

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

[The House met at 2:30 o'clock.]

## PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of introducing to you, sir, and to this Assembly some 60 students from St. Dede School in the constituency of Edmonton Gold Bar. These students have now almost completed half of their journey through school. They are in Grade 6. They have come to see the Legislature in action, but particularly they have come to see the Minister of Education and the manner in which he performs. These students are located in the public gallery, and I would ask that they stand and be acknowledged by the House.

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to this Assembly, some 50 students from Terrace Heights School. They are attending Grade 6 and they are accompanied by Mrs. Kortes and Mrs. Derman. I would like to thank the students for showing an interest in the work of the government in the province. I would ask them to stand now and be recognized.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, 22 members of the Canada World Youth Exchange Program who are here from all across Canada and also from Yugoslavia to look at our beautiful princess Province of Alberta. I would like them now to rise and be recognized.

## FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Annual Report of the Department of Public Works.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, on Friday there were some questions asked about terms of reference for the Communal Property Liaison Committee, and I would like to table copies of news releases of December 23 and again of January 15 which outline quite specifically those terms of reference. I believe all hon. members have previously received this information, but there was a request that it be tabled.

Also, in response to another hon. member's question concerning the make-up of the committee, I have copies of the Order-in-Council of February 13 establishing the committee.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to advise and submit, pursuant to Section 2 (9) of The Wilderness Areas Act that no recommendations were made to me over the last year by the Advisory Committee.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a report entitled Potential Limitations of Canadian Petroleum Supplies. This report was by the National Energy Board. It is dated December, 1972. A copy of it was furnished to our government by the federal government, and copies have been distributed to all hon. members of the Legislature.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc.

Municipal Assistance Grants

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. I wonder if the minister could advise the House as to whether the government has or does not have a mathematical formula on which the announced municipal assistance grants and incentive grants were based?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, the incentive grants were based directly, in a mathematical way, on what the supplementary requisition for educational purposes had been in each municipality for the previous year.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it is the minister's intention to table the formula in the House?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, the formula is very simple and it has been mentioned in the report. It is in the government's news announcement of which, as far as I know, all members in all municipalities have a copy.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary, I wonder if I could also ask the minister whether the formula takes into account increased municipal revenues that will result from items such as the increased assessment on older homes in the City of Edmonton, resulting from the general re-assessment that took place in the city?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I think it has become apparent that the hon. leader is talking about two different grants, and asking questions, perhaps, in an intermixed way. There is the assistance grant which is fairly complex, and on which additional information is forthcoming. The incentive grant is a straight dollars and cents relationship back to what the previous supplementary school requisition had been. But it's important that we separate the two kinds of grants.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drayton Valley with a supplementary, followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge East.

MR. ZANDER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is the formula being used the same as the one used by the previous government?

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, if we are speaking of the formula for the municipal assistance grant, the answer is no.

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, does this formula take into account the prerogative Edmonton enjoys, relative to other cities, of being able to increase utility rates in lieu of the direct tax increase?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I think I have mentioned previously that the formula -- or working paper really is a better term to use -- takes into consideration, first of all, the two different kinds of municipalities broken down to an urban and a rural basis. It then deals with several factors, always trying to equalize those factors among the various municipalities in the particular classification as a procedure is worked through.

Now there are certain kinds of items, and the hon. member has mentioned one, the fact that a particular municipality might enjoy a benefit by reason that it does have municipally-owned utilities contributing to its revenues, but there may be special circumstances relating, let us say, to an extraordinary capital expenditure which would reflect on a debt servicing charge. These things are matters which have to be negotiated individually with each municipality, and are not considered in the working paper.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary --

MR. SPEAKER:

Could this be the last supplementary on this subject?

MR. CLARK:

-- to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Have the two factors that a municipality has an accumulated surplus or a deficit in this last year of operation been taken into consideration in developing the formula?

MR. RUSSELL:

No, they haven't, Mr. Speaker. I should emphasize that the formula has to relate to the relative needs and relative ability position of each municipality with respect to its neighbour. Now, I think if you wanted to get very pure about it, it's not really legal for a municipality to budget for a surplus or a deficit. But again, that's another example of the kind of thing -- and I think our regulations will reflect this -- that if there are particular circumstances which affect the ability of a municipality to stay within the seven and a half per cent guidelines -- and the government obviously has to be open-minded and be ready to talk about special circumstances like that, I don't know if anyone in this House could devise a working paper that would cover every municipality, taking into consideration all these circumstances that obviously can surface.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Cypress followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has the hon. minister sent to each member of the Liaison Committee terms of reference as to how they are expected to carry out their responsibilities? My reason for raising the question is that I don't find any reference to it in the material tabled today.

MR. RUSSELL:

No, Mr. Speaker. My only communication has been through the chairman of the committee.

MR. STROM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it the intention of the hon. minister to send to the members of the committee terms of reference, and can we expect that it would include the recommendations in the report given by the special committee to the minister?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to recognize the working relationship established between the Liaison Committee and the government. The Chairman of the Liaison Committee will work with an ad hoc committee of the Executive Council, which will then report and discuss with government. I don't think it is out of line to assume that the man we have selected for the chairman of the committee, bearing in mind his responsibilities, will do the very things the hon. member is talking about.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Long Distance Telephone Service

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, my question today is directed to the hon. Provincial Treasurer in his capacity as acting Telephones Minister. It's to do with the Trans Canada Telephone System Agreement and Alberta Government Telephones covering long distance lines. Is it the government's intention to give up its agreement with Trans Canada Telephone in order that Edmonton Telephones can provide long distance service within our province?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder, under the circumstances, if I could beg the hon. member's indulgence and ask him to put this as a written question on the Order Paper. I will certainly look into it and report back to him.

MR. DIXON:

That's agreeable with me, Mr. Speaker, but I wonder if I could ask another question and he could take them both and report back to the House. The other question, is it the --

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly the hon. member could also add that one to his written question, if it's a supplementary that is, on the same topic.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, as I understood it, he was going to reply to my oral question at a later date and I was just going to give him a further oral question. I don't mind a written question if this is what he requires.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I was asking for the indulgence, at least temporarily, of members of the House in this matter. I would appreciate it if they would put their questions in written form, and then I can examine them and report back to the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview followed by the hon. Member for Camrose.

Janitorial Services

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour concerning the contracting out of certain janitorial services in several government buildings. The question, Mr. Speaker, is, can the minister advise the House, on the basis of the existing contracts, what hourly rate would be paid to the contractors, how that hourly rate compares with the hourly rate paid government staff, and what the rate would be to the employees of the contractors?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, the details of this experiment are carried out in the Department of Public Works and I would ask my colleague the minister to reply.

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to reply to this question because there has been a fair amount of publicity about it, some of which is rather misinformed.

The Department of Public Works is carrying out some research work in the matter of obtaining the services of the private sector on contract to do some of the work normally being carried out by the Department of Public Works personnel. I would like to stress that no public works personnel were laid off in order to do this, but when we got to the point where it would have been necessary to engage more wage labour in the department, we thought it was a good opportunity to experiment with the private sector and take out a contract to do some of the work that had been normally done.

We felt this was necessary for two reasons. One was to see if it were less expensive to contract the work. The second reason was that the only way the Department of Public Works could assess its efficiency was to be able to compare it in a realistic manner with the private sector. Therefore this experiment is in the process of being carried out.

I don't have the facts and figures asked for before me, but would be prepared to obtain them. On the other hand, it is a pilot project on an experimental basis, and I would like to complete the experiment before we provide comparative figures. I would be very happy to report to the House at that time on the relative merits of these jobs being done by the private sector compared with them being done by the civil service.

I should also point out that before this experiment was attempted, the officials of the Civil Service Association were informed, well in advance, of the object of our experiment and were in agreement with it.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Public Works. Can the minister advise whether any employees in his department will be reclassified into lower-wage, light-caretaking work as a result of the private contracting?

DR. BACKUS:

No, Mr. Speaker, there will be no effect on the employees already being employed in the Department of Public Works. The two areas where we carried out this experiment were, at the time, due to people leaving the service. We had an opportunity available to put these outside caretakers in without affecting in any way the civil servants already being employed by the department.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question --

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View with a supplementary.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Were the services for this particular contract, providing janitorial services in this experiment, tendered for?

DR. BACKUS:

I don't believe a general tender was put out in this case, Mr. Speaker. As I say, it was on an experimental basis and we were in a position where we needed to get the services fairly quickly and therefore couldn't wait for the full tendering process.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary. Could the minister tell us the name of the contractor and the building in which the experiment was conducted?

DR. BACKUS:

I can give you the name of the buildings in which the experiment is being conducted. I don't have before me the name of the contractor. We are using half of the Highways Building. We are doing this on purpose because we can make a very accurate comparison of the quality of the work in the two halves of the building, and a time-cost factor as well. The other building is where the Department of Municipal Affairs is located. We are doing it here on one floor to compare with similar work being done by the department on another floor.

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the last supplementary by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview?

MR. NOTLEY:

Can the minister advise what criteria will be used in judging the success of this experiment? Will it merely be economic considerations or will the broad range of social factors be considered as well?

DR. BACKUS:

Well, we anticipate a very broad range of investigation on this. We anticipate that the cost factors will certainly enter into it, but the quality of workmanship is also going to be compared, and I think the problems of security are also a consideration. There will be several other factors involved. I hope when the experiment is completed I will be able to make a fairly full report to the House on it.

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View had a supplementary before we called a halt.

MR. LUDWIG:

I misunderstood the minister. I didn't know whether he was going to get me the name of the contractor, since he did not have it.

DR. BACKUS:

If the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View would like the name of the contractor I would be happy to get it for him. I will, of course, subsequently be making a report for the House as a result of our experiments, and I will give all the details at that time as well.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Camrose, followed by the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen.

#### Dairy Production

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. Since the fluid milk producers of Alberta are currently 11 million pounds short of butterfat in meeting their quota under the national milk marketing sharing system, what steps have been taken by your department to bring back to Alberta their share of the butterfat quota on a national level?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, we are concerned with regard to the question of the amount of dairy production in Alberta, and the continuing decline. We think that one of the ways in which we could stop the decline is not only to improve our dairy policy, which we are having a look at, but also to make representations to the Canadian Dairy Commission for a return of the subsidy-eligibility quota to Alberta and its allocation by our dairy control boards, so that we can effectively use the subsidy-eligibility quota to build up processing plants and an increase in dairy production in Alberta. These representations have been made to the Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa, as well as to the Canadian Dairy Commission and the Canadian Dairy Farmers Association.

MR. STROMBERG:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Alberta Dairy Control Board announced yesterday that Peace River milk and cream producers who retain their market quotas --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Would the hon. member please come directly to the question and ask for information rather than to state it?

MR. STROMBERG:

...[Inaudible]... to other Alberta producers?

DR. HORNER:

Essentially the announcement today by the Alberta Dairy Control Board and the Canadian Dairy Commission dealt with the question of whether or not a producer would lose his quota because of non-production. This penalty is not going to be imposed in the Peace River area because of the crop conditions we had there last fall. In other words, those farmers will not lose their quota because they didn't produce. We are looking at the other matter of making additional quota available to all of the dairy producers in Alberta.

As I said earlier, we are in the process of revamping our dairy policy, and we hope to have some announcement to make in that regard in the coming weeks in an attempt to increase greatly the production of dairy products in Alberta.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In light of your announcement on farmers in the Peace River country not losing their eligibility, other dairy farmers across the province lost their crop this year -- would the minister and the commission consider that circumstance reasonable so they wouldn't lose their eligibility?

DR. HORNER:

I would think, Mr. Speaker, that if any of these farmers in other areas are having difficulty because of climatic conditions they should notify the Alberta Dairy Control Board and we will take up the matter with the Canadian Dairy Commission. I would be pretty confident, in fact, that they wouldn't lose their quota if legitimate climatic conditions are involved.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Is there a waiting list of applicants for quota for dairy products?

DR. HORNER:

It's a little more complex than that, Mr. Speaker. When we, as a province, joined the national market-share situation in which Alberta was allocated so much market-share quota, it became a little bit difficult because we have market-share quota, and a subsidy-eligibility quota. We are hopeful that within a matter of two or three years one will match the other, but there is a period of time, starting from last April 1 over the next year, in which there will be a difference between these two types of quota. The question then remains as to how we can get this quota out, particularly to younger farmers starting out. This is the thing frustrating us at the moment, and for which we have made repeated representations to the Canadian Dairy Commission.

We say very simply that we do have young people we would like to encourage to enter the dairy industry, but we have to have subsidy-eligibility quota, which is the one which pays the subsidy money to make it a financially sound proposition.

