge West mentioned whether or not day care centres were a good way to bring up children. I must confess that I don't know. I do realize that after we had one child, we knew all about how to bring up children. After two children, I still thought I was an expert. When it got to four children, I began to realize I didn't know too much about it. By the time nine had arrived, I had given up, I can tell you. So to have anybody get out and tell you — now we have seven grandchildren. Watching two generations of children being raised, I'm not an expert on raising children, but I am this: I'm very

suspicious of anybody that tells me they're an expert at raising children. I tell them, "Show me an expert on raising children and I'll show you somebody who doesn't know too much about children."

I think back now about raising my own family. Maybe I spared the rod and spoiled the child; I had listened to that. I know now from watching my grandchildren — I think I have two single parents amongst my family, and they're doing a very good job of raising their children, just as good as the ones that have both parents at work. To come out and say now that the single parent or the two parents — that one is better than the other or one has to be encouraged and one discouraged, I'm not in a position to say, and I doubt whether very many others are today. I think the point is, though, as the hon. Member for Calgary Foothills said, to get out there and try to put these organizations together, try to give some leadership and some help.

If I may add anything at all to it, it's some of the things I've observed around the world. I recall my first contracts working behind the iron curtain in the late '50s and early '60s. It was rather intriguing. Day care centres were almost unheard of over here, or if they were, they were very expensive. But of course in Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Poland, and west Russia day care centres had been around since the 1920s. It was always amazing to me to talk to wives of my confreres over there. They looked forward to the day — they looked for government aid to stay home. The idea of having a day care centre was not a thrill. It was not something they looked forward to. They thought the real thing was somehow or another getting that grant after they had a baby in order to stay home. Most of the populations were in decline then; they got a grant after having a baby.

They were the absolute opposite of what we were. We were working on figuring out how to get that woman out of the home so she would get some identification, some method of feeling important, by getting out in the job world. It just showed me, though, after working back and forth in the areas, that it depended a lot on your cultural background and maybe a little bit on history. We have a tendency to cycle, and this is why I want to bring forward that if we're talking about encouraging day care schools, I would like to think of us at the same time also coming up with some sort of financial reward for those women or men, those parents, that want to stay home. In other words, let's not get so carried away that we do as the countries behind the iron curtain did in the 1920s to the '60s: they suddenly started to turn around and put money up to try to encourage people to stay home until the child was five years of age.

Maybe we should be remembering a dual program. In other words there may be some single parents or other parents that want to work, but there may be other areas where we could, by a small amount of money — probably a lot less than the subsidies we pay to keep day care centres going — be able to encourage some parents to stay at home, not so much encourage them but allow them to stay at home without the terrific financial cost that it now is when they compare it to what it would be if they could use a subsidized day care centre and earn a salary at the same time. In other words, it has to be done in balance.

I may also add to the motion that I think one of the areas we often overlook today is rural parents. I think the mobility of rural parents today means that day care centres — maybe just stretching employers and corporations a bit — could be used in rural areas much more than they

thought, maybe co-operatively. Often people think of day care centres as being an urban idea. I would submit that it can also be a rural idea, because the woman on the farm today in particular is often a partner in the work outside and around just as much as some parent in the city who goes to work for seven hours a day. Consequently, if at all possible they should have equity in funding or at least access to anything the urban parent has in the way of aid to establish day care centres.

The hon. Member for Lethbridge West mentioned the idea of community schools. I was going to toss one back. I noticed the Member for Calgary Foothills is doing more research on it. In the early '70s when Chairman Mao ran China, I spent a great deal of time in China. As a matter of fact, I was a consultant in trying to get under way their energy industries and offshore drilling in the wide river mouths in the three major areas. One of the things of interest I noticed was that their day care homes were quite often established in conjunction with senior citizens' homes, thereby maybe cementing the oldest bond known to history between the very old and the very young. We see it in pictures; we see it in paintings; we all remember our favourite grandfather or our favourite granduncle. Consequently, I thought it was a very good idea and one that I haven't seen explored here. It would give some motive, some focus in life to the senior citizen and, at the same time, that care. It may not have the degrees that are necessary. It may not have all the social worker input. Nevertheless, it has attention, companionship, and love, which are sometimes awfully hard to replace when you put together a day care institution.

With that, I have given a brief summary of my remarks and feelings. Again, before I sit down, I'd like to compliment the Member for Calgary Foothills for bringing the motion forward.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, I think a few points should be added to the debate here. The Member for Lethbridge West made a number of observations that I think require a little bit of response.

One of the things he referred to is that he seems to think there is no need for having any sort of standards in terms of day care. He went on about how everyone seems to know best except for the parents. Just this afternoon we got into a discussion where the Minister of Education assured us there were no schools in the province that would be operating without certified teachers. Why is that? I think the reason we have that kind of regulation is that the children of this province are so important and so special that we have to be assured that the people who are dealing with them for their care, their training, and their schooling have some understanding of child development and learning.

It seems to me a bit inconsistent to say that at five years of age when they go into the ECS formal schooling system they're entitled to all of the standards, the trained staff, the quality programs, the space requirements, and so on, in the formal schooling system but that at four years of age or younger all of a sudden anything goes. I think if we are really concerned about our children's well-being and their development in terms of emotionally stable, well-rounded individuals, we have to be very concerned about the question of standards and trained staff. While I think the question of encouraging private businesses to have day care centres may be one that has some merit, it would seem that before we get into an extension of that, we should be clear that those kinds of centres must have and must

subscribe to very clear standards of staff training and space and ensure that they're going to be offering quality programs.

One of the other references that the Member for Lethbridge West made was to the importance of the family. There's no question — absolutely none — that the family is an important unit in this society, Mr. Speaker. I think perhaps what the Member for Lethbridge West may not have observed is that the nature of the family unit in our society is changing and evolving. There is not just the traditional nuclear family anymore; there is a whole variety of forms of families. There are single-parent families, some with the mother as the head, others with the father as the head. There are blended families. There are extended families of one sort or another with relatives or nonrelated other friends and important people in the family unit. The last figures I saw for the United States, and I think they'd probably be applicable to Canada, are that the traditional nuclear family of the mother and the father — the father bringing home the paycheque, the mother at home looking after two children — is a minority grouping in the family structures of our society. I think we need to look in terms of supporting all the different forms the family has evolved into in the context of the kind of society ours is evolving into.

