

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Thursday Evening, May 3, 1973

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at 8:00 o'clock.]

MR. SPEAKER:

Now if I might refer to the matter which arose at the close of yesterday afternoon's sitting; hon. members may recall that the House had been in committee and that a ruling made by the hon. Chairman was appealed in effect to the House. Then when we convened as a House we lacked the exact words on which the ruling was based and the exact words of the ruling. Consequently the matter was allowed to stand over.

I have now, in keeping with the suggestions made by the hon. House Leaders on both sides, the words of Hansard in front of me and if hon. members wish I can refer briefly to the second paragraph of the remarks of the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development on page 51-2763 of yesterday's Hansard. Perhaps I can assume that those words have been read by hon. members and are therefore now before the House. Then the words of the hon. Chairman at page 51-2765 where he says:

Order please. Please, order. Without having the exact words in front of me I would have to rule that there was no point of order and would ask the hon. Mr. Crawford to continue with his presentation.

Whereupon, the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View appealed the Chairman's ruling purportedly to the Speaker, but of course such an appeal must be to the House.

Unless hon. members have some further observations to make on the subject, and the appeal of course is not debatable, I propose to put the question.

[The ruling was upheld.]

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply to study estimates.

[The motion was carried.]

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 8:04 o'clock.]

* * * * *

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of Supply will now come to order.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, as I was saying --

[Laughter]

In all good humour, Mr. Chairman, I am going to do something that will be surprising to hon. members, I think. As hon. members know, I don't usually like

to do things that surprise them because it is a strain on both them and me that is usually unnecessary. But I just thought that I would add that I withdraw any reference I made to hon. gentlemen opposite imputing that any of them, either collectively or individually, required the services of a psychiatrist.

Then I wanted to get on, Mr. Chairman, to the subject at hand. I feel obliged now to make a reference to the remarks made yesterday by the hon. Member for Drumheller. I want to begin -- because in fact I think without knowing it he has twice made a statement now with regard to my response or lack of it to him regarding the first inquiry he made in the Davy case. I'm referring to Hansard, page 2761 of yesterday. Although I haven't compared the exact words, they certainly carry the same import as the words spoken on February 19 during that debate. He says, "I wrote to the Minister of Health and Welfare about a Mr. E. Davy admitted to the hospital on December 19 and got a reply back about the wrong man."

I dispute that, Mr. Speaker. It was wrong when the statement was first made and it was wrong when it was made again. I am going on the presumption that the explanation that I'm now going to give is based on things that are unknown to the hon. Member for Drumheller.

The sentence that just follows it, in quotes, "I immediately brought this to the attention of his executive secretary in his office, and still I haven't any information on that particular case." Mr. Chairman, I did indeed receive an inquiry about Mr. E. Davy, but there is a Mr. E. Davy with the same surname spelling -- there was at that time, in any event -- at the Alberta Hospital, Edmonton. No reference in the letter was made to Mr. F. J. E. Davy, I believe the correct initials are, the gentleman who was later made the subject of the inquiry, in a sense. When the response went back in respect to Mr. E. Davy, as far as the record was concerned, without being perceptive of the error on either side in the description of the person, it was a full response to the inquiry made.

Then onto the scene comes another gentleman with the same surname and three initials instead of one, one of which is "E", and the hon. Member for Drumheller says he still hasn't received any information on that particular case. I offer him the proceedings of the House of the following day, the Order-in-Council in regard to the naming of the judicial inquiry, the hearing itself and the findings of the judge. Now everything that needs to be said about that particular person who has not been confined in any way, as far as I know, since the month of January -- everything surely has been answered by now. If it's necessary to answer further by explaining that in a letter, I suppose that could be done.

But Mr. Chairman, the serious concern that many hon. members will have is that yesterday the hon. Member for Drumheller once again returned to the wholly discredited case that he had advocated in February. Once again we found a reference to the same objectionable word, incarceration. Every hon. member knows that means imprisonment. Every member knows that was not an ingredient in any of the sequence of events that are known as the Davy case.

Reference was made again to political prisoner. It's true the reference was made in a slightly different way than it was in February, but when reference was made to the fact that the information was given by Davy that he had been held as a political prisoner and that he had named the doctor, the hon. member never suggested that before raising that accusation in the House he had ever communicated with the doctor in question. It's that sort of checking that, in all fairness, every member must undertake when he chooses to make an allegation against another member.

I believe that, in fact if not in procedural law, it is possible to make a challenge or an accusation which an hon. member is entitled to take as being directed against him, if he is a member of the group against which it is made. The reference to the government having imprisoned this man and held him as a political prisoner was made several times in the speech in February.

To say that by saying "government" no particular member of it was meant doesn't very much help in explaining the need, or the apparent need felt by the hon. Member for Drumheller to raise such a charge; to try to bury it among the broad usage of the term "government" instead of naming ministers, but knowing, all the same, that when received by any person who was a member of the government, could not be regarded as something that was fairly made.

Hon. members will already be familiar with the Hansard transcript of February 19 and with the text of the report as filed by Chief Justice Milvain.

Mr. Chairman, as I do not want to add any new dimension to a motion to what I consider to be the very regrettable sequence that has brought us up to the present time, I want to make some of my references in my remarks tonight to the various statements made by the hon. Member for Drumheller on the record, and to the various statements made in the course of the findings of the hon. Chief Justice.

I have not tried to collect every insult that there was in the transcript of February 19 but these are the beginning of some quotations. "They have committed a terrible error in incarcerating a citizen of this province in a mental hospital who is completely sane." And again, shortly thereafter: "The government [has] seized its first political prisoner, [has] picked him up in a government building and placed him in a mental hospital." And again shortly after that:

What kind of a province is this? What kind of a government is this that we have in the Province of Alberta? The doctors were under a lot of political pressure to keep him there longer -- words from one of the doctors in that particular area.

Words that were never checked with the doctor in question and were later denied under oath.

A further quotation, Mr. Chairman:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to say I term this the rape of civil liberties, a mockery of The Alberta Bill of Rights, a mockery of the thing that, held up as the great protection for the people of Alberta, is now being used to incarcerate the same people, putting them into mental institutions [hospitals].

Another quotation from the same text: "It is a shameful day indeed when the people of this province are incarcerated in a mental hospital because they are fighting for their own liberties and their own rights." Furthermore, a quotation with reference to, no doubt, an imputation