In other words, we don't want to encourage young people into the dairy industry, and then find that because they don't have the subsidy-eligibility quota it's not an economic proposition. We are working on the matter, and that is what is frustrating us at the moment -- to try and get the Canadian Dairy Commission to see our point of view in that regard so that we can, in fact, encourage young people into the dairy operations.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the waiting list reasonably long?

DR. HORNER:

Unfortunately, it isn't, Mr. Speaker, and it is going to be a matter of encouraging people to come into the dairy industry. I would hope that the review we are doing now of our dairy policy -- and I would welcome any input that any hon. member might have as to how we could further develop the incentives, or otherwise to improve our dairy production in Alberta, not only of dairy products, Mr. Speaker, but substantial increase in dairy cattle in Alberta -- would be welcome.

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the last supplementary on this topic.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. You referred to coming into the dairy industry. Does the minister feel that if steps were taken to increase the income to these people who have to work long hours, and every day of the year, that this would be the best inducement they could have?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is clearly making a debating point, rather than asking a question.

DR. HORNER:

I love those kinds of debating points, Mr. Speaker. They allow me to answer the questions in some detail.

As a matter of fact, if the hon. gentleman doesn't know, he might be interested in knowing that the Canadian dairy farmers have already made their representations to the federal government, and the Canadian Dairy Commission, in regard to support levels that will be put on this year. He would also be interested to know that we, as a government, have concurred with the dairy farmers of Alberta, and have asked the Canadian Dairy Commission to raise the support level by 70 cents per hundred pounds. I think this is a reasonable price support, having regard to the costs incurred in that particular type of agricultural endeavour.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister, may I just interject and say that we have a fairly large number of members who still wish to ask questions, and perhaps we should adhere more strictly to the rule with regard to supplementaries and with regard to the answers.

The hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

Hunting, Fishing Licences

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Lands and Forests. With respect to the recent announcement that hunting and fishing licences will be increased by a dollar, could the Minister advise if our senior citizens will continue to enjoy free fishing privileges?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, two things if I might, the last matter first, that being that we contemplate no change in the matter the hon. member brings forward regarding senior citizens. At the same time it gives me an opportunity to reinforce the fact that the Buck for Wildlife Program is a buck, a dollar, for wildlife habitat improvement. At any time there is any mention of this matter brought forward, it is important, I think, in fairness, to relate precisely what it is for.



MR. FRENCH:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise if any consideration is being given to issuing an identification card or some form of identification for our senior citizens so that it won't be necessary for them to carry their birth certificate, or other proof of age when out fishing?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will recall our having discussed that point in the House last year. I had looked into it, and found a number of complications, and have thus far discovered no alternative entirely in keeping with what the senior citizens themselves want. But we are certainly open to suggestion.

MR. FRENCH:

My last supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise if our senior citizens will be expected to pay the increase of the dollar for their hunting privileges?

DR. WARRACK:

It is intended that the wildlife habitat improvement program we have chosen to see come forward in the Province of Alberta would be shared equally among those who hunt.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly.

#### DPW Contracts

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Public Works? Does the Dept. of Public Works use the services of a private agency for hiring temporary labour?

DR. BACKUS:

I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that the department does use a private agency for the hiring of wage labour. There is a waiting list of people who wish to work for the government, and therefore it is usually unnecessary for us to apply to an agency.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the same apply then to Manpower? Is that why Manpower is not being used?

DR. BACKUS:

Yes, I think the same would be said to apply to Manpower. We usually don't have to go to Manpower -- the federal manpower offices -- to find help for jobs available in the Department of Public Works.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would permit me to give some additional information to the hon. Member for Drumheller. I'm not sure I understood the full import of the first part of the question, but I think it is important to say, to the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that the offices of the Public Service Commissioner, for and on behalf of the government, have a pretty refined system of recruitment, of prior identification of needs, as he works with the staff in the departments of government, and then follows a series of recruitment procedures, interviews, screening of applications and selection of staff.

The point of my rising is to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, to the Assembly, that we have in the government the personnel department whose function, amongst others, is a very specific and high priority one, that of assisting the departments of government in staffing, assignment, placement, movement, promotions, and so on with respect to the employees of this government.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly, followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

Control of Snowmobiles

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation. Has the advisory committee with regard to snowmobiling and snowmobilers been shelved, and if this is incorrect, how active is this committee?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, the advisory committee has certainly not been shelved, and to my understanding it met last on January 4 under the chairmanship of Mr. Gibbon who is mayor of St. Albert. It discussed, among other things, a guide for operators, and reaction to the brief that they presented to some cabinet ministers last fall, and also how effective municipal by-laws were in the control of snowmobiles.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member --

Snowmobile Insurance

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney General on the question of snowmobilers. Last week you indicated that insurance rates for snowmobile operators were going to go down in the future, and at that time I asked you whether or not this would be rebated to people who already paid the increased amount. Are you in a position to report to the Assembly today on what the position of the companies will be with respect to the rebate?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I think the best answer to that question is for me to file the order of the Automobile Insurance Board which was recently issued, and I will promptly do that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation, followed by the hon. Member for Drayton Valley.

Rapeseed Quotas

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Concerning your statement to the High Energy Grain and Oil Seed Conference in Calgary, in which you stated that the government would appeal the convictions of the rapeseed growers, what action has the government taken, or will be taking? And will the government be going to the courts if necessary?

DR. HORNER:

Well pretty obviously, Mr. Speaker, when you appeal a decision you have to go to the courts. I don't know where else you can appeal a legal decision. We will be appealing the decision, and I will be having something to say with regard to the situation because it is a special situation in relation to quotas to processing plants within the province, and has a great deal of difference between other quotas that are normally held by farmers in Alberta.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, could the minister tell us how many rapeseed crushing plants you envision in Alberta in the immediate future?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't know that they wanted my futuristic speech today, but the question --

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

DR. HORNER:

The question in relation to the number of rapeseed crushing plants that we could develop in Alberta is an open one. I have suggested that in the next 10 years I would like to see six to eight crushers built here, provided that we can maintain our market for the raw oil and rapeseed meal which would develop. I am very confident that we will see an expansion of rapeseed crushing plants within Alberta, provided we can solve the difficult problem of transportation costs, and provided we can continue to grow the kind of varieties that the world market demands in relation to the processed goods.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drayton Valley, followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

MR. WYSE:

One supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. Will the government be using public funds to appeal these cases?

DR. HORNER:

I don't think there are any other funds available to the government, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the hon. Minister of Agriculture advise the House whether any assistance will be given to a projected rapeseed plant in High Prairie?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, of course that reflects on a matter raised in the Legislature in the previous session with regard to industrial enterprise, the suggestion of a plant in the Peace River area, and we had made an application under DREE for assistance to build a plant in the High Prairie-McLennan area. At the present time, my understanding is -- and we have checked on this very recently -- that this matter is still before DREE under Mr. Jamieson. I did have some preliminary discussions with Mr. Jamieson and he assured us that they would be looking at the matter again and would give us an answer in the very near future.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drayton Valley, followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

#### New Oil Companies

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. With the number of drilling contracts cancelled in British Columbia and the oil companies apparently moving out in wholesale exodus, is there any indication of these companies investing in Alberta?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I think that question relates to British Columbia's announcement of the new royalties regulations relating to crude oil, which I understand averages some 30 per cent and increases to some 40 per cent over 6,000 barrels. It is rather difficult to ascertain exactly how many wells were cancelled as a result of that announcement. I did receive over the week-end from a reliable source, however, that the best indications would be some 22 wells.

I am also pleased to advise the hon. members that we are very pleased the way our drilling incentive program is operating and we hope that they will take the benefit of that --

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister --

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff, followed by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

#### Bottle Depots

MR. WYSE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. What is the present status of Alberta's new bottle-and-return system? Is it still in a state of confusion?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question is clearly out of order. If he wishes to rephrase it --

MR. WYSE:

What is the status of Alberta's new bottle return system?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to answer the question in either form that he puts it because the hon. gentleman last year indicated that he was going to prove a point to the House and he hasn't come forth with his proof as yet.

The system is working very well, Mr. Speaker. There are 146 depots working in the province. We do have a little difficulty in Calgary, but this is being rationalized. The depots in Edmonton are being increased to 15 shortly and I would just like to suggest that, as I have said before, virtually all of North America is watching us in this regard. It is a pretty good example of something that can be done by a determined government regardless of the opposition.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Have any of the universal depots shut down since January and what is the reason? Is the government anticipating any increase in the one per cent handling charge?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I have the information right here in front of me. If he wishes, I can give it to him. The number that have shut down: in Edmonton we had approved 12 depots; ten are operating and two are preparing to open. Negotiations are in progress for three additional depots. In Calgary we had ten approved, with seven operating and three preparing to open. Negotiation is in progress for three additional depots.

Province-wide, we have a total of nine depots that have closed voluntarily, and one approval was revoked. The approval revoked was because of NSF cheques. It was in Calgary. Several of the depots have retired voluntarily because they found the volume too great to handle. They were formerly beer bottle depots and they found the volume too much to handle with their facilities. Several terminated their pro tem licence because they were in a secondary business, and the bottle business was growing so rapidly that they either had to give up their old business or retain it. So they, in fact, have given up the bottle business.

Apart from that, I think everything is working pretty well. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that 4.6 million bottles -- that's liquor and wine bottles -- were returned in the month of January. Two point four million non-refillable soft drink cans and bottles were returned, and this amounted to 98 per cent of what was sold in the month of January. Approximately 30 per cent of the refillable bottles were returned to the universal depots; 70 per cent still went to the retailers.

I might also say at this time that the overall result of the legislation is a gradual return to the refillable container. Soft drink sales now stand at 82 per cent refillable bottles, and 16 per cent cans --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. minister's answer, although given in admirable detail, is one that is ordinarily answered on the Order Paper.

MR. WYSE:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of the Environment. The Premier and he indicated last fall that the price of soft drinks in the province would not increase because of your amendment. Has the price increased?

MR. YURKO:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't remember the Premier making that statement. I sure don't remember myself making it. The hon. member must have been listening to the wind.

[Interjections]

However, I do want to suggest we recognize that we increased the handling of bottles by one cent, because this is what all depots get -- one cent for handling containers. And it's only natural that all soft drink companies would pass that one cent on to the customers. If there have been increases beyond that, then simply it is a matter of increase because of inflation and other matters. But the legislation basically increased the cost of soft drinks by one cent because that is what each depot is getting for handling a container.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury. Might this be the last supplementary on this point.

MR. WYSE:

I have three more. Mr. Speaker, supplementary question. Is the minister aware that a soft drink manufacturing plant has shut the doors because --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member is clearly giving information instead of asking it. The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury, followed by the hon. Member for Taber-Warner.

#### Boundaries Advisory Committee

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and ask him what has been the government's response to the brief from the City of Edmonton regarding the unitary system of government in metropolitan Edmonton?

MR. RUSSELL:

There was a great deal of consideration, Mr. Speaker, given to the brief during the past several months. In the meantime, of course, we immediately started receiving opposing briefs from the adjacent municipalities who were affected. Of course, then the legal representatives of those municipalities started submitting letters. You can guess at the situation evolving.

We have recently announced the establishment of a Boundaries Advisory Committee and tried to indicate to the City of Edmonton, of course, that they have three courses of action open to them. They may still wish to pursue their application for expansion of boundaries directly with the provincial government. They always have the option, of course, of going directly to the Local Authorities Board, or they may wish to work with the other municipalities through the auspices of the Boundaries Advisory Committee. I haven't had an indication from the city yet which route they will choose.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Taker-Warner, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood.

Dentistry Teaching Facilities

MR. D. MILLER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Has the minister considered expansion of dental teaching facilities at the University of Alberta with the hope of increasing the number of dental graduates per year?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the question, I apprehend, is one that relates to a large extent to the duties of the administration of the University of Alberta in regard to how many students will be admitted or graduated in any given year. I might add that I know some knowledgeable observers of the scene hold the opinion that if there is an area in health care in Alberta where we are not over-served it is dentistry, and that more dentists could be used. However, I have taken no steps relating to the enrolments as such in that regard.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, followed by the hon. Member for Lacombe.

Royal Visit

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Premier. Mr. Premier, is it the government's intention to extend an invitation soon to Her Majesty the Queen to make a full provincial visit? I ask this question in light of the correspondence tabled and the program announced by the hon. Mr. Dowling.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, as hon. members will recall, the correspondence that was tabled, and, I believe, the last letter from the Prime Minister, made reference to Her Majesty making a full provincial visit in the near future. I would be interested in the views of members with regard to that matter.