Another point that needs to be made is that often the reason more and more people are looking at the question of day care for their children, Mr. Speaker, is that in our society we seem to be unable to commit ourselves to a policy of full employment and a policy of living wages for people who are working. I can tell you that in my constituency there are people who have families who are trying to make ends meet at \$4 and \$5 an hour, at the minimum wage. When this government comes around to realizing that people have to get a decent wage for their labour so they can support their family, maybe the father or the mother might be able to feel more comfortable staying at home and taking on the responsibility for the care of the children. But many people in our society at the lower levels of income just cannot afford it. There is no way you can support a family, let alone yourself, when you're making \$4 or even \$5 an hour, at \$800 a month, let's say. You take home perhaps \$700. The rent is \$500. You're trying to feed somebody and clothe them. There's just absolutely no way on one income. So many people are basically forced into circumstances where they need good quality child care so that both parents can work to try to bring home enough money to keep the family economically viable.

To conclude, I would just say that while the motion here certainly has some merit, there are important questions of standards that have yet to be addressed in terms of trained staff and in making sure that we have quality programs that can be offered. Until we address those issues, I think it would be premature to look at expanding the day care system into corporations.

MR. SPEAKER: May the member sum up?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS. KOPER: Mr. Speaker, there have been 17 members from all points in Alberta speaking on this issue. Over the period of time this House has spent on it, I feel that every single person who addressed the issue this motion is directed to has spoken with the best interests of the children at heart. I think that was certainly brought out by those speakers this afternoon. The Member for Lethbridge West brought

out some very pertinent points about examining our overall purposes in day care and why we are involved in this program. He also had some positive suggestions about how the community can co-operate — the infrastructure in schools. The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon talked about the use of senior citizens' homes and the factor of this happy combination of the young and older people. The Member for Edmonton Mill Woods talked about the changing needs of the family. This was brought up by many speakers in our initial discussion of why we should be talking about this motion.

It all started from the basic premise of, first of all, what is best for children. The increased participation of women in the work force and the actual need, in this province particularly, for their skills and the valuable things they can contribute to our work force has made it necessary to look at some way to implement child care that meets the needs in the very best way, first of all for the children, secondly for the parents, and thirdly for the people who are employing parents. There are benefits to the family, the business, and the employee, but there must be benefits and care for the children.

Since the time we first debated this motion, Mr. Speaker, a few things have happened that perhaps we should call to the attention of the House. For instance, Alderman Craig Reid in the city of Calgary has come forward with the idea that when new businesses apply for land use or redesignations of development permit authorizations, day care spaces should be part of the authorization. They should be a condition of the city's approval. That was brought out for consideration at that time.

The Member for Gold Bar spoke of the reality of parent monitoring and how parents are very, very busy. There are other ways parents can monitor that. As we educate people and there is more public reaction such as that, I feel we will increase the level of awareness of parents and make a team of the day care operators, the parents, and the child.

It was also noted that there is a move afoot at Calgary city hall since we discussed our motion. The city of Calgary is providing a \$40,000 start-up grant for the day care centre in its new city hall. It has been included in the building's design. It will be operated by an employee group, including membership from the unions and professional associations of city hall. At least half of the maximum of 80 spaces should be open by November.

We have other examples as well of day care centres that are affiliated with the workplace. If one considers education as work and we look at the regions in Alberta, there are three in the northeast that operate day care centres: the Blue Quills Native Education Council, the AVC training centre at Lac La Biche, and Keyano College. There are nine in Edmonton and three in region 4. Michener Centre has a day care centre that is operated for staff. There are nine day cares in Calgary related to educational or hospital centres and two in region 6. So I feel that the public sector is very much involved in the issue of day care in the workplace, Mr. Speaker. We have a precedent established.

I believe the Member for Edmonton Calder mentioned leadership from this government. Two years ago there was a directive from the minister of social services asking if employees were interested in this. I could see the present minister being willing to listen to that.

I also want to reflect on the idea that the government should look at standards. When the Member for Cypress-Redcliff addressed the House, he very plainly brought forth two of the recommendations from the Social Care Facilities

Review Committee which addressed that very issue. They are on page 206 of the June 24th *Hansard*. For the record, I think that certainly reflects that the minister is aware of this issue and is investigating standards.

Mr. Speaker, government can help. The Member for Calgary North West described the roles that government needs to play in maintaining regulations and standards: minimum requirements for the physical plant, health standards, and standards for the supervision of students. The quality of the programs is indeed important to these centres. That's why there is a social care facilities review.

Mr. Speaker, I think this motion will give an added flexibility and alternative to parents if it could be discussed by our government. There are all sorts of ways it could be done; e.g., through tax incentives to employers if a nonprofit entity were established. We need to address the cost. As the hon. Member for Lethbridge West mentioned, we are paying \$5 million a month. There are ways of doing it. The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon agreed we could use that money in a better way.

Mr. Speaker, I hope members will support the passage of this motion. The underlying consideration of it all is what is best for children.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Gogo in the Chair]

219. Moved by Mr. Brassard:

Be it resolved that the government of Alberta continue research into effective weather modification and consider expansion of the operational cloud seeding program to reduce the impact of both hail and drought.

MR. BRASSARD: Mr. Speaker, the first year we moved to our farm, I recall walking across the fields and reaching down and checking a handful of earth every so often, just like on TV. I didn't really know what I was looking for at the time, but I do know there were a great many hopes and dreams attached to that day. It was a very poor hay crop, and we decided to break the land that fall. After picking rocks and living with the dust of it all for six months, it was finally put back into production the following spring. Anyone who has planted even a flower box has experienced the pride of accomplishment when the first tiny shoots finally appear. You tend to hover over it and measure the growth almost daily for a while.

I'd always been able to just turn the water hose on my garden when I thought it looked a little dry, but looking out over that dry field of new growth, it was the first time in my life that I truly appreciated how totally the farmer is dependent on the weather. I remember saying a quiet little prayer for rain that night. Of course, we did indeed finally get rain, and the crop grew. It was fertilized, sprayed for weeds, and discussed at great length, and it seemed to thrive on all the attention. It was a great crop.

A friend of mine was visiting from Manitoba, and I took him home to show him the farm and the crop that was almost ready for harvest. As we visited over coffee, it started to rain, and the rain quickly turned to hail. Mr. Speaker, we stood at the kitchen window and watched that hailstorm totally destroy our field of grain. I recall the feelings of frustration, anger, and futility at not being able to do one single thing to prevent what was happening or even lessen the damage. I remember walking through the

wet stubble afterwards almost in tears wondering why anyone in their right mind would want to farm for a living and set themselves up for this kind of desolation. It was then I was convinced that anything that could be done should be done, and I have supported hail suppression ever since.