We have made a specific request, of course, for 1973 and 1974, and my inclination would be that there really is an opportunity, perhaps presented in the tone of the Prime Minister's letter and his discussions with Her Majesty, for us to take the initiative to make that invitation for a full provincial visit. I would like to think about it for a couple of days and if hon. members have any suggestions they would like to make in that regard I would welcome them.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lacombe, followed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

Harvested Crop Assistance

MR. COOKSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Recent reports by the federal government indicate that payments will be made for crop-out only in the Peace River country, which is really representative of only 80 per cent of the crop-out. I am wondering if he is aware of this and whether he is contemplating any type of action?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, there are two or three things involved here. First of all, might I point out that our assistance as a provincial government is not restricted to any geographic area in the province, but in the initial response from Ottawa they did in fact have what I thought was a restriction on the Peace River area. I have subsequently been in correspondence with the Member of Parliament for Red Deer, Mr. Gordon Towers. His correspondence with the federal Minister of Agriculture indicates that they would follow the provincial lead. I

have subsequently written to Mr. Whelan to confirm this, and I will advise the hon. member and the House as soon as I receive a reply. The House might be interested, in relation to the question about harvested crop assistance, that we have had 6,892 claims to date. The claims that have been calculated in the past for payment are 5,051 for a total of \$1,821,475.50.

MR. SPEAKER:

This is the last question for which we have time. The hon. Member for Clover Bar.

Rural Dental Services

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, thank you. I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister without Portfolio responsible for Rural Development, Mr. Topolnisky. My question is: what form will the proposed increased dental services to rural areas take?

MR. CRAWFORD:

If I could respond to that. If the hon. member is referring to remarks in the Speech from the Throne in regard to dental services, that was intended to relate primarily to adding initiative to already existing services which are primarily in remote areas of the province. There are programs which would be administered under the Department of Health and Social Development that would relate, to a large extent, to areas where there are primarily native populations which have not been served in the past.

DR. BUCK:

Supplementary to the minister then. Is the government looking at any type of incentive program to get dentists out into the rural areas?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I assure the hon. member that the hon. minister, Miss Hunley and myself have discussed questions like this from time to time. I know that he would be aware that it is not a matter which is free from difficulty. It is so in the various professions -- it doesn't matter which one cares to discuss, medicine, dentistry, pharmacy and so on. The mobility of the professionals in those fields relies greatly upon matters of personal choice, upon the viability of their particular practice or business in the communities in question.

Now as to whether or not special incentives are being proposed at the present time, we have no specific incentives to place before the House immediately for consideration in that regard. But suggestions that might be made, and observations on other programs that have been attempted in regard to incentives -- for example, in other provinces which we have studied, some of them appeared not to fulfil the expectations of the people putting them forward. Any new suggestions that come along, or observations in regard to various types of incentives, would indeed be welcome. We do recognize the problem.

Dentistry Teaching Facilities (cont.)

MR. FCSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment further, and answer from Advanced Education's point of view a question put earlier to the Minister of Health and Social Development on the question of the dental faculty at the University of Alberta and the possible expansion of it.

I am not aware of an application before the Board of Governors to expand the dental faculty, however I am sure there have been discussions in that regard. But I wanted to point out to the hon. member that expansion of an existing faculty or an addition of a new faculty to a university, is a matter internal to that university, and would be something brought forward by the university for discussion to the Board of Governors, not to government, but to the institution. If the Board of Governors feels that they want to expand a faculty or add a new faculty, whether it is industry or something else, they would then bring that forward to the commission and to the Department of Advanced Education for consideration.

MR. CLARK:

Who supplies the money?

AN HON. MEMBER:

John Q., good old John Q.

MR. CLARK:

Poor old John Q.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

130. Mr. Taylor asked the government the following question:

- (1) What is the total cost of the trade mission to Central and South America?
- (2) What are the names of persons on this mission whose expenses were paid by the Government of Alberta?
- (3) What places were visited?
- (4) How many contracts have resulted from the trip?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

113. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Clark:

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

A copy of the contract between the Government of Alberta and the Government of Canada covering the utilization of The Royal Canadian Mounted Police for policing the province.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move Motion 113 standing in my name on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER:

Has that contract not been tabled and would not the hon. leader of the Opposition wish to withdraw this motion by leave of the House?

MR. HENDERSON:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have been in the habit of receiving a copy and I haven't seen it so I assumed it hadn't been tabled, but if it has been tabled, fine and dandy.

MR. LEITCH:

Yes, it has Mr. Speaker, in fact it was tabled some time ago.

MR. HENDERSON:

[Inaudible]

MR. LEITCH:

I then tabled it the following day.



MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. Leader of the Opposition unanimous leave of the House to withdraw Motion No. 113?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

118. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Clark.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

Two copies of any reports compiled by or for the Energy Board, the Department of the Environment or any other government department regarding the environmental consequence of atmospheric discharge of sulphur dioxide gas at Imperial Oil's Golden Spike gas plant.

[The motion was carried.]

109. Mr. Dixon proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Benoit.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

(1) The names of the 80 tourist-oriented individuals and corporations who received loans from the \$50 million Opportunity Fund in 1972, and the actual location of these tourist-oriented projects.

(2) The amount of each loan granted, showing the terms on which each loan was made.

(3) What securities were taken by the government to assure repayment on each loan.

(4) What qualified appraisers or evaluators were used in every case in approving each loan.

(5) Details of property or security involved.

Hon. Mr. Dowling moved, seconded by hon. Mr. Hyndman the following amendment:

That the motion be amended by deleting paragraph 1 and by renumbering paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5 as paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4, respectively; and by amending new paragraph 1 to read "the amount of each Alberta Opportunity Company tourist-oriented loan granted, including the actual location of such projects, and the terms under which each loan was made".

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, the amendment in question deals essentially with the standards of confidentiality relative to tourist loans made by the Alberta Opportunity Fund. Put another way, it has to do with the use of government discretion in determining what personal information should be made available with respect to tourist loans.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion it arises out of the quite proper function of the Legislature and of the members of the Legislature, to be able to monitor or check administration of the Alberta Opportunity Fund, and of the kinds of loans it is making. Basically, the members need information to scrutinize the activities of the board, if they wish, to scrutinize in terms of preventing what might be termed official abuse; to scrutinize in terms of adding to public confidence, that the board is doing what it is supposed to be doing; and to scrutinize in order to be able to evaluate how well the board is achieving its objectives.

Earlier in the debate, Mr. Speaker, we established quite clearly that the matter of the loan is quite separate from the matter of a public expenditure. In the case of a public expenditure the information does come before the House in terms of the reports which are tabled. I think we are left then with this

specific amendment, which does only one thing, Mr. Speaker. It simply removes the identification of the people who have asked for and received loans.

If there is any objection to the amendment, it would have to be in terms of what prohibition or what hindrance it would pose in the way of members of the Assembly checking the activities of the Opportunity Fund. I submit, Mr. Speaker, there is no way that removal of these names can in any manner prevent members evaluating how well the Opportunity Fund is doing in terms of the objectives of the tourist loan program. These are broad economic and social objectives, and the names are quite irrelevant to determination of their attainment. It's the amount of money was loaned in total; the number of loans is not in question.

In terms of the matter of public confidence it's my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that confidence will be hampered or destroyed if the names are released. In terms of official abuse, abuse in what direction? To what kind of use could the names be put in order to check on abuse? If the loan has been properly given, that's not related to the name of the person or corporation.

I can see no way in which the names of these individuals or corporations are necessary to the fulfilment of, what I deem to be, the proper activity of this Assembly or the members thereof, in terms of checking upon the Alberta Opportunity Fund and tourist loans.

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I would like to make one additional point. In previous debate some mention was made of collateral, and the fact that some of this is registered, and therefore open to public scrutiny. It is true that certain types of collateral are registered. Collateral is registered in order to enable the creditor to know that he has prior claim on that collateral, to prevent anyone else from getting a prior claim.

For anyone to make use of that information, they would have to do a great deal of diligent searching. Even at that, the information they would obtain would be something less than complete.

In no way, Mr. Speaker, should the analogy be drawn between the registration of a mortgage and the kind of information which is asked for here in one blanket summarized form.

So, Mr. Speaker, in urging all members to vote for the amendment, I would like to state again that I think this is a crucial matter, a matter which hinges on the ability of the Assembly to carry out its function. But at the same time, it relates very closely to the need to respect the confidentiality of certain personal documents of people dealing with government -- and, at that, a very distant form of dealing with government -- and not in terms of public expenditure.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, just a few words. I don't want to prolong the discussion. We have had a lot of discussion on this matter, and certainly the name of the Member for Wainwright was raised earlier in the debate. I would like to suggest that reference has been made here that the loan is separate from public expenditures. I disagree in that there is an amount of money that I understand is revolving. Once that money is loaned to an individual or a group, it can't be re-loaned to somebody else until it is paid back. So to me it is certainly an amount of money that is voted by this Legislature being used.

In looking at this I can't help but look at myself as two different individuals -- one dressed up in a suit, a promoter, shall we say, maybe backed by legal counsel, going to this fund to get money. And here I am going to retain my confidentiality. On the other hand, if I get into my overalls and go out and loan money to buy cattle, then I may be required to put the standing arrow brand on.

So, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of that, and looking at my own self and playing two parts, I have to oppose the amendment, and while the minister has offered that these records are available to us as individual MLAs, I feel that in the matter of open government certainly I am opposed to the amendment.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, there are really just two items that I want to touch briefly on relating to the amendment, and I think they are the key to the question of whether the information that has been asked for in the entire Return should be public or should be restricted strictly to what the amendment suggests.

Now it has been suggested that because a member can go to the minister's office and get the information privately, that this should suffice for any member of the Legislature. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that such a hypothesis simply will not stand up under scrutiny. A member who obtains that information privately, in my mind, is bound to respect the terms of the regulations as they now stand and say that it is not to be used for public purposes.

A member who acquires the information by such means, I think, then immediately becomes suspect if the matter does become public. So the fact that the government is prepared to disclose privately, so to speak, or under the table, or in the back room, some of the information the Return asks for, as opposed to doing so publicly, does not constitute a satisfactory method of providing the information, nor one which is sound in principle.

I can certainly anticipate a member from this side getting the information from the minister, and in one way or another the information being made public. Then I am quite certain that there are going to be a lot of suspicions cast on the members seated opposite. This is one of the reasons given by the member who just spoke, I believe, as to one reason why there is no need to make the names public.

The other argument, Mr. Speaker, was along the lines that there is no public money involved until there is a loss incurred, and I have difficulty in following this argument. It's public money the Board is spending. As I read the act, which in Section 11 says, "from time to time the Provincial Treasurer shall pay to the fund from the general revenue fund upon the request of the company such sums as may be required to carry out the provisions of the act." ... obviously, the Treasurer has to have authority in the form of an appropriation from this Legislature, or you do it by warrant and it is still subject to approval of the warrant by the House in the ensuing session.

So very clearly, it isn't a question of simply only being responsible as a Legislature for examination of the losses, because some of these funds are going to be out on the books for years and they represent a debt and liability against the province. They represent a direct expenditure of public funds and remain as such for all years until the loan is repaid. And the argument, therefore, that we should only be concerned about the losses simply cannot be logically pursued.

There is very definitely every year, I presume, unless there is a year when the fund has a surplus and there is no call upon an appropriation of Legislature -- if that money is not being spent by the Board so far as this House is concerned, what is it doing? Does it not show as an expenditure in the Public Accounts? I think very clearly, until it is returned, Mr. Speaker, it has to show as an expenditure on the Public Accounts. And the argument that we only need concern ourselves about the losses, until that happens there is no expenditure of public money involved, is simply incorrect. Because very clearly, there is an expenditure of public money involved, and it is expenditure that is authorized one way or another by an appropriation in the estimates that will come before this House each year. And it is either an appropriation that is current in advance of the fact, or it is an appropriation in the form of approving a warrant that the Executive Council had seen fit to pass because the funds were not provided for in the preceding year.

I fail to follow the argument, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the funds advanced are not being expended. If they are not being expended, what do we need an appropriation for? We get back to the fact that if the fund were a matter of guaranteeing advances from private financial institutions, I could buy the argument 100 per cent. But very clearly, there has to be, one way or the other, either before the fact or after the fact, an approval for expenditure of the funds that are forthcoming to this particular corporation, and until they are repaid they constitute a direct expenditure of public funds. We cannot accept the grounds that have been submitted for secrecy, nor the propositions presented that will allow a member to go in the back door and find out privately what he has been denied the right of achieving publicly on the floor of this Assembly.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, as I see the amendment, it hinders a member of the opposition in carrying out his role. The minister's invitation to come to his office to view the files seems to me something that is not quite right. It is an invitation to come skulking around or something of that nature, and I would clearly want to know what the crux would be on any member of the Legislature who does scrutinize those loan files. Can he make notes? Can he ask for facsimiles to take away with him? Can he tell someone else what he saw? What about the

logistics of handling all the opposition members at the same time, plus the back-benchers on the government side periodically.

It seems to me that that is not a practical answer, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to hark back to what the hon. Mr. Peacock said on second reading of Bill No. 50. In part, he said, "All emphasis in the program is upon, firstly, the individual Albertan who is a resident, and thereafter upon the rural community, the small business enterprise, and industry in general. And the province as a whole without discrimination of any kind."

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that part of our role is to determine whether or not they are operating the fund without discrimination of any kind, and the amendment clearly is a hindrance to all members who would like to determine whether or not there has been discrimination in the lending of funds under the Alberta Opportunity Company.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one point in connection with the proposed amendment, that the fund is under the jurisdiction of a minister of the Crown. I think that is an axiom we have to know. Secondly, the money is voted by the members of the Legislature -- another axiom, I think, that is very important.

If we carry this matter of confidentiality too far, it may well prevent this Legislature from doing the work for which we are being paid. Surely it is the responsibility of every member of the Legislature not only to vote the money, but also to follow through and make sure that full value is achieved for every dollar spent. While the amendment goes part way to meet the spirit of the motion, it injects a point that I think would be detrimental to if not even negating the responsibilities of members of the Legislature. Any money voted by the Legislature surely should be under scrutiny by the Legislature in full detail. If we do not recognize that point, Mr. Speaker, then responsible government goes down the river, or down the drain, whichever way you want it to go down. But it is negated. And I cannot emphasize this point enough, that if we are gradually going to bring confidentiality into so many of these things, an MLA might just as well stay at home if all we have to do is to come up here and say, "agreed, agreed" when the budget is going through and chat about it -- having no possibility of knowing to whom the money is going and being able to follow it through.

The argument of the hon. member, Mr. Young, in my view is an excuse, not a reason -- when he says there is no reason to know the name. Well, of course, the name makes the entire difference. What bank would lend any money to a person without knowing his name, only knowing his business? The name is an important item. We are dealing with public money. There is a responsibility for it to be administered fairly to everybody in the province, irrespective of colour, race, creed, politics, et cetera. If we don't know the name, how are we going to follow up and see if it is within the spirit of The Alberta Bill of Rights?

Mr. Speaker, I think this matter is very important. The thought I am trying to emphasize, right now, is the potential negation of the responsibilities of the members of this Legislature under the cloak of confidentiality. I don't think this is sound, I don't think it is responsible government, and I don't think it is open government. If we are going to close these files to members of the Legislature, it becomes anything but open government. It is closed government. And it is also not responsible, because the members cannot follow through expenditures the way they properly should do.

On the point that people who do business with the government expect confidentiality and that the rule is here that some monies have been loaned with this rule in effect -- I think there possibly is a responsibility on the part of the government which passed this Order-in-Council on the regulations to honour it, and I think every hon. member of the Legislature would expect that. But I also think the responsibility to start changing this -- also, this pinpoints the importance of the Legislature having something to do with regulations which in effect, have the effect of law. If we are going to pass laws and then have nothing to do with regulations, then again the work of the MLAs is being thwarted.

I'm not going to pay much attention to arguments about what other governments did or what other governments didn't do, because many governments, I suppose, including the last one in this province, are slow in getting regulations. But that's not the point I am making. I recognize that. But that even pinpoints more the importance of when we are passing laws -- they should at

least be perused and discussed by the lawmakers of the province -- not only by the cabinet, and not only by the minister of that department.

I also have some appreciation of the difficulty of getting the amendments in time to get them before the House. But we have committees in this Legislature that haven't been called for years and years. Why shouldn't these committees be examining these regulations? They have the effect of law. Are we simply going to be satisfied by passing the act, and having nothing to do with the regulations? If we are, then the regulations have more to do, even though they are based on the act, with the everyday operations of this type of thing than the law itself. It becomes the law, just as much as the law passed in the act or the original bill.

So, again, I would emphasize that if regulations are going to be passed by cabinet and then contain items that are nauseating to the members of the Legislature, this is certainly not sound. It's not good law-making and it's not good administration.

So the second point I want to make is that regulations -- and we should see to it -- are perused by the members of this Legislature as carefully, if not more carefully, than the bill itself.

Those are the two points I want to make, Mr. Speaker, and I want to emphasize again that the amendment, while it goes part way, does a serious thing, far more serious than that which is just applicable to this act, in that it may well thwart or handcuff the members of the Legislature from doing the work they are sent here to do. That is important. Secondly, no regulation should be passed that has the effect of nullifying the work of an MIA.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate some of the concern shown by members on the government side about the question of confidentiality. But in looking over the case, it seems to me that the weight of argument rests in favour of the members of the Legislature obtaining the information called for in the original Motion for a Return.

The analogy was made between welfare payments and the need to make sure that confidentiality is taken into consideration in the payment of social assistance benefits on one hand. Comparison was made with the loans under the Alberta Opportunities Fund on the other.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is a pretty important distinction. As most of us know, the social workers are not given the option of handing out social assistance or social aid on a no-holds-barred basis. They have very definite, prescribed regulations they have to follow. The latitude the social workers can exercise is really quite limited. Those of us who have had to deal quite closely with the Department of Social Development in making representation on behalf of constituents, can testify the regulations are there, and the social workers have to work within restricted, prescribed regulations. On the other hand, when we examine the Alberta Opportunity Fund, there is a good deal more latitude. It's not the case of borrowing \$1,000 or \$1,200 or \$1,500, but there is a great latitude in the amount of money one can acquire from the fund.

Therefore it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the analogy between the Department of Social Development, where you have very stringent requirements on the one hand, and the Alberta Opportunity Fund, where you have pretty broad areas on the other, is one which, to my mind anyway, is not adequate or accurate.

Now I don't think many members in this Assembly would argue the point raised by the opposition were we talking about grants as such. There is really no doubt that under DREE this information is made public. It would be an untenable proposition if grants from the government were made to industry or business and this money was kept confidential. I submit that one of the encouraging things about the whole discussion over DREE is that enough public information did come out on an ongoing basis. We have a good deal of discussion in the country today which will probably improve the administration of the federal incentive program. It seems to me that in the expenditure of public money, for whatever purposes -- purposes which may be completely altruistic or from the highest of motives -- the more this expenditure can be brought out in the open, especially when it concerns awarding money in one way or another to private individuals so they can develop a profitable operation, it should be available to the members of the Legislature and to the public.

Now, the hon. minister proposed that if MLAs wanted to obtain specific information -- on a confidential basis, I assume -- this information would be provided. Frankly, this places the MLAs in a completely untenable position. Several of the opposition members have already stated the case, but it seems to me that it is worth re-emphasizing that if a person were to acquire the names of individuals who obtained money from the fund on a confidential basis it would clearly be quite wrong for those MLAs to use this information in any other than a confidential sense. They may happen to find that the loans went to people who had no right getting them. They would therefore be prescribed from taking any action, because of the fact that they received this information on a confidential basis. The net result, Mr. Speaker, of that sort of proposition is that your MLAs would cease, really, to carry out their public responsibilities which are in part to act as watchdogs of the public expenditure.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the amendment, while it would provide us with a good deal of useful information, nevertheless leaves out information which should be made public. I therefore find that I have to vote against it and support the original motion.

May I just close by saying that when public money is spent -- and I concur with the views expressed by the members of the opposition -- even though it is in the form of loans, the fact remains that this money is allocated by the Legislature. As a result, if we are going to develop schemes of assistance to industry or the private sector, it is my view that these schemes will operate better and will command a greater degree of public confidence if in fact the public knows what's going on, and if there's no suggestion at all that there is any sort of behind-the-scenes manipulation.

I'm not suggesting, in the case of the Alberta Opportunity Fund, that there's one shred of evidence that there is any kind of behind-the-scenes manipulation. But I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that if these schemes are to earn the respect of not only the business community they are set up to serve, but the population as a whole, they should be as open as possible and information should be disclosed fully not only to members of this Legislature, but the people of the province.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a few remarks to the House concerning this amendment.

I believe that one of the most important responsibilities of an MLA has to do with the expenditure of public funds. One of our prime responsibilities here, is to see that public funds are spent properly, and that nothing is done wrong. I believe this particular responsibility would be agreed to by most hon. members.

In providing large votes, as this particular one could be -- \$50 million or \$100 million is large for a province of this size -- then telling the MLAs that once you have voted this the veil comes down, you can no longer question this, I think the hon. members on both sides of the House, the back-benchers, ought to stand up and fight to retain the responsibility they have here.

It is easy for the government to say this should be confidential. But once we have this precedent, the same debate would prevail in every case in the spending of public funds. When an elected representative is sent here as one of the watchdogs, on both sides of the House, you can't lock beyond this.

Now I wish also to go on record as saying that I am not accusing the government of any patronage. You can't accuse unless you have facts. But the governments have been known in the past to have mishandled funds. And if the hon. members are agreeable, the Conservatives have been no exception, except in this province, because they have never had the opportunity.

But, can I say this, Mr. Speaker, that it is the responsibility of the MLAs in this House to ensure that the opportunity to mishandle funds does not present itself. I'm not saying that anybody by the name of Hecner or anybody else will get a loan, but if he does I should be the first one to know because I am elected here and I am paid to be here to protect the public against improper use of the funds.

But the government is saying by our amendment, "You have no right to ask these questions." Once we have passed this bill, the Opportunity Fund legislation, and have started a corporation then the executive has a free hand in handling this thing.

I think that the principle is wrong, it is contrary to their often-declared position of open government. It is contrary to what the public generally expects, and I believe that it is not in the best interests of the public. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, urge the hon. members on both sides of the House to oppose this amendment.

MR. WYSE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to stand and state that I agree with what has been said on this side of the House. Mr. Speaker, it is not only our right to know where public money is being spent, large amounts of public money, but it is also our responsibility, as MIAs, to see that these public funds are spent wisely. But what I can't understand here, Mr. Speaker, I cannot comprehend, what the government is hiding? Why won't they tell us where these funds are going, and what is the reason why they refuse? I personally want to know where these loans are going and in what part of the province.

Now I have had much correspondence with two companies in my particular area who have had both their applications turned down. They have met the qualifications for the fund, but yet they were turned down, and we haven't had a satisfactory reason why they are turned down.

Some have stated that because Medicine Hat is in the DREE area, the government is not accepting any applications, or at least we are not getting our share. Now this is the reason why I am concerned and I want this information.

Another question I want to ask is why the provincial government moved our industrial development officer to Calgary? It indicates that he was not going to be used that much in that portion of the province. Is this their reason, or their idea of decentralization? These are some of the reasons why I want to find out answers to these questions Mr. Speaker, and to see if there is any hanky-panky really going on.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I notice that the hon. Minister of Advanced Education is not in the House. I'll see if I can answer the question. For the information of the House the industrial development worker to whom the gentleman refers --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Is the hon. minister speaking on the amendment? There is no provision for a question period at this time.

DR. HOHOL:

Yes, if the gentleman agrees. The point I want to make is that we have two such workers, one in the south stationed in Calgary, and one in the north stationed in Edmonton. The one in the south is now working out some of the crucial and difficult problems as part of a committee working in Grande Cache following the closure of Plant No. 5.

MR. HENDERSON:

I wonder if the hon. Minister of Industry and Development concurs with the statements just made?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. leader of the Opposition has already spoken. The question period ended some time ago.

MR. HENDERSON:

Am I not permitted a question to the member who has just spoken?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. leader of the Opposition is asking the unanimous consent of the House to revert to the question period?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to know if I could address a question to the minister who has just spoken? Would he entertain a question?

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Apparently the hon. Leader of the Opposition has not the unanimous consent of the House to depart from the rules in this way.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Questions have been permitted in this House continually from a member to a member who has just spoken. This has happened to me, and happened to everybody every day. I can't understand your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Sorry. I have missed the purport of what has been going on in that event. I wasn't aware that the question was directed to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister just to state a clarification for the benefit of the House. I think it's relevant to Hansard.

He referred to the minister of post-secondary education relative to the matter of industrial development. This is really the context within which I raise to rise. . . within which I rise to raise my question. Did he mean to refer to the minister of post-secondary education?

DR. HOWE:

I didn't mean to refer, Mr. Speaker, to the minister of post-secondary education, if I did I meant the Minister of Advanced Education.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a couple of words because of some of the points made by the members of the opposition. They have drawn the attention of the House, in their role as watchdogs of the public purse to the idea that once public funds are voted by this House, under the responsibility of a minister, that there is no opportunity for them to see, in fact, how those public funds are spent. Surely the members who have made that point know that is just not so. We have in this House, and in most legislatures, I'm sure, a Public Accounts Committee. The members can have the Board of the Alberta Opportunity Fund before them, they can question why loans are turned down. You can ask them how they make them, you can go into all the detail you want, nobody stops you. You can ask them questions for as long as you can stand and ask questions, and their responsibility is to answer.