We live in one of the two highest hail areas in North America. The only other area subjected to a similar degree of affliction is east of Denver, Colorado. These two areas are by far the worst in North America, and we alone receive an average of 61 hailstorms every year — one of the worst areas on earth, as a matter of fact. We are indeed recognized as "hail alley" with just cause. It is this very fact that prompted action back in the 1950s using the Krick ground generator system. These early efforts were initiated by the farmers themselves, who formed the Alberta Weather Modification Co-op. It was formed in desperation, since farms were being hailed out six and seven years in a row. Funding was supplied on a voluntary basis and augmented by municipal revenue providing they were able to obtain two-thirds majority support in a plebiscite. There was a great amount of controversy surrounding the program even then. There was natural skepticism without proven results or understandable methods, and there was always that uneasy feeling that we were fooling around with something that had always been the domain of the good Lord above. However, the program went ahead.

The Weather Modification Co-op was followed by the Alberta Research Council's hail studies project in 1956, which was organized by meteorologists from McGill University. Then came Project Hail Stop in 1969, followed in 1976 by the Alberta hail project administered by the Alberta Weather Modification Board and created by the Minister of Agriculture. The methods became more sophisticated as well.

Hail is basically nothing more than frozen raindrops which keep recirculating in a cloud until released by a number of forces. As the hailstones fall to the ground, they melt, but if they are too large, they are still solid when they reach the ground. Hailstones can get as large as baseballs, and the major aim of hail suppression research has been to reduce the size of hail so that as it falls to the ground, it will melt into rain. By releasing the number of freezing nuclei inside a cloud, more water droplets will freeze and their average size will be smaller. These smaller particles formed may melt completely and fall to earth as rain. If they melt only partially, the resulting hailstones will be smaller and softer and less damaging.

From this concept came the theory of cloud seeding. By introducing artificial nuclei into the cloud, the desired results can be brought about. In the 1940s a Dr. Irving P. Krick at the California Institute of Technology meteorology department devised a method of injecting silver iodide into a cloud formation, thereby bringing about the desired results. Dr. Krick was basically a weatherman with exceptional credentials.

Further work done by a group of General Electric research laboratories in New York under the direction of Dr. Irving Langmuir and Vincent Shaeffer found that they could literally produce a snowstorm almost at will. A very small quantity of silver iodide, when vapourized, can produce billions of invisible particles, each particle capable of acting as a nucleus for the formation of an ice crystal which ultimately becomes a snowflake and falls to the earth as rain when surface temperatures are above freezing and snow when the surface temperatures are below. They were convinced that they could have a radical effect on rain and snow as well as

hail. This was indeed radical thinking, and it has been surrounded by controversy ever since.

The Krick system uses generators resembling an overgrown barbecue strategically placed over a given area, putting out the required amount of silver iodide which integrates with the clouds overhead to act as the catalyst and produce the results I spoke of. These generators eventually were augmented by airplanes and most recently were replaced by them completely.

Cloud seeding is expensive. We have spent in excess of \$40 million since this provincial funding first started, over \$20 million of it in the last five-year program, so there's no question that the review is timely, if not imperative. I have difficulty understanding just why the results of the past five years and earlier can't be evaluated over the winter months, since the seeding actually takes place only over June, July, and August.

This research program has attracted scientists from around the world who come to see firsthand what I suppose is an ideal outdoor laboratory for weather modification research. The Research Council has the best qualified scientific team in North America studying not only the weather but severe convective storms and has produced the best documented case studies in the world demonstrating that seeding cumulus clouds using dry ice or silver iodide can induce clouds which would not normally rain to produce rain. We have developed advanced techniques for severe weather forecasting which are applied in Alberta and could be applied throughout Canada. We have developed techniques for applying weather radar information to stream flow forecasting and remote rainfall measurement. The Research Council in co-operation with INTERA Technologies Ltd. has developed a flying atmospheric research laboratory capable of not only probing the dynamics of a storm but the investigation of other atmospheric problems such as pollution studies.

Airborne cloud seeding has been used in the winter months in an attempt to increase snowfall in areas that feed runoff from the Eastern Slopes of the Rockies, which would increase water supplies for agriculture and aid overall water management in southern Alberta. This has already been successfully applied in many parts of the United States to enhance the snowpack and increase hydro capacity or improve spring runoffs in river systems.

From the standpoint of pure research the program has already proven successful. From the perspective of applied research, however, the results are somewhat less conclusive. What started out as pure hail suppression has been logically extended into the general areas of weather modification and, while truly beneficial, also makes the results less conclusively defined.

One of the most confusing factors with which the researchers have had to contend is the natural variability of our climate. Attempting to distinguish the normal variations from those produced by cloud seeding experiments has been the greatest challenge from the beginning and remains so today. This year has been an excellent example of just about ideal farming weather without any help from artificial sources, but therein lies the danger. We must not delude ourselves based simply on this year's good weather performance; there have been far too many consistently bad ones.

We have already been told by some scientific sources that the hail suppression program may have cut farmers' losses by as much as 25 percent, and the benefit to cost ratio is 10 to 1. I think these facts must remain our primary focus. Our attention and responsibility must remain directed

toward the benefit of the farming industry as opposed to the scientific community. Hail suppression must remain our first priority, with all other considerations secondary. If the scientists conclude that the program over the past five years has been beneficial, then it must be reinstated immediately.

That's why this motion is so important at this time, even before the results of the study. An effective program begins in June, and preparations will have to be put in place well in advance of that. If the results of the review are indeed positive, it will be too late to open up this subject for discussion next spring and still get the approval of this Assembly in time to be effective next summer. As I said at the start, Mr. Speaker, whatever can be done, must be done. I ask for the support of this Assembly on Motion 219.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak to Motion 219, sponsored by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury. The level of technology needed to reduce hail and increase precipitation is difficult to describe in terms that are both accurate and definitive. I could use many different kinds of adjectives to describe this — high, progressive, or advanced — but they do not indicate in any way the difficult question that a weather modification program must address.

I am told that in a sense the gestation of Alberta's weather modification program can be compared to the process required to create a new airplane. A new plane doesn't just suddenly appear. It can take several years to go from the initial concept to a fully developed design. During this time different aspects — engines, wings, hydraulics, electrical systems, and many other parts — must be fully evaluated and researched. Finally a prototype is built, tested, and retested to ensure that the plane will perform faultlessly all the time. Only when you reach that point, after months and years of testing, research, retesting, and further research, are you finally ready to enter into full production. That, it is said, is how you design and build a successful airplane.

The process of designing a weather modification program is similar: testing and research repeated again and again. However, measuring the success of weather modification isn't quite as simple as rating the success of an aircraft. When a plane flies, we know it's successful. However, with current technology, when silver iodide particles are injected into clouds, it is not known with complete assurance what effect that action will have. In other words, we don't know if weather modification will fly. Therefore, it seems that any valid debate on the value of weather modification research and an operational weather modification program must start with examining the objectives of efforts such as these.

For the last five years the primary purpose of the Alberta weather modification research program has been to find out whether scientists can reduce the damage to crops caused by hail and reduce poor yields caused by drought. Though it has not been a major research objective, reducing the incidence of heavy hail might also save Albertans millions of dollars every year in damage to cars and buildings. However, even while the program has attempted to meet these objectives, it has also had a responsibility to discover whether these efforts might cause environmental damage and whether they may take from nature so much precipitation that agriculture to the east and south will suffer as a result.

Those objectives are difficult. They are made more difficult because in many cases there are no firm rules,

standards, or guidelines to say what is right or what is wrong. I understand guidelines had to be developed as the program developed. Compounding the difficulty is the very nature of weather. Weather is variable day to day and year to year so that you are not exactly sure whether an increase or decrease in rainfall or hail today is the result of something like cloud seeding or a variation in long-term weather patterns. So in evaluating the merit of having a weather modification program in Alberta, Mr. Speaker, we must consider the benefits of goals like reducing hail and increasing rainfall against the difficulties I outlined, and that's not easy.

I would draw members' attention to the subject of ozone damage in the atmosphere. In the 1970s, I am told, scientists raised the alarm that the use of fluorocarbons in aerosols might be damaging the ozone layer, which protects us from the damaging rays of the sun. When government controls were designed limiting the use of fluorocarbons, we all thought the ozone question was settled. Today, a number of years later, scientists are worried because a hole in the world's ozone layer approximately the size of Canada has shown up over the Antarctic. Scientists have no ready explanation for the disappearance of ozone. It could be a normal, long-term variation, or it could be the result of chemicals which are released when styrofoam plastic cups are destroyed. Who knows? However, this phenomenon is causing concern, and I bring it up because I believe we must be as sure as we possibly can that weather modification efforts do not lead to long-term difficulties that will haunt us in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I admit that some of the physics of a subject like weather modification are away beyond my ability to comprehend, as I would think they are to most members. Not many of us here are scientists, and it takes scientific expertise to answer valid questions such as: if we were to achieve increased rainfall during summer months, would we be dealing with moisture that was coming from across the Rockies and would normally be going farther east or would we be dealing with evaporation, which I think it is reasonable to say is moisture which originates in Alberta and which we have a right to try and retain in this province? This is a difficult question to ask much less to answer. Yet it is just one of many which must be considered in evaluating the need, potential, and implementation of any structured, government-sponsored weather modification program.

Questions like that have been at the heart of weather modification efforts in Alberta since the beginning. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take some time to go through some of the history of this program. With its frequent hailstorms and its highly variable precipitation, Alberta is a natural choice for the site of weather modification research. For instance, the area surrounding Red Deer, with an average of 61 storms per summer, boasts the highest hail frequency in the world. It is not surprising then that Alberta farmers became active supporters of weather modification almost as soon as the subject emerged as a possible area for scientific intervention. In fact, this occurred early in the 1950s, when the scientists at McGill University conducted their pioneering research on hail formation. These advances later became the foundation for hail seeding research in Alberta.

As members are aware, to date hail suppression has been the main focus of weather modification efforts in the province. These started in 1956, when the producers in the municipal district of Kneehill and the county of Mountain View, two areas particularly hard hit by hailstorms, formed the Alberta Weather Modification Co-op. Soon after its

formation, the co-op hired a private consulting firm to carry out suppression, which was later supplemented with aircraft seeders. These particular weather modification efforts continued until 1968.

Support for the co-op program ran high in the farming community from the first. This prompted the Alberta Research Council to implement its Alberta hail studies project in 1956. The purpose of this project, which was sponsored by the Stormy Weather Group at McGill University, was to obtain much needed background on the hailstorm process. By 1969 researchers felt they understood enough about hail formation to implement Project Hail Stop, which consisted of a series of experiments designed to assess the effects of cloud seeding. The findings of this research eventually led to the establishment of the Alberta hail project in 1974.

The hail project was initially a five-year effort aimed at determining the technical feasibility of hail suppression with particular emphasis on operational cloud seeding. The project was administered by the Alberta Weather Modification Board, a 10-member body established for the purpose by the Minister of Agriculture, while the research was conducted by the Alberta Research Council. The program attracted international attention and was granted a short extension in 1979 to undergo what now seems to have become a traditional five-year review.

In 1981 the program became another five-year mandate as part of the weather modification research program of the Alberta Research Council atmospheric sciences department. The objective of this program was to conduct technical and economic feasibility assessments of hail suppression, rainfall management, and snowfall augmentation and to develop an experimental design for assessing the economics of weather modification in general. While the program was administered by the Alberta Research Council, it was funded by Alberta Agriculture and received general direction from the weather modification advisory committee, which was appointed by the Minister of Agriculture.

As members are aware, Mr. Speaker, the weather modification research program received sufficient funding this year to complete its report on activities of the last five years. This report will contain, I am sure, recommendations concerning the future of funding and operations of weather modification efforts in Alberta.

Last spring, when the review of the program was announced, many individuals were concerned about the hail damage farmers would suffer. However, if there has ever been a year when the hail project could be reviewed without serious consequences, it is 1986. As was pointed out in the July issue of the *Conservation Tillage News*:

This is one year that a farmer won't mind being hailed out. The value of the crop insurance is higher than in the market (over \$4 a bushel for [insured] wheat compared to [wheat selling for] about \$3.50 in the market). If [the farmer's] lucky, the hail hits. He has his money with no concerns about quota, delivery schedules, cash flow, etc.

However, the main point in the article, which is entitled *Hail Suppression Suspended*, was:

While farmers may be convinced the program has proven benefits, [those benefits] are far from proven scientifically. One of the problems with the project is that it has been very difficult to gather data on unseeded storms.

So suspending the actual cloud seeding for a year will provide a data base on unseeded storms which can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of cloud seeding. This is

fortunate because this will add to the research on weather modification in a passive sense.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of further research in any area that can benefit agriculture. As the MLA who sits on the Agricultural Research Council of Alberta, which administers the Farming for the Future agricultural research program, I have learned firsthand how critical research is to our farm industry and how it has better equipped farmers to handle drought, disease, international competition, and a host of other problems. Hail costs Alberta producers an average of \$150 million per year in crop damage, and I think we should do everything possible to find ways to reduce that damage. However, weather modification research goes much further than simple hail reduction. During the last mandate, the weather modification research program was specifically asked to investigate rain augmentation and snowpack enhancement. If one or both of these studies were successful, the benefit to Alberta farmers could be hundreds of millions if not billions of dollars per year. As I understand it, snowpack enhancement in particular offers considerable potential. In the south we depend very much on spring runoff to build up river flows, which in turn replenishes the water storage facilities in our irrigation network. With heritage fund dollars going toward building structures which will be able to irrigate 1.5 million acres, we must ensure that there is sufficient water to supply our irrigation network. In my view, this is just one reason why further research in weather modification is very important.