So, Mr. Speaker, the idea that it is impossible for the members to come and fulfil their responsibility is just false, and they should not be leaving that impression in the House.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit a question? When he finishes?

MR. GETTY:

Yes. Mr. Speaker, one of the members made the point that this money is voted by the Legislature and it's a responsibility of a minister and therefore all such funds that are like that should be public -- how they are spent.

Obviously, many things that a minister of the government does must, in fact, be maintained in confidence. It is only reasonable. Part of the problem of governing is that you are dealing with confidential information that comes before you, and the fact the funds to carry out this confidential action are voted by the Legislature does not in any way allow you, nevertheless, to make that public.



The hon. Member for Wainwright mentioned he could go with legal advice and obtain information on how to get a loan. Well, if he had that legal advice he would know in fact, there are presently regulations existing that would keep your name confidential. Everybody who has come before the Alberta Opportunity Company, we should assume, is aware of the regulations which have been passed, and that in fact they came with the knowledge that this information was going to be kept confidential. I certainly don't see how the members can then argue that, in fact, it should be laid on the table in this Legislature and then appear in newspapers, or any other form of media, or become public. I can't follow that line of reasoning.

I asked the hon. Member for Cardston, and he thought -- well maybe he was wrong, and maybe in the future this kind of thing could be made public. I think that was the way he answered my question.

And that is open to every member of the House. If they want to propose in some way that regulations be amended or that all government expenditures be treated in a completely public way, and that none can in any way be spent in a confidential manner, then all of them have the opportunity to lay resolutions before this House and make whatever arguments they want, and try to carry the argument. Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that they had that opportunity and they should try and do it the first chance.

The only other thing, Mr. Speaker, I found remarkable was the reaction to the minister's offer that if there were some suggestions -- and several members mentioned pork-barrel patronage, and so on -- that they were going to be the watchdogs of that. Fine. They might in confidence go to his office. Now, I'm not sure about the hon. leader of the Opposition, whether he deals under the table or whether he deals in back rooms, Mr. Speaker, but that is not the way the minister of this government is prepared to deal.

The reaction -- I find it shameful, as a matter of fact -- and then the hon. Member for Calgary Bow gets up and says that he is worried about skulking around. Well, maybe he skulks around, Mr. Speaker, but certainly it was not the intention, nor has that offer been made --

MR. WILSON:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think I was misquoted. I said I had an invitation to skulk around. I didn't say I was skulking around.

MR. GETTY:

I don't know if it was a point of order or not, Mr. Speaker. As I was just telling him, he did not have such an invitation. There is something about the way he thinks, Mr. Speaker, that would make him think that he would be skulking around. That's his own responsibility and certainly not that of the government.

Now, there is one other point that is just a matter of history, Mr. Speaker. When I was first in this Legislature I thought The Alberta Commercial Corporation, which in a way has become The Alberta Opportunity Company, in one portion of it, I asked in a Motion for a Return for almost identical information. The reason was -- although I didn't ask for a list of tourist companies -- I wanted to know about security, and who had pledged it to The Alberta Commercial Corporation. At that time, those members in the House who were on this side all stood up and said, what a terrible thing that is for you to do. What a terrible thing. Our Commercial Corporation must make loans and take security in confidence. As a matter of fact they appealed to me to withdraw the motion at the time, Mr. Speaker. And listening to their argument, which was no different from the one that is being made now, I did withdraw the motion for a return. But it is amazing, Mr. Speaker, how walking across that ten or twelve feet has changed their argument so considerably.

Now, the argument about a grant. I can't find it in any way the same as a loan, because a grant is a thing that is done. It's given, and there is no security taken. There is no assessment of the man's security. There is --

MR. HENDERSON:

A point of order. Is the minister speaking to the amendment or to the main motion?

MR. SPEAKER:

There has been so much latitude in the debate on the amendment that it would be very doubtful whether the Speaker could now enforce the rule about relevance.

MR. HENDERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The question of comments on grants -- I think if you will check you will find we are in the comments to the main motion, and not to the amendment.

[Interjections]

We are just talking about the amendment now.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether he is paying attention. It was only five minutes ago that the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, in fact, got into grants and how DREE operates. So if you are not listening, I can't help you; Jim; you're just going to have to pay attention.

MR. HENDERSON:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker; he is clearly out of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

MR. GETTY:

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that grants are different. There isn't a repayment situation set up. In that way persons can have their security assessed. You can get some feeling on how they are going to earn enough money to make a payment on loans, and this doesn't exist with grants. So, Mr. Speaker, there are obviously many reasons why, in this situation, the hon. Member from Jasper has made an intelligent amendment which we certainly find the whole House should be easily able to support, and I urge all of the members, Mr. Speaker, to support it.

MR. HENDERSON:

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the minister: he indicated he would answer it. Do I gather from his remarks addressed to the amendment that the information we are asking for in this Return is going to be provided in the Public Accounts of the Province of Alberta? This is what I concluded from his remarks, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GETTY:

No, Mr. Speaker, that's not so, but some hon. members on the other side wanted to know why certain things were turned down. I can't think of a better opportunity than to come before the Public Accounts Committee with The Alberta Opportunity Company Board and question them. One of the hon. members said that after funds are voted upon, how do you find out how they are spent? Well, Public Accounts Committee has been a tradition. That is how you find out how funds are spent. And so, as I said when I got up to speak, to point out some of the arguments that have been presented, Mr. Speaker, I just cannot agree with them and have had to make my point of view regarding them. Certainly, I commend all the members to Public Accounts as a great opportunity to find out how the funds, in fact, of the government are spent.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few comments with regard to the amendment, may I say that the minister of skulking affairs is the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. I think, Mr. Speaker --

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, in his usual way of dealing with the federal government he is throwing up a smoke-screen once again. For the minister to stand in the House and suggest to us that he is opposed to having this information made public today -- and all the members over there are obviously going to support this kind of an amendment -- but for the members over there to say they are going to oppose that today, and then in a year or two years time when the Public Accounts come before the committee, they are not going to take the same approach in debating it before Public Accounts, is really asking us to believe quite a bit on this side of the House. And for the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs to seriously suggest that that's a very responsible argument really leaves me to question his ability to negotiate with the federal government.

MR. GETTY:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I don't know whether the hon. member was listening to the question that the Leader of the Opposition asked me, because I dealt with that very point and he has now, in fact, changed what I told him in that answer.

Now I know that they aren't listening to each other over there, that's been obvious today, but they should listen when I --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. If the hon. minister is debating the amendment further.

MR. CLARK:

I think, Mr. Speaker, we recognize what the hon. minister is trying to do.

DR. HORNER:

[Inaudible]

MR. CLARK:

I'm glad you recognize that, Dr. Horner.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You gave us lessons.

MR. CLARK:

We have the master. Might I say, Mr. Speaker, just two other things. In the amendment made by the Member for Edson, the Minister of Tourism, he uses the term, "actual location". Now I recognize that perhaps he can't ask the question, but I'd ask the member who has moved the Return to elaborate on what he means by actual location in the course of the Motion for Return that he has placed before the House. Because that actual location the hon. member referred to in his main motion, and the same term used in the amendment, deals with the legal description of where the property is located. That's one thing. On the other hand, if it is simply the mailing address, that is simply another thing altogether. And so when the hon. member Mr. Dixon is closing the debate on this particular Motion for a Return, I ask that he touch on the question of what does he really mean by actual location.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague, the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, did not get the opportunity to make his point very clearly again because of the way --

[Interjections]

Now just a minute. Because of the way it has been twisted so badly, I think it is very important that it be clarified, and that is the matter of reference of any matter by members of this House to the Public Accounts Committee.

I had the responsibility of serving as chairman of that committee for four years, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is important that all the members realize it is up to the members of the committee to decide upon what subjects shall be

brought in front of the committee for discussion and analysis during that particular session. To my knowledge there were never any that were refused.

But there is one point I do wish to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, I can recall on several occasions the Provincial Auditor sitting beside me when a certain question was put to a witness at the Public Accounts Committee, and he raised the concern of confidentiality. After all, that is what this entire motion and debate has been about. It is a matter of confidentiality of private business affairs between a citizen of Alberta and The Alberta Opportunity Company.

In no way did the hon. Mr. Getty leave the inference that if this matter were referred to the Public Accounts Committee the names of the applicants would be automatically divulged. I think that would have to be a matter to be decided on the ruling of the chairman of the committee on the advice that he might receive at that time. But surely a full discussion of the matter could take place, and I think the attempts to twist that, and twist it badly, must be clarified for the record.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, in entering into this debate I would like to make one or two comments on some of the things that have been said.

First of all, I would like to relate to the remarks of the Minister of Intergovernmental and Federal Affairs.

One of the things I have often noted about the hon. minister is his sincerity and his consistency over a long period of time, and I know that when he was over here, standing approximately in this place, he made some very good proposals to the House. I remember as a minister of the Crown then, believing in them and listening to each and every one of those submissions. I always felt that what he submitted to the House was the rule we should follow and that years later the thought at that point in time would be as good today, and even 10 years from now.

But I heard something very interesting today, when he indicated that he made a Motion for a Return about The Alberta Commercial Corporation. He indicated that he felt certain information should be before the House and that the principle of revealing this data was very important. He said he had worked for it and had even been asked by the other side of the House at that point in time to withdraw it and he did not feel that was a very good intention or action by government.

So the question I ask is, what about now? Why not the same type of principle prevailing? Why isn't information being revealed at this time so we as an opposition, we as members of the Legislature, can act responsibly and make judgments on responsibilities that have been placed in the hands of the Minister of Industry and Commerce? That is one question.

The second thing is with regard to the comments of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. He has indicated that we can raise this matter again in public accounts. Well certainly we can. The procedure does allow for that very fact. But one of the things we must recognize is that the majority of members on the committee are on the government side of the House. The majority of members that can make the decision on this particular amendment are on the government side of the House. The situation was exactly the same then as it is now.

How can we rationalize on any matter if we don't have the opportunity of gaining the names of the companies or the individuals we are asking for? I think the reasoning or the logic just doesn't hold water, Mr. Speaker. I certainly feel there is nothing wrong with us knowing this type of information. I'm certainly going to vote against the amendment.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker --

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question, question.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to enter this debate because I think several things should be clear to this House, and to this Assembly. One is how The Alberta

Opportunity Company works. There is a board before which the approval of all loans goes. Anybody who has had any experience in business appreciates the fact that you cannot get a board from the private sector to handle these loans, and judge on them, if a minister in any way is going to reverse the decisions of that board. So the first line of protection for the program as far as The Alberta Opportunity Fund is concerned, in regard to the loans, is the board itself.

The second, as was ably pointed out by my colleague, Mr. Miniely, is the the annual audit. We're accountable to that.

The third thing which is important, and I repeat, in the regulations under Section 14(2) is that the loans to date have been taken on the understanding that the names were confidential. Apart from the general competitive aspects of setting up a fund or a company such as this to preform in the market place, those that have had experience recognize there are certain areas of confidentiality which must be recognized. It was with that intent and with that sincerity that we introduced Section 14(2), into the regulations when they were written.

Therefore, in supporting the amendment to this motion, I can only support it for the reasons I have reiterated to all members of this House.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a question to clarify the regulations with the hon. minister.

MR. PEACOCK:

Yes?

MR. DIXON:

In Section 14(2), it says, "other than those legally entitled to such information." Who, in your opinion, is legally entitled to the information?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is really asking a legal opinion in express words.

MR. DIXON:

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the minister doesn't want to answer that question, I wonder --

[Interjections]

--I'm not out of order. The hon. minister spoke on the regulations, I'm asking him to clarify them.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, do we conclude that the matter of interpretations of law cannot be dealt with during debate? I can understand, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, that the interpretation of law in the normal Question Period clearly contravenes the rules of Beauchesne. But the question of law and the interpretation of law during the course of debate on a motion before the House is surely a different matter, Mr. Speaker.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it seems to me that this debate on the amendment has wandered far from the amendment. I don't know in any way how a question of law can come into an amendment of a resolution before the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

At the moment, the Chair is not aware of any precedent for a rule which directly covers the point; but it does seem to be questionable, without wishing to play on words, that a minister of the Crown should be asked to interpret a law which is subject to interpretation by the courts and there is the possibility, although perhaps not the likelihood, that if the same law has to be interpreted by the courts the minister's interpretation may in some way inhibit the interpretation by the court.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, just one more item on the point of order. I think the question is relevant because the Minister of Agriculture, the Deputy Premier, said earlier in the debate, well, forget the regulation -- if it needs to be changed we'll change it. And this is the question we're talking about. Our member is asking the Minister of Commerce a question. It's quite relevant to the debate that preceded us in the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Without at the moment intending to create any precedent in the matter, the Chair is of the opinion that the minister should not be asked to give a legal opinion concerning the effect of any statute or regulation, which also has the effect of a statute, by virtue of the authority given in the statute. However, the hon. minister has indicated his willingness to express an opinion on the regulations, and if the House does not object, perhaps he might proceed.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the willingness on the part of the minister to respond to the question, but I do think, with all due respect, sir, it is important that we have a follow-up interpretation or justification support for the ruling that you have just made in principle.