I hesitate to favour implementing an operational program until I have at least seen the results and recommendations which come out of the review of the last five-year program. I anticipate that we will see those recommendations in late October or early November, when the Premier asked that the review be completed. However, I will note to hon. members that if weather modification research is to continue, we will not be able to deliberate for many months without seriously jeopardizing the effort. As we have found out so often with Farming for the Future, qualified manpower is the key component in any research effort, and the skills, talents, and knowledge required for weather modification research are very special indeed.

In the July/August issue of *Alberta Farm and Ranch* the supplement Trends notes that suspension of weather modification research has Unifarm concerned "most particularly about the loss of knowledgeable program staff." In *Conservation Tillage News* the concern was expressed that

the move has some worried that suspension of the program will result in the loss of valuable research staff.

I share that concern. The best estimate is that if a decision on future weather modification research is not made by the end of the fiscal year, that is next March, many of the staff will be permanently lost to us. This would seriously impair future weather modification research efforts in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, over the last five years weather modification research has cost \$26.3 million, or about \$5.25 million per year. If, as some people claim, our hail losses of \$150 million per year were reduced by 25 percent through weather modification efforts, that would be a very favourable return on the investment. If, as others claim, we can add hundreds of millions of dollars per year to Alberta's economy through rain augmentation and snowpack enhancement, the return would probably be considered an economic miracle.

As I stated previously, I remain to be convinced of the environmental aspects of weather modification efforts. I think they must be properly researched and identified before

any full-scale operational program goes into effect. I also maintain, Mr. Speaker, that we will never have the information we need to make any final decisions on the viability of weather modification programs without further research, for which we require qualified research personnel. It is for these reasons that I eagerly await the upcoming weather modification review and hope that we will be able to support further research in this very important area of agriculture in coming years.

Thank you.

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to be able to rise at this time to speak in support of Motion 219. I want to begin by complimenting and thanking my friend and colleague the Member for Olds-Didsbury for bringing this motion forward at his first opportunity. I also want to acknowledge the comments of the Member for Innisfail. Some of you might know that the weather modification research centre is located at the Penhold airport. For a good number of years that Penhold base was located in the Innisfail constituency, but thanks to the recent boundary adjustments, I can proudly state that the research station is now located in the new constituency of Red Deer South.

Mr. Speaker, for most Albertans the weather, whether it be rain or shine, is nothing too serious. Sure, it's inconvenient at times. Generally speaking, we all like to have warm, sunny days in the summer, we don't like to be rained and snowed on, and normally we don't appreciate hailstorms, although there are times in the cities when hailstorms are found to be intriguing as well. But overall the consequences of weather are of little significance to us. However, for others in the province the arrival or absence of rain, hail, or snow can mean the difference between prosperity and financial hardship, a bumper year and a disaster year.

For Alberta's farmers weather is more than just a trivial concern. Put yourself in the shoes of a farmer. One moment you're out on your doorstep admiring bumper crops as they glisten in the sun, and as is so often the case in Alberta, 10 minutes later the weather has changed and your total year's earnings are being pulverized, destroyed by a hailstorm. I think the Member for Olds-Didsbury did a tremendous job of alluding to the feelings, heartaches, and anguish suffered in those circumstances. I think that's something only a farmer can fully appreciate and empathize with. In spite of the central role weather plays in their welfare, most farmers accept inclement weather with resignation. Farmers have had to accept it, for ultimately their success or failure depends on forces well beyond their control.

Today, Mr. Speaker, things may be changing. This new field we're talking about — and relatively speaking it is a new field, although the Member for Innisfail did a good job of bringing out some of the history of weather modification. It goes back a considerable number of years, but it is a new field. Hopefully with just a little more success we can end the tyranny of weather over farming. I personally believe that we are on the brink of opening totally new horizons, the potential for a whole new era in farming. We in Alberta are world leaders in the technology we are exploring and developing. We have built, as was alluded to earlier by the Member for Olds-Didsbury, the best qualified team in North America to examine and develop weather modification. We in Alberta have a leading edge in this field. Our research has provided some of the best documented cases in the world.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, weather modification is a systematic attempt to alter climatic factors for the benefit of agriculture and the economy as a whole. There are three main branches: one, hail suppression; two, rainfall augmentation; and three, snowpack enhancement. In reference to hail suppression, the merit is obvious. The Alberta Research Council estimates that in Alberta hail losses to crops alone amount to \$150 million per year on average, with another \$25 million in property damage. Actual losses are probably much higher since insurance usually does not fully cover losses and not all farmers are insured. The \$5 million that was allocated annually to weather modification and largely devoted to hail suppression was not excessive by any means when you put it in perspective with the losses sustained. Even with a limited amount of success, Albertans stand to gain a tremendous amount in the long term.

I know I don't have to expound the merits of our agricultural industry in this Assembly. This government is a hundred percent committed to working with that very critical sector of our economy towards a prosperous outcome. I would only remind my colleagues that Alberta has an agricultural industry with values of farm receipts amounting to about \$4 billion Canadian and that we are producing about 25 percent of Canada's wheat and 50 percent of Canada's barley.

In relation to the second main branch of weather modification I alluded to earlier, rainfall augmentation, again the merit is obvious. Farmers and Albertans are critically dependent on the appropriate timing and amount of rainfall. Imagine if we could enhance that. Think of what it would do for our south country. Think of what it could mean in terms of savings as it relates to the dams we're building, the irrigation systems that we've spent on, and the other process we're utilizing at this time.

The third branch of weather modification is snowpack augmentation. I would only point out the potential for providing more reliable and greater flow of water in Alberta's river systems, not to mention the advantages for our ski industry and thus our tourist industry. Mount Allan, Lake Louise, and others might not need the multimillion dollar expenditures they are now spending on snowmaking.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to say that I have had the opportunity of visiting the weather modification research station in my constituency on numerous occasions, most recently with the minister of high technology, the hon. Mr. Young, and two representatives from his department and also my colleague the Member for Red Deer North, Stockwell Day. I have to say that it was a lonely feeling going through the operation this time. The offices, the specialized equipment, the displays, and the furnishings were all there, but what was normally a hub of activity in the summertime was geared down to almost a standstill while we await the outcome of the summary report and review.

Mr. Speaker, now is not the time to let up on this very critical work. The more I read on weather modification, the more information that I see and receive, the more committed I am to forging ahead. It means too much to our farming community and to Albertans as a whole to let up now. Look at the major accomplishments of this project to date. The Member for Olds-Didsbury has already mentioned some of these accomplishments, but I believe they are worth highlighting once again. One, as I mentioned earlier, probably the best qualified team in North America; I mention this again because I feel it is absolutely critical that we keep this expertise together for the future. Two, again as mentioned earlier, the Alberta Research Council



in co-operation with INTERA Technologies has developed a flying atmospheric research laboratory, and it's second to none in the world. We have provided some of the best documented case studies in the world which demonstrate clearly that seeding cumulus clouds with dry ice or silver iodide can induce clouds that would not naturally rain to produce rain. So we are making some inroads.

The research project has greatly enhanced or increased the knowledge of hailstorms over the central Alberta area and has demonstrated that cloud seeding does have an effect on these storms. There is a much better understanding now of the conditions over the Rocky Mountains in southern Alberta during the late winter months: It has been demonstrated that conditions exist in which cloud seeding should be able to increase snowfall; it has worked. The project has developed advanced techniques for severe weather forecasting. The ramifications and implications reach far beyond the borders of this province and could easily be applied throughout Canada and elsewhere. As mentioned earlier, the Alberta Research Council has developed techniques for applying weather radar information to stream flow forecasting and remote rainfall measurement.

Mr. Speaker, the project has accomplished a lot already. It obviously has merit and is the field of the future. Let's carry on that great Alberta tradition. We are pioneers and leaders. Let us continue to explore into the future. One aspect of weather modification about which no question remains is the issue of benefit, for there can be no doubt that if perfected, weather modification would be a tremendous advance not only for the farming sector but for the province as a whole. I would encourage the swift passage of Motion 219.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on Motion 219, at the outset I too would like to compliment the Member for Olds-Didsbury on his thorough and well-documented presentation. I think it's time indeed for someone to pay tribute to the efforts of the Alberta Weather Modification Co-op over the years in trying to cope with some of the very serious problems producers face, especially in the zone to which the Member for Olds-Didsbury referred, which is one of the highest hail risk areas in our farming communities.

The motion in general is something that members on both sides would certainly support. That is, we support continued research and consider expansion of the cloud seeding program. It's a fairly general motion, and the reasons we would support this have certainly been stated very clearly by the members for Innisfail and Red Deer South. I find myself in some ways being left with little to say because it has all been said so well.

Concerning the cancellation of the hail suppression program this summer for the purposes of a review, I would like to say that when I first raised this issue in the House in question period on July 7, I asked the associate minister why we might be undertaking such a review, because it was only in 1979 that this whole program had been reviewed. I think the sentiments were pretty clear at that time that the program was having a positive effect, the cost/benefit ratio was quite attractive, and for the money invested in the program, the return to producers in terms of reduced damage from hail was quite substantial. I wondered why we needed a review so soon after, and the answer was that it was basically a review of a review. I've now heard from the Member for Innisfail that the thrust of the review would be to try and determine the patterns of unseeded storms in that area.

I think that's a worthwhile pursuit, Mr. Speaker, but I submit that that sort of research could have been done in an area outside the hail suppression program area and still come up with some results that would be at least as valid as the ones that will be presented after this summer's review. We can all recognize that it's very difficult to come up with sound, reasoned, empirical scientific data on anything to do with the weather in the context of one year's experience, because each year is so very different and indeed each storm is different. My suggestion would have been to see the program carried on this year because the benefit has been established and conduct the research into the patterns and formation of unseeded storm systems in an area outside the program's target area.

I share the concern of the Member for Red Deer South that some of the valuable and very qualified staff of the program may have been lost. I hope that's not the case, and I hope that the review is a positive and forward-looking one that supports the intent of this motion.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the motion. Any research we can do in the area of weather modification in terms of reducing to some degree the risks our agricultural producers face is positive, and I think the thrust of this is certainly to be supported.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to be able to rise this afternoon in support of Motion 219. Before I begin my remarks, I'd like to acknowledge the presence in the public gallery of Mr. Jim Bishop from Three Hills. Mr. Bishop has been a very dedicated and hardworking person on behalf of the whole area of weather modification and hail suppression. I don't think anyone has stuck to that effort with more perseverance than Jim. He has done a great deal to keep the issue before the public of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, previous members have referred to personal experiences with hailstorms. One that I remember rather well was returning home from the University of Alberta one day to our teacherage next to one of the rural schools in Ponoka county and finding that the house was flooded and all the windows on the west side had been knocked out. Our brand-new '68 Buick, which was our pride and joy at the time, looked something like a honeycomb, and wife and children were huddled together on the sofa waiting for father to come home and solve the problem. That hailstorm was one of the most devastating that ever went through central Alberta, and there have certainly been many others.

Mr. Speaker, as a member representing a constituency on the northern boundary of what is referred to as "hail alley," I've had a great deal of discussion with constituents about the need for and the maintenance of a hail suppression and weather modification program, particularly the hail suppression aspect of this matter. During the previous term I received a petition with some 700 names with basically the same wording as this motion. Despite the fact that this year has been almost hail-free in our area and a time of excellent weather conditions and the previous two years were almost precipitation-free, the interest in a hail suppression program is very much there. The news of the budget decision which seemed to be necessary this year to terminate the program was met with a great deal of consternation and criticism. I think we have to acknowledge that as long as there is not a thorough report on this whole matter of hail suppression and weather modification and a thorough discussion of that report, the evidence that people such as those who signed this petition have gathered are things that

have to be listened to and considered and balanced against what other evidence might eventually come forward.

The people supporting the petition I referred to observed certain things. They didn't sign a petition solely on the basis of some type of emotion. They've gone through the damaging situation that a hailstorm creates, and they make these observations, Mr. Speaker. They were aware of the seeding schedule which existed for a time in our area. They noted and documented that when storms were seeded, what appeared by all evidence to be a very severe hailstorm resulted in rain or slush being deposited rather than the usual hard objects. They kept records of the alternate-day seeding, which I hope and assume the research station did in great detail too. They noted that over a period of two or three years hail damage on the off days was there and very severe and on the days when seeding took place was virtually nonexistent. They're also aware of the research findings which are available and which, I might put forward, are of a positive nature. The criticisms seem to me to be founded in no evidence at all. Perhaps the research that has been released is not complete, but in my view it certainly all points in one direction; that is, that a program of this nature is effective.