MR. SPEAKER:

I am prepared to have the authorities checked and give the information to the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to answer the question, or give my interpretation. I would suggest that, apart from the legal interpretation, the intent was that people entering into the negotiation be privy to the knowledge.

MR. DIXON:

My further question to the minister is: if a corporation went bankrupt and an official of the company absconded with the loan money, and a newsman asked you for the name of the individual who absconded with the money, you would have to go get permission from the company before you could name him. That's how ridiculous they are.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is clearly debating and not asking a question.

Are you ready for the question on the amendment? Taking the amendment as read, would all those in favour of the amendment please say aye. Would those opposed to the amendment please say no.

[Mr. Speaker declared the amendment carried; a number of members rose, calling for a division. The division bell was rung.]

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided as follows:

## For the amendment:

Adair	Doan	Hyndman	Purdy
Appleby	Dowling	Jamison	Russell
Ashton	Farran	King	Schmid
Backus	Fluker	Kozlak	Stromberg
Batiuk	Foster	Lee	Topolnisky
Chambers	Getty	Leitch	Trynchy
Chichak	Ghitter	Lougheed	Warrack
Cookson	Hansen	McCrimmon	Young
Copithorne	Harle	Miller, J.	Yurko
Crawford	Hohol	Moore	Zander
Diachuk	Horner	Paproski	
Dickie	Hunley	Peacock	

## Against the amendment:

Anderson	Cooper	Ho Lem	Speaker
Barton	Dixon	Ludwig	Strom
Benoit	Drain	Miller, D.	Taylor
Buck	French	Notley	Wilson
Buckwell	Gruenwald	Ruste	Wyse
Clark	Henderson	Sorenson	

Totals: Ayes - 46                      Noes - 23]

[The motion was carried.]

114. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Taylor.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

- (1) A copy of the terms of reference and such related correspondence establishing the study, promised by the Premier at the last session, to review all legislation for the purposes of determining whether any of the statutes, or sections thereof, are contrary to The Alberta Bill of Rights.
- (2) A copy of the preliminary report or correspondence relating to that study.
- (3) What will be the date that the final report will be tabled in the Legislature.

## MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move Motion No. 114 standing in my name on the Order Paper. I might just comment very briefly. The fundamental reason for asking for this particular information relates to the terms of the Alberta bill of human rights, which makes provisions for the notwithstanding clause. I think we raised in the debate last year a number of areas where it might be in the public interest to consider the application of the notwithstanding clause. I think there are some areas in which there could be some injustices done if this clause is not inserted. The one that comes to my mind is the age of majority. Obviously, the legislation which has been written in the past, right back from 1905 up to the last session of the Legislature, was written without a view to the possibility of an Alberta bill of human rights being drafted. It seems to me it is highly desirable that this item receive a high priority.

I believe during the debate last year there was an indication from the government ministers that such a study would have a high priority.

## MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, we agree to the question on the understanding that we will not be filing copies of departmental or interdepartmental preliminary reports or correspondence.

## MR. SPEAKER:

Strictly speaking, that is an amendment to the motion. If the House wishes to accept the motion on those terms without a formal amendment, I will put the question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, if I might just respond very briefly to the comment made by the Attorney General. I am really at a loss to know why they feel a need for such caution in the matter. Certainly, the legislation they are examining is not their own handiwork, it is that of previous governments. I don't think in any way, shape or form it would bind or tie the Crown --

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it the hon. Leader of the Opposition is closing the debate. May the hon. Leader of the Opposition close the debate?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HENDERSON:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I say, I can understand some apprehension on the part of the government having some reluctance to deal with some aspects of the matter of correspondence. I could accept the suggestion that the government exercise some discretion as to what interdepartmental correspondence they may believe is not in the public interest to bring forth at this time. But I would hope that the government would simply say that they refuse at this point in time to provide any correspondence. I don't have the copy of Hansard before me, but I recall in general terms in the debate -- it may have been in committee -- I put the question to the Premier whether such a study was to be conducted. He indicated that yes, there would be one conducted in the form of a preliminary study. He gave no indication when the study would be completed, and it was understood that an in-depth, on-going study would take a considerably longer period of time.

I would simply close in saying that I accept the need on the part of the government to exercise some discretion in certain areas relative to the examination of interdepartmental correspondence. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the reason for not tabling the correspondence would not relate to an issue of partisan politics, because the study is primarily going to be an examination of actions of the previous governments, and governments in the province as opposed to anything that the present administration has done.

[The motion was carried]

MR. SPEAKER:

In order to record effectively what has been done I would ask leave of the House to include in the Votes and Proceedings, along with the motion, the condition which was imposed by the hon. The Attorney General. Have I that consent from the House.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

115. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Dixon.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

Information required:

(1) For the years 1970, 1971 and 1972, the following:

(a) total Crown reserves of conventional crude oil (non-tar sands) and liquid petroleum gas as of December 31 of each year,

(b) total annual production of conventional crude oil (non-tar sands) and liquid petroleum gas for each year,

(c) annual incremental reserves resulting from



- (i) new discoveries (ii) improved recovery techniques.
- (2) Forecast prepared by the Energy Board and the Department of Mines and Minerals for annual production of Alberta.
- (a) conventional oil (non-tar sands) and liquid petroleum gas,
- (b) natural gas
- (c) tar sands synthetic oil for the years 1973 to 1980 inclusive from proven fields or reservoirs in existence as of December 31, 1972.
- (3) (a) The name and annual production of oil, liquid petroleum gas for the period 1973 to 1980 inclusive for each Alberta oil pool having proven producible reserves in excess of 50 million barrels as of December 31, 1972.
- (b) The proven recoverable reserves for each pool named in (3) (a) as of December 31, 1972.
- (4) (a) The number and names of oil and gas companies as of December 31, 1972, who have opted in favor of the tax on mineral oil and gas reserves.
- (b) The number and names of oil and gas companies as of December 31, 1972, who have opted in favour of higher royalties.

[The motion was carried.]

116. Mr. Ludwig proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Dixon.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

- (1) The gross expenditure made by the government for the provision of facilities in the Southern Alberta Jubilee Auditorium and the Northern Alberta Jubilee Auditorium for the serving of alcoholic beverages.
- (2) The amounts expended for furnishing and equipment in each Auditorium since September 10, 1971.
- (3) Any protests received by government with regard to the serving of alcoholic beverages in the Jubilee Auditoriums. Please table all correspondence, including petitions received and replies to the said correspondence and petitions.

MR. LUDWIG:

I would like to make a few preliminary remarks concerning this motion.

[Interjections]

First of all this issue of liquor in the auditorium. I have never had the hon. members opposite so agreeable. I wonder what they are up to.

[Interjections]

Maybe I shouldn't be pushing my luck, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LUDWIG:

The issue of liquor in the auditoriums in Calgary, and in Edmonton, became very important, notwithstanding that some people wanted it served in the auditoriums. Because of the nature of the institution, the nature of the building, and the use to which it is put, a great number of people from all walks of life were not happy about this decision. I believe one of the greatest criticisms one can make about this decision is the fact that we are now moving into a position where liquor will be served in government buildings, Mr. Speaker. This negates entirely the private enterprise view of the government that here we have a situation where people have built hotels, provided for liquor outlets at their private expense, and made an investment --

perhaps gambled, and took a chance -- but now a government building will be used to compete with these facilities. I believe that this is contrary to what the government has preached, or what it professes to stand for. I believe that this question therefore, Mr. Speaker, is very timely and very necessary, so that we find out whether we are not going to be subsidizing drinking.

It's one thing to subsidize cultural activities, and to perhaps spend money that the government makes through The Alberta Liquor Control Board to take care of alcoholics, but it is another thing to subsidize social drinking in the auditoriums.

Another thing that I wish to point out is that we are sensitive about liquor advertising. But children, students, et cetera often hold functions in the auditorium, and we will have one part of the auditorium used for --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. As the Chair understands it, the debate on this motion must be relevant to whether or not the motion should be passed to require the government to give the requested information, and as I understand it, that does not render relevant a general debate concerning the advisability of liquor in auditoria or anything of that kind.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, there is ample precedent in this House. On a number of occasions, once a Motion for a Return was made, we had a very broad and wide ranging debate as witnessed by the previous --

DR. HORNER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUDWIG:

I am on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and there can be no point of order on a point of order. I would like to finish. Yes.

Mr. Speaker, when we refer to Motion No. 109, one can hardly say now that there was not the broadest, and the most all encompassing debate on this motion possible, whether it was relevant as to whether the motion should be passed or not, and I am exercising the rights that were established in this House for a number of years by precedent. I believe -- although I will be obliged to abide by the ruling of the Chair -- that your ruling, bearing in mind what has transpired, would be unduly restrictive Mr. Speaker.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order. First of all, I rather question the hon. member's tactics in questioning the ruling of the Chair. Also, I would refer him to his colleague, the former Speaker in this House. When we attempted to debate motions which were agreeable to the government, we were sat down very quickly and told that we couldn't debate except the narrow --

[Interjections]

-- Well the hon. member has had his chance, and he keeps shouting words about what is truth and what isn't truth. I rather suspect, Mr. Speaker, he has little knowledge of what, in fact, is truth. The fact is -- and I challenge well the hon. member has had his chance, he keeps shouting words about what is truth and what isn't, and I rather suspect, Mr. Speaker, he has little knowledge of what, in fact, is truth. The fact is, and I challenge the hon. Member for Calgary Millican to back me up on this, that the Speaker in this Legislature, in fact, made the ruling that the debate on the Motion for a Return was restricted to the question of whether or not the government was obliged to divulge certain information. I respectfully submit, Mr. Speaker, that the debate on Motion 109, in fact, had some relevance to that particular question. And again, I question the hon. member debating the ruling of the Chair.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

It's impossible for the Chair to accept as precedents occurrences that in the past are recorded neither in Hansard, nor in the Journals of the House. And unless some such precedent could be brought to the attention of the Chair, we shall have to confine ourselves to our present rules and Beauchesne and what may be in the Hansard which has been kept since the beginning of last session. Under the circumstances, I must ask the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View to keep his remarks within the subject of the motion which is, the advisability of giving the requested information.

MR. LUDWIG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will continue, therefore, to express my views as to why I believe this motion is important, why it is in the interests of the public, and why the hon. members ought to support it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What question? What motion?

MR. LUDWIG:

I didn't know I'd get an ovation so quickly, Mr. Speaker, but it's amazing how I can get their concurrence, and then when I say something the government seems to be blushing a bit about -- feels embarrassed -- how I incur their opposition, so they are most unpredictable. But I would like to proceed with my motion.

[Interjections]

MR. LUDWIG:

I'm making a distinction between question 1 and 2, in that I'm asking for the amount of expenditures on liquor facilities in the auditoriums and secondly, in question 2, the amount expended for furnishings and equipment in each auditorium since September 10, 1971. I'm anxious to make this distinction to determine what priorities our government -- our 'Now' government -- places on liquor facilities and on the comfort of the public generally. That is one that I make.

And also --

[Interjections]

MR. LUDWIG:

And also, Mr. Speaker, saying what heckling appears to be in order, and I hope that this is borne in mind when the tables are turned on the government. I'd like to state, Mr. Speaker, with regard to Question 3, that I understand that a great number of letters and a few petitions have been signed urging the government not to make this move, and I'm requesting that in the event that such a petition was received, or petitions were received by whichever ministers in charge, that these petitions be tabled to indicate to the hon. members whether this was, in fact, a proper thing to do.

I'm concerned about the fact, Mr. Speaker, and I wish that perhaps if any of the hon. members would respond to whether the government in fact, intends to make a profit on these liquor sales. I'm suggesting that they are going to have a money loser and I'm objecting to the fact that I might have to subsidize this kind of an operation. So, Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks -- relevant remarks -- I urge the hon. members to support this most worthy motion.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I accept the motion subject to the usual concurrence by the correspondents.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You'll get a letter Albert.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, before closing this debate, in view of the remarks made by the Member for Calgary Mountain View, it should be perhaps noted that he has once

again engaged in intellectual combat with this side of the House. Unfortunately, he was unarmed.

MR. LUDWIG:

It is amazing, Mr. Speaker, how little armament a man needs to deal with the hon. members opposite.

MR. SPEAKER:

We have here a similar situation to the one with regard to the previous motion. The hon. Minister of Youth, Culture and Recreation has suggested a limitation or a condition on the Order. The suggestion of the Chair would be that in that event that limitation be included with the motion when it is reported in the votes and journals of the House. All those in favour of the motion, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No

[The motion was carried.]

121. Mr. Anderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Wyse.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

A resume of public housing units constructed since September 10th, 1971, or presently under construction, in the province under the Alberta Housing Act, indicating:

- (1) The number of units;
- (2) The locations of these units;
- (3) The physical descriptions;
- (4) The capital costs;
- (5) The annual operating costs;
- (6) The scale of rent; and
- (7) The vacancy rates.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, speaking to the reasons why this motion ought to be concurred with. I agree that it should. It is a very well thought out Motion for a Return, very well worded and extremely logical in its format. I commend the hon. members for their diligent research. If they will compare the journals of February 22, 1968, they will see that it is identical in wording to a motion I had submitted, seconded by the hon. Dr. Horner; the government at that time, of course agreed to provide the information as we will. I find myself in the unique position over a span of a couple of years almost, of being the minister responsible for answering my own motion for a return. I don't know if the opposition in its diligence and in looking busy has been told to get so many Motions for a Return in, but in any case the hon. members Mr. Anderson and Mr. Wyse have gone to a good source to get theirs. I am sorry they have not been a little more imaginative, but at least they picked a good subject and the government agrees to this motion.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I recall the answer. I only hope that the hon. minister who has just spoken will be able to match the intelligence of the question with the intelligence of the answer.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No problem.

[The motion was carried.]

122. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly: seconded by Mr. Wyse.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

(1) The correspondence between the Government of Alberta, its agencies, departments or boards and representatives of the Japanese Government or Japanese oil companies concerning negotiations or commitments for development for the Athabasca tar sands.

(2) The same between the Alberta Government and Canadian, United States or other oil companies.

MR. HENDERSON:

I might point out in advance before somebody opposite does, that this is the exact wording, this and the next one, and there may be one or two others, of questions placed on the Order Paper by the gentlemen seated opposite when they were seated here. I thought the question seemed to serve them well, and looking a year or two down the road, there is no reason why we shouldn't have a repeat show.

On the more serious side, the questions were relevant when they were asked by the hon. members seated opposite and they are even more relevant today. I was so impressed with the draftsmanship of the questions, that I thought, being an engineer, not having too good a command of the English language, I would accept the wisdom displayed in the previous motions, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, we agree to the motion, subject to the usual concurrence of the parties to any correspondence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The rules of copyright having no relevance, would all those in favour of the motion please say aye?

[The motion was carried.]

123. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Barton.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

The correspondence, if any, between the Government of Alberta, its agencies, departments or boards and the Federal Government, the United States or Japan regarding attempts by Alberta to increase the markets for Alberta's conventional oil production.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the comments about the rules of copyright not being relevant. It is very obvious that there is not a single party in the political movement that has a monopoly on plagiarism, including the gentlemen seated opposite.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, we agree to the motion, subject to the usual clearance of the parties to any correspondence.

MR. SPEAKER:

Subject to those conditions, would all those in favour of the motion please say aye?

[The motion was carried.]

124. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Cooper.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

(1) The projections of the government of Alberta of anticipated occupational opportunities of Albertans in all trades and professions for the next five, ten and fifteen years, together with the anticipated earnings as well as training and qualification material to be required in each of the various trades and professions.

(2) The reference to the sources of material for such projections.

MP. CLARK:

Might I say that you will find this in the Journal for 1968, I believe. And might I say that I hope your answer is a darn sight better than the answer that the opposition got at that time, because we have now had a Department of Advanced Education in operation for 18 months, and the Department of Manpower and Labour has talked on several occasions about doing manpower projections in this particular area. So really what we are asking you here is to show us the fruits of your labours.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, the information sought in this question is certainly important. My understanding is that the answer to the question initially put was zero, so there is just no way we can improve in that particular answer, and we accept it.

[The motion was carried.]

125. Mr. Barton proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Sorenson.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

How many gas co-operatives were brought into operation since January 1st, 1972, indicating the names, location of each and dates of incorporation.

[The motion was carried.]

126. Mr. Barton proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Dixon.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

Copies of all correspondence between the Federal Government and the Alberta Government with regards to the proposed new rapeseed crushing plant for High Prairie.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, the government has no objection to this motion. The only thing, I wonder how long they looked to try and find out if there was one in 1968 that had to do with a crushing plant in High Prairie?

MR. TAYLOR:

Is there one?

MP. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this motion, I recall in this House that the hon. Minister of Agriculture, when he was in opposition, didn't know they even crushed rapeseed in this province. At that time I believe I brought a bottle of rapeseed oil from the Lethbridge processing plant to the minister to show him.

[The motion was carried.]

127. Mr. French proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Clark.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

The detailed and comprehensive research studies which are being used in guiding the growth of:

- (1) the Department of Agriculture,
- (2) the Department of Advanced Education,
- (3) the Department of Industry and Commerce,
- (4) the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation.

[The motion was carried.]

128. Mr. Benoit proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Dixon.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

All correspondence since September 10th, 1971, between the Government of Alberta or any of its departments, agencies or boards, and:

- (1) the Federal Government,
- (2) the Government of the Yukon Territory,
- (3) the Government of the States of Alaska and Montana,
- (4) the United States Federal Government

in respect of the upgrading, improvement of paving of the Alaska Highway and in respect of its tourist potential.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, we agree to this with the usual copyright reservations.

[The motion was carried.]

129. Mr. Benoit proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Buckwell.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

The amount of money spent since September 10th, 1971, by Alberta on research of the tourist industry.

[The motion was carried.]

131. Mr. R. Speaker proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Anderson.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

(1) The number of recipients of Social Assistance and Social Allowance in various age and education categories, as at December 31st, 1972, covering the following:

- (a) single male and female;
- (b) married male and female who are the head of the family; and
- (c) single male and female with dependent children.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

I think that this motion is very relevant at this time, and the information is very necessary. In the Throne debate, in the Speech placed before us, there was no mention of this area of concern in the Province of Alberta. I felt that some of the relevant and new statistics were necessary at this time.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member will find the reference familiar if I indicate to him that the data on social allowance is readily available, but on

social assistance it's not quite so available, being primarily in the hands of the Cities of Calgary and Edmonton.

All I wanted to suggest to him was that the information, when given, so far as it relates to social assistance -- there is no problem over social allowance -- that there will be a preponderance of information available, but there will be some gaps in it. It will be up to 90 per cent accurate, I'm told, by the officials.

[The motion was carried.]

132. Mr. R. Speaker proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. French.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

(1) How many recipients of Social Allowance were domiciled in motels, or other like accommodation, authorized by the Department of Health and Social Development in each city and town in Alberta as at December 31, 1972.

(2) How many recipients of Social Assistance were domiciled in motels, or other like accommodation, authorized by the Department of Health and Social Development in each city and town in Alberta as at December 31, 1972.

(3) How many recipients of Social Allowance and Social Assistance were domiciled in motels, or other like accommodation, authorized by the Department of Health and Social Development in each city and town during the calendar year of 1972.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there may be some difficulty over part (3) and I would ask the hon. member to hold that until the next day.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree that this may go over to the next day?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

133. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Sorenson.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

(1) All correspondence between the Government of Alberta, its Ministers, Departments, Agencies and Boards with the Broadcasters' Association of Alberta or any of its members with regards to permitting advertising of liquor on television and radio.

(2) A copy of the studies done or commissioned by the Government of Alberta on the effects of liquor advertising especially as it is related to the rate of alcoholism.

[The motion was carried.]

134. Mr. Wilson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Clark.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

A copy of the Plan of the Alberta Government for the development of recreational facilities in the Canmore Corridor adjacent to Banff National Park to provide necessary recreational facilities for the citizens of Calgary and surrounding areas.

[The motion was carried.]

135. Mr. Dixon proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Ludwig.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:



(1) The amount in fees paid by Alberta Government Telephones to the City of Edmonton for origination and termination fees for long distance telephone calls, for the period January 1, 1972 to December 31, 1972.

(2) The rate per line that AGT pays to the City of Edmonton for use of lines for AGT offices in Edmonton.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder, under the circumstances, if I could ask the hon. member to let this stand for a day or two?

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I was even going to suggest that, but I thought you might not want me to delay it.

MR. HENDERSON:

Is it understood, Mr. Speaker, that when the questions are delayed that they will maintain their position on the Order Paper?

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe that is implicit in the unanimous agreement of the House that they go over. Is there such an agreement with respect to 135?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

136. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Clark.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

(1) The names of Alberta Government Boards or Agencies whose funds, or trust funds, were transferred into General Public Revenue since September 10, 1971.

(2) The amount of money involved in each transfer.

[The motion was carried.]

137. Mr. Barton proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. R. Speaker.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

Correspondence between Government of Alberta, its Ministers, departments or agencies, and

(a) Native Friendship Centres,

(b) Federal Government

regarding the financial difficulties of the Native Friendship Centres.

MR. GETTY:

I have no objection to this subject to the usual concurrence of the interested parties.

[The motion was carried subject to that condition.]

138. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Cooper.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

All correspondence between Local 250 of the Brewery Workers, Tartan Breweries Company, and the Government of Alberta, its Ministers, departments or agencies, since January 1, 1972.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, subject to approval of correspondence, I would be pleased to table the questions answered on this very important matter.

[The motion was carried subject to that condition.]

139. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Ho Lem.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

Copies of all correspondence since December 15, 1972, between the Government of Alberta and any of its Departments, Agencies or Boards and any city, town or village in Alberta regarding the final Farran Report and the Alberta Property Tax Reduction Plan.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, again subject only to the concurrence of the correspondents we agree to the motion.

[The motion was carried subject to that condition.]

140. Mr. Buckwell proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Barton.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

(1) The number of employees in each Provincial Government department, agency, or board as of December 31, 1972, including the Alberta Government Telephones and categorized in accordance with budget accounts and also setting forth the budgeted number of employees in each category.

(2) The total amount paid in salaries during the first nine months of the fiscal year 1972/73 up to December 31, 1972, as a percentage of each department's aggregate expenditure in the same period.

[The motion was carried.]

141. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Mandeville.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

Copies of all correspondence between the Government of Alberta, any of its Ministers or Agencies and the Government of British Columbia, and any of its Ministers or Agencies, in regards to the W.A.C. Bennett Dam and the Peace-Athabasca Delta, since September 1, 1971.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, as with all the other Motions for a Return, this one is subject, of course, to the concurrence of the Government of British Columbia in regards to tabling the correspondence in which they are involved.

[The motion was carried subject to that condition.]

142. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to this Assembly, seconded by Mr. Miller.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

Reports prepared by or for the Department of the Environment or the Energy Board regarding the ecological implications of a second and subsequent McMurray Tar Sands processing plants as particularly related to atmospheric discharge of sulphur dioxide gas.

[The motion was carried.]

143. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Taylor.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

A copy of all written submissions made since September 10, 1971, by the Government of Alberta to any of the First Ministers' conferences or Ministers of Finance conferences on the matter of equalization payment.

[The motion was carried.]

144. Mr. Ho Lem proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Wilson.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

The total number of inmates at the Calgary Correctional Institute, Calgary, and Fort Saskatchewan Jail, Edmonton, and the percentage breakdown by institution as to the ages of the following categories:

16 - 18 years  
18 - 25 years  
25 - 40 years  
40 - 65 years  
65 years and older.

MR. HO LEM:

My reason for requesting this information is based on the many concerns expressed over the increased criminal convictions recently, where we find that many of our institutions are taxed to their fullest facilities. Now this is the result, I feel of the temptations of our permissive society. We find our young people exposed to so many temptations, and of course, this is again compounded by the situation, I feel, of the failure of our institutions in providing rehabilitative programs, correctional programs, affecting young people as well as old, and also first-time offenders.

The information which I seek today is in regard to the numbers, as well as percentages of various age groups, and I am hoping that when the government replies further information will be given regarding what programs are being instituted in these correctional institutions for our youth, because I feel that the public has a concern that these people are lumped in together with hardened criminals. Of course, for the youthful first-time offenders, it gives them an opportunity to learn the techniques in pursuing a career of --

DR. HORNER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I don't know how the hon. member can refer in debate on the question of whether or not we should make this Return, and then ask for additional information which he hopes the government will table at the same time. If he wants additional information other than that which he has put down on the Order Paper, then he should ask for it.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, just in answer to that point, I was hoping only -- I am not demanding -- that this additional information might be supplied. The public is concerned over the many criminal activities operated even within the institutions. We hear of homosexual activities. We hear about drug addiction carried on within these institutions, and we would like further information to ease the public concern in this area.

[The motion was carried.]