Constituents also argue — I think this is important for politicians such as ourselves to note — that we are in a time when the government wants to use money as effectively as possible, as always. We're looking into the future of the hail and crop insurance program and its viability. They balance those needs against what seems to be a fact; that is, that there would be a multimillion dollar cost benefit from the maintenance of a hail suppression program. Being very logical in their thinking, they wonder why we prefer to pay out multimillions of dollars in hail and crop insurance claims instead of putting a few million, perhaps \$4 million or \$5 million, into the maintenance of the program.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address what might be objections to the passage of this motion. One matter that was brought forward in previous debate is that if you live to the west of the hail area, it is maintained that in certain years you receive too much rain, and if you live to the east, you do not receive enough rain. When there are crop difficulties in the farming sector, I think there's a natural tendency to look for a reason, and this is as good as any. But once again, the research that is available indicates that the formation of the storms which deposit hail takes place over a very short distance. Seeding is not likely to affect people downstream or upstream from the affected area. I also might offer that most hailstorms come from showers or limited rain activity. The hail seeding program is not interfering with the general rains, which I think are all-important in terms of passing uninterrupted, if that is the case, from one part of the province to the other.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Another objection that is sometimes raised is that this is not a sound program: it has not been proven; it might have some problems associated with it. I'd suggest, Mr. Speaker, that when there is lack of rain in the south, we irrigate. It's costly and has a certain environmental impact, but we do it. When there is flooding in the north, we build dams and dikes. We are looking at further drainage projects. That is objected to very seriously by many people because it might have something to do with harming a water source or destroying natural habitat. Nevertheless, when we look at the cost benefit of the whole thing, and rightly so, we

go ahead and do as much as we can. When there are grasshoppers in the south, we aid in the spraying program even though it's not too good for the bees, but we take in balance the cost benefit of such an effort and do it. When there's early frost or snow in the north, we make a modification in our payments under the hail and crop insurance program.

Mr. Speaker, because the effort in this particular regard with respect to hail suppression must be 10 or more feet above the ground, it is charged by some of the critics that it is very mysterious and something that we shouldn't delve into. I think there is considerable evidence already before us that this program is effective, can be effective in the future, and should be extended. Now that this is the direction that is being taken, I certainly look forward to the complete report, which we are awaiting from the research people. I hope this will be a very thorough report and will be widely publicized and open for discussion. I hope it will not be too long from now, because I think a decision on this whole matter has been delayed far too long. I support the direction of the motion. I would like to see it passed, and I certainly say that the report that has been referred to in debate should be forthcoming as soon as possible so we can get on with the very important task.

MR. YOUNIE: Mr. Speaker, a few very brief comments in favour of the motion, although my intent would be to express a few minor reservations in the hope that if those reservations are being dealt with in the review, someone could communicate that to me and, if not, they could be included. They stem from the personal experience of living in the area just west of Sylvan Lake, where a lot of the cloud seeding was done during the hail suppression portion of it.

It seemed to be the observation of a number of farmers that rain that would have fallen as hail perhaps in the Ponoka or Stettler areas instead fell as rain during haying season in the Rocky Mountain House-Sylvan Lake area. Neighbours used to look up and see the jet there to seed the cloud and put away the haying equipment for another day because they were assured that within three or four hours it would in fact rain. I certainly think part of the study should be to check and see if there has been an increase in rain in that area since the cloud seeding portion of the study started and a decrease in rain as well as hail in the areas to the east, that in fact the comments I've heard over the last decade that Stettler has been very dry and without rain might also be connected to that. I think a natural part of the study should be to see if there is a connection or not and, if so, what methods can be used to make sure that instead of hail at Stettler we would get rain at Stettler rather than rain at Sylvan Lake.

In terms of a comment made by the Member for Innisfail, in approximately 1970 my wife, who was then my girlfriend, worked for the hail studies program of the Alberta Research Council centered at Penhold air base. Her comment was that as soon as a cloud crossed the mountains, they started following it. If it turned into a thunderhead, it was monitored very closely on radar and, if advisable, was then seeded. Oftentimes it was amusing to watch the hail studies' vans heading off the air base with their little freezer compartments on the roof to go and find hailstones to study, if there were any. It was the cause of some local amusement. Obviously it was also a very important part of the study, to trace the development of hail to see what effect the seeding had on it, whether the hailstones would've been

larger, and so on. It does seem to answer that one question, that they were seeding clouds that seemed to originate from quite a bit farther west. Exactly at what point they caused the rain to fall, I'm not sure. I hope that part of the study would be to determine that.

In terms of agriculture, I think weather modification is important in the overall sense, not just to turn hail in the east into rain in the west but to in fact monitor how we can make sure there is better distribution of precipitation in the province, to look over the whole area, to consider very carefully whether or not it is possible to control the weather without affecting the rest of the environment to a great extent, and to judge whether or not that control will have a negative effect. I see the whole area as one of great importance to the agricultural community throughout central Alberta, where the hail does fall and where one of the selling features of a farm is often whether or not it gets the worst of the hail as it passes through. One I looked at with the possible intention of buying had as its best selling feature a large hill just to the west of it that the owner claimed separated hailstorms so that there was hail north and south of him and very seldom on his farm. When that kind of thing develops, I think it's obvious that it's of great concern in that area, and we should look at it very carefully. But I hope some of those long-term environmental concerns would be an important part of this study as well.

Thank you.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, just a short comment. I won't try to repeat what previous speakers have said, but I want to get on record that the Alberta Liberal Party is certainly in favour of the resolution and of continuing weather modification studies. I think the question at issue here is whether or not they actually believe in the studies. It seems that if you believe in the studies, there can be no question that from a financial situation, a cost/benefit analysis, it is certainly worth while to turn hail into water. Anyone who would try to argue otherwise would be rather foolish. If there is an argument at all, it is whether or not weather can be modified. I think there has been enough evidence along that line to show that it can be.

One of the puzzling things to me, though, and why it hasn't come up here, is why farmers have had to fight the bureaucracy for so many years. Whether you go back to the days of Hatfield, who was first brought in back in the '20s — I think he was from Oklahoma. There have been plays and movies. Maybe because Broadway has laughed so much at the rainmaker or the smooth-talking fellow who comes to town, gets all the money from everybody, and takes off, this government has become gun-shy. I don't know what it is.

One of the things they have forgotten that hasn't been mentioned here is that the farmers themselves have been putting a great deal of money into this. As a matter of fact, they started off in the first co-ops doing nearly all the money. They're still putting a great deal of money in, and nobody has mentioned that. Time and time again this government is willing to go will-o'-the-wisp with taxpayer's money, whether it's to Europe to explore labour laws, to China to import the best volleyball players, or to some other far corner of the globe. Yet we seem to run away from something we can do at home: matching money already put up by farmers.

As a matter of fact, I think it's a heck of a comment on the caucus of this governing party that nearly everybody who has been up to speak on this motion has been trying

to rattle the deck, trying to make a noise to get this front bench to listen. I can assure them that the opposition parties here will help those on the back bench. If this is the only way you can get your caucus to listen, go ahead and bring it in. As a matter of fact, you might even move in behind us and do a little clapping on the desk. If it takes this kind of noise and tying up the whole Legislature for the afternoon for the caucus to get the front bench to listen, I'm quite willing to support it. But with the kind of money this government spends on so many schemes — and I won't say that they're all foolish or anything, but a great many of them would stretch the bounds of credulity — it amazes me that you can't find a few dollars in the Treasury to come along with something the farmers themselves want and are putting up the money for.