145. Mr. Wilson proposed the following motion to this Assembly, seconded by Mr. Clark.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

Copies of all correspondence with and minutes of all meetings held between the Government of Alberta, its Ministers, Departments or Agencies and the City of Edmonton with regard to the establishing of a provincial park for that city.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express some concerns with respect to this particular Motion No. 145, on two counts. Mr. Speaker, one count is that, as was announced in this House very shortly ago by both the Premier and myself on separate occasions, we are looking toward the development of a provincial park that would be a metropolitan provincial park in the Edmonton city or immediate area.

With respect to the matters under consideration and including any correspondence and other related and allied studies, reports and data, I do feel it is clearly a matter not in the public interest of the people of Alberta, and particularly the people of Edmonton, with respect to the possibility of a provincial park that would be a metropolitan park in Edmonton.

I think it is very clear on all matters in the decision process, and particularly early in the decision process as has been indicated in this House already, that there is some considerable risk of jeopardizing the most favourable possible decision in that decision process by unduly advanced disclosure of information such as is suggested here. Alternatively, it could very well be the case that there would be the possibility of a much more costly undertaking in order to have the kind of facility that we are all in this House, I am sure, very hopeful will be possible.

So that, Mr. Speaker, is my first point in terms of reservation in meeting the request of this Motion for a Return: the fact that this decision is in process, and my concern for jeopardizing the most favourable alternative, and particularly the possibility of any facility we might contemplate, having to cost the taxpayer of this province more than necessary to meet a full objective, that I know we all concur in.

My second concern, Mr. Speaker, is with the fact that, as a matter of concept, included in this Motion for a Return are the minutes of all meetings held. I would certainly take the position, with respect to this particular topic and to any other topic I might imagine, that it is so very clearly inappropriate to be tabling for public information the minutes of all meetings held on matters of important public importance as are in the custody of the people elected by the citizens of Albertas.

So I would think it might be a consideration that would be a part of several motions for a return and happens to arrive firstly in Motion for a Return No. 145, that it would not be in the public interest to table the minutes of all meetings held for any decision process in which the Government of Alberta was a part.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in listening to the hon. minister I would like to make two observations concerning this motion.

Firstly, if the government wants to keep quiet about its activities concerning future parks, then it should not announce them in the Speech from the Throne; there are not that many possible locations and therefore speculation could well be in hand by now.

Secondly, if it is that much of a foregone conclusion that there will be a park, then a government that has any intelligence at all in dealing with real estate would have optioned, or appraised the property, or in fact, bought most of it by now.

So, the minister is closing the door after the horse has maybe gone. I think that, if anything, the hon. members ought to be told what transpired, and how this proposed park came about. It's too late to say that now somebody might start speculating if given information. That is now in the past.

I also think that if the members from Edmonton are not interested in where the park is going to be and what it's going to cost, and how much it's going to cost the rest of the people, then at least the MLAs elsewhere ought to know. This is not going to be a cheap kind of a proposal. We find in Calgary all of a sudden that the government is going to spend \$25 million for a park, and we are told now. We don't know whether there is going to be any more land to be purchased, whether speculation is rife on the site now and surrounding areas. So the minister is making a defence of an untenable position. I believe this information ought to be given to us, and it ought to be given to us now.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this --

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the subject relates to the vicinity of the City of Edmonton, I feel that perhaps the representatives from the City of Edmonton might have some feeling and some expression as to whether, in fact, it is wise or not to deliver such information as is being requested, and whether in fact the horse has been let out of the barn and then the doors closed.

I differ with the member opposite who just spoke with respect to how many sites there may be available. I can think, without any research, in the vicinity of Edmonton, within the boundaries or without, of at least five possible sites. So to say that we may have disclosed prematurely is, I would say, wrong.

Secondly, I think the citizens of Edmonton have a right to know generally as to the projections or the policy that the provincial government may take in the matter, simply because the entire subject was debated at some length during the session last year.

I think that to ask prematurely for such information as has been in Motion for Return No. 145, is ludicrous. It is ludicrous to say that you are entitled to information, or that the people should know. After all, until documents, regardless of what stage they are at, are signed and negotiations completely concluded, there is always a matter of jeopardy as to the best transaction or negotiation that may be reached on behalf of the citizens of Alberta.

Insofar as minutes of any meetings are concerned, in the stages of negotiations many comments are made. Many things are said. They are not for the public, regardless of whether they concern what the ultimate result will be in a service to the citizens of Alberta. I think that it is of interest and concern that the best possible conclusions may have been arrived at as a result of the negotiations. So I can't help but say that this question, if not premature, is at least out of order in the area of minutes. It is certainly premature in asking for any correspondence with respect to the negotiations on the parkland in the City of Edmonton or within its vicinity.

DR. WARRACK:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I would like to clarify to the House that no figure of \$25 million came from me. That's strictly from the hon. member, who has now made one additional mistake. And in addition, on February 19 the Premier of this province did explain very clearly why, and that in fact it is a policy of this government that when an announcement affects a particular region of this province that's where the announcement will be made.

MR. LUDWIG:

For the purpose of clarifying the \$25 million figure, I estimate roughly that when the government borrows \$8 million or more it is going to cost the people \$25 million. And I don't think I am far out.

DR. WARRACK:

... [Inaudible] ...

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this motion because it might save the government from some pitfalls. They got into these pitfalls regarding parks, in Calgary. I feel it is very vital that we have some rapport with the local authorities, and not have cabinet ministers holding meetings and then telling certain people in the area, weeks before the thing is actually announced, that there is going to be a park. We have other problems too. And I think we are doing the government a favour by asking for this information, because what has happened in Calgary can certainly happen in the City of Edmonton. We are having complaints at the present time --

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question? Are you opposed to what has happened in Calgary with the obtaining of the park?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The purpose of questions asked of members who are speaking in debate is to seek clarification, not to score debating points.

MR. DIXON:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that with the legal training the hon. member has he knows he was out of order, but he was trying to get a point across. Certainly nobody is opposed to a park. But, I as a member am anxious that the government gets the best deal and satisfies the most people, and I think that the hon. member would feel the same way.

For example, in Calgary they would have been a lot better off to buy the Burns feedlot out. They would have solved a problem and had a park, instead of buying out beautiful residential area. This is the type of thing I am talking about, and I am only trying to point out some of the pitfalls where you can carry this confidentiality too far. You have to remember the effect of the land freeze that can happen to the adjacent property. So, I don't think it hurts too much to have public disclosure and public debate.

I can remember when we were the government, and the hon. Minister of Highways would go right to the town and have a public meeting, as if to say, "This is the route that we favour. What do you people think about it"? I think this is the way we should operate business.

We had two hon. ministers, the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals, and the hon. the Attorney General, getting quite a bit of publicity long before this park was ever announced. I don't blame them, as members. They are trying to promote something for their own constituency, and this is fine. But there are other constituencies in Calgary where the working man needs a park a great deal more than many of the people that would be adjacent to this very large park they are proposing in Calgary. This is all I am saying; we have to look at the -

MR. FARRAN:

Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. DIXON:

Certainly.

MR. FARRAN:

Doesn't Calgary Millican border on Moose Park? Doesn't it come down to Fish Creek?

MR. DIXON:

No it doesn't -- I wish it did, then I wouldn't have to worry about some of the problems, I could say we had the park -- but no it doesn't.

However, what I am trying to get across, Mr. Speaker, to the minister, is don't be too anxious to cut off public scrutiny when the government is talking about spending \$10, \$11, or \$25 million as has been thrown around here today.

I think that more public light could be placed on the provisions of the parks. Actually they are for the benefit of the community. These parks are built within the city confines. The present one for Calgary has been announced. I'm sure the one in Edmonton, from all reports, is going to be within the confines of the City of Edmonton. So I can't see anything too much wrong with this motion.

I've had complaints that the city was not brought into the picture, the land was purchased before they knew anything about it. These are the kinds of things that I'd like to avoid so that we can argue with the city. If they are unhappy with the deal -- or any particular councilman or MLA -- we could say, "Well, you were consulted, you knew what was going on."

But here we have this government running out with \$11 million in the City of Calgary. I could give you some information that I think you could spend \$500,000 and get just as much good. So I think public meetings are the thing that we need and public scrutiny and co-operation of the people.

I think as far as the city of Edmonton is concerned, when the parks department have announced they are willing to put up some money for a park in the City of Edmonton, let the people in the City of Edmonton decide where it should be put. And I think you would find that they would probably come up with a real good location. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Question, question.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, I, as a rural member, certainly do not object to the City of Edmonton and the City of Calgary having parks. I'd like to have a first class park if possible.

But something that the hon. members across the way don't realize, is that they themselves committed more or less a greater crime when they were on this side, when they went out and purchased the land southeast of the City of Edmonton to the tune of some \$7 1/2 million. When they purchased the first part of that land they paid a fair price, an average price. But the minute the fact became known, the price on that land doubled and tripled. And this was done through the Department of Municipal Affairs, as you will recall some of the hon. gentlemen over there asking something that you people committed sometime ago.

Now, do we want to have the taxpayers of this province have the price of land doubled or tripled? I think if we can buy this land through some part of the department and have an appraisal done of it, that we know in what direction we are going, and the land is going to become cheaper. It's going to cost the people of this province less funds than we are putting out right now.

I certainly am opposed to revealing the location or the amount of funds we are willing to pay at this time for any park in the City of Edmonton.

MR. HENDERSON:

Does somebody not want the floor?

AN HON. MEMBER:

We've all settled down.

MR. HENDERSON:

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are only two or three very brief comments I'd like to make in the time available on the particular motion. And I think it is relevant maybe to point out one or two of the reasons that relate to this motion.

So far as all the comments about asking for correspondence and meetings and so on and so forth, there is certainly nothing out of order about that. And so the hon. gentleman seated opposite went to great length to use the argument that refusal to table minutes was an indication of the fact that there was no open government in Alberta.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, it is not too unusual to hear the subject of open government discussed in this House at this point in time. And the precedent in putting motions like this on the Order Paper is clearly precedent established by some of the hon. members seated opposite.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that in any way, shape or form, anyone on this side wishes to jeopardize the possibility of this park being established. While I do have some concerns as where it is established, I concur with the principle of it because the concept of parks adjacent to Edmonton and adjacent to Calgary was one we dealt with at some length in the last election campaign, and I'm glad to hear the hon. members seated opposite have accepted. So I could say it's probably one of the few things that I did agree with in our own campaign last time.

MR. GHITTER:

Did you have one?

MR. HENDERSON:

I think, Mr. Speaker, seriously though, we certainly do not want in any way to jeopardize this operation that may be underway. Drafting the motion was really predicated on one or two assumptions which apparently are false.

Firstly, the Premier has reserved the right to make announcements on these subjects outside the House, and so it is quite logical, therefore, when he insists on this prerogative that he has no responsibility to make such statements in the House. But surely it is incumbent upon us to try to pursue the matter to find out what it is all about.

Secondly, we assume that in light of the statements made and the great headlines in the Journal resulting from statements made by the Member for St. Albert, that the matter of the question of the location of the park for the City of Edmonton was settled. It was a closed matter; the negotiations were completed. And so quite frankly we could see no reason why then after the fact, particularly when we heard such glowing words out of the Premier as to the tremendous amount of consultation and the joy and pleasures of the City Council in Calgary as to that announcement, why on earth the government shouldn't be called upon to produce this particular information in the House.

But I say, Mr. Speaker, the question of asking for the minutes and the correspondence is certainly not out of order, and I do say that the reason for placing the question at this time was clearly based on the assumption that the government had made the decision that the deal was in hand, and there was no reason not to make the information available to the members of the House, notwithstanding the claim on the part of the Premier that he reserves the prerogatives to make all these announcements outside of the House. Obviously, the matter should be announced inside the House, particularly where there have been policy statements announced in the Throne Speech.

So I can only conclude that on the basis of the remarks of the Minister of Lands and Forests that the question of a park for the City of Edmonton has not been resolved and that there will not be a statement forthcoming from the Premier on this subject in the near future.

Therefore, if my conclusions are correct in this regard, Mr. Speaker, I can understand why the government is somewhat reluctant at this time not to table the correspondence and minutes of meetings. I would also point out, of course, we understand that the City of Edmonton would have to concur on the matter before the government could be expected to table it. But to hear it suggested that it is out of order to ask for the correspondence and minutes and is going to jeopardize the park, when all the action thus far on the part of the government indicates the matter has been settled, the Premier insists that he has no responsibility to make statements on this subject in the House when the House is in session. I find it difficult, Mr. Speaker, to follow the logic in the arguments presented thus far in not making the information available.

But I see the hour of adjournment is at hand, Mr. Speaker. There are a few other comments I would like to make on the subject, but the time simply is not available and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. Leader of the Opposition adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until 8:00 o'clock this evening.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 5:28 o'clock.]