I certainly support it. Hair on you on the back bench; go on with your revolution. I'll cheer you on.

Thank you.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I always like following the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon. He comes on fairly strong, and the louder he talks, the less sense he makes.

He talks about the irresponsible spending of money when he's talking about weather modification. I'd like to tell the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon that this government has been spending money on weather modification. For 10 years we did research on that through the Department of Agriculture, spending millions of dollars very responsibly on behalf of the farmers of Alberta. Because there were no concrete results to tell us whether or not it was worth while or productive, this government said: "We'll go to the Research Council and give them another five years for pure research on it. We'll draw the area in so they can do concentrated research, and then we will get the results and make that decision." I think that's a responsible way of doing it. Let's study it, make sure we have all the facts, and then make the decision. We won't study it and then decide to spend more money before we make the decision. That may be the way the Liberal Party would like to do it, Mr. Speaker, but that's not the way this government does it. It does it in a very responsible manner, and I must underline that. We have studied it, given it an extra five years, and now we await that result. That's the way it should be.

I really don't know whether weather modification is as glowing as the reports we've heard this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. I don't think we have the actual facts. People see these things through the eyes that they want to see them. I can relate that I was at a meeting of farmers this spring. We had coffee afterwards, and the subject of weather modification came up. One of my very prominent farmers who lives in the Clive area said: "You guys are cutting out weather modification. You shouldn't do that, because for the last seven or eight years, we haven't had any hail out there to speak of. Prior to that we had hail in our area every year, not 100 percent but to some extent. But because of weather modification, we haven't had it for the last six or seven years, and you people are wrong in taking it out." He was talking like the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon. Another big hog producer who lives northwest of Lacombe joined in and said, "Yes, that's right." They were in general agreement that for the last six or seven years, the results were there for everybody to see. We had less hail and so on. They were very surprised when I informed them that for the last five years we haven't had hail suppression in our area. They were giving full credit to it, but it was

taken away when we went to the Research Council. We were not in that pilot area. They didn't know the difference, but they gave full credit to it. So it's in a man's mind how he looks at it. I think we should wait until we get the facts before we let fantasy take over.

For once, Mr. Speaker, I listened to the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry, and I was right on with him. He came up with the most responsible thing I've heard this afternoon. I must say that sitting beside us has had an effect. We have finally got him coming over a little bit and thinking in the land of reality instead of the land of fantasy. I must congratulate him. Many times I criticize the socialists, but in this case the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry gets full points. He said, "I have concerns." I have concerns, and until we have the proven facts, I think any responsible citizen in Alberta should have concerns when we're spending this type of money on an experimental thing. That's exactly what we have done in this government. We have taken a responsible approach to a very serious situation. I'm not belittling the damage of hail. Everybody knows that it's very, very devastating. But we have done a responsible thing. We have examined it, studied it, and spent the bucks. Contrary to Mr. Westlock, we have spent those dollars. Now we are going to evaluate that and make sure we have the results before we spend more. I think that is a responsible way.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Mr. Speaker, I just want to participate for two or three minutes and to also acknowledge the presence in the gallery of Mr. Jim Bishop, who I met for the first time in 1964 when I returned to the Drumheller area to practise law and became involved in what was then a very hot issue about hail suppression. I guess we've made some headway in the last 30 years, since '57, when it first started. At least there seems to be general recognition that there is something to this idea. I, too, congratulate the Member for Olds-Didsbury for bringing this motion before the Chamber, because I think it's important that this process carry on. But it is a slow process.

In those days back in the '60s there was a strong point of view in the scientific establishment that there was just nothing to this hail suppression; it was a bunch of voodoo. Thanks to the efforts of Mr. Bishop and his colleagues, they persevered, and a lot of farmers' money was put into this idea. Eventually, in 1974, the government became involved in studies. Sometimes I think the scientific establishment is not all that practical. There is still a little controversy going on in this area between aircraft seeding and ground generation. Of course, it's like statistics; I guess figures can say anything you want them to say.

All I would point out is that Mr. Bishop and his friends have done a great service to this province by getting the government interested and certain progress made. They're practical people; I think their ideas should be considered when this is carried on. I hope the report will indicate that there is still room for government financing in this area of weather modification and hail suppression and that the people on the practical side will have something to say about this process in the future.

Again, I congratulate the Member for Olds-Didsbury for making it possible for us to make our comments on this today.

MR. FISCHER: Mr. Speaker, this is a very timely motion that the Member for Olds-Didsbury has sponsored in view of the fact that the review committee is going to have a look at what progress they've made over the past 10 years. I'm like the Member for Lacombe; I think it's awfully early to fully endorse a motion when we're sending a review committee out to look at it. We want to hear the facts before we go ahead with the program or shut it down.

I would like to say that hail and crop insurance is a very expensive item to the farming industry. Some people have gone broke over the past few years by overinsuring and spending such a high percentage of their income on insurance. Now, especially with the high cost/price squeeze we have in agriculture, it's important to evaluate your insurance programs very carefully.

When we talk about the hail suppression and modifying the weather, we are talking about who is getting the hail and who is getting the rain. I don't think anyone can or should control the rain. I look at what has happened in the past 10 years. The hail rates in northeastern Alberta, the Wainwright or Lloydminster or Vermilion districts, have increased from 3 percent to 9 percent since this weather modification has been going on. That has made a difference of anywhere from \$5,000 to \$10,000 to \$15,000 more per farm to insure. If we have to think that someone down at the research station is interfering with the weather — they do not modify it outside of the zones they are treating; they don't seem to have any results of what they're doing to the rest of the country.

I feel that possibly the program has some merit to it, but when government starts to interfere with the weather, I think it can be nothing but a political nightmare. I certainly wouldn't want to see even a Conservative government trying to say who should get rain and who shouldn't. Certainly I would like to have a lot of that moisture in my country.

I don't mean to rain on the Member for Olds-Didsbury's parade, but I do believe there is a lot of concern among Albertans on this weather modification program. I believe the review should take place and that we should decide about the program's future afterwards. Maybe weather management should be left up to Mother Nature and not the government. From my experience you do not interfere with or go against the will of Mother Nature, because too often you end up hurting yourself. I believe this is very true in the case of our trying to control the weather.

With that I would like to adjourn the debate.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is not proposed that the Assembly sit this evening. By way of information, it is proposed that tomorrow afternoon motions 13, 14, and 15 would be dealt with and then that the House would resolve itself into Committee of Supply for study of the Capital Fund estimates.

[At 5:29 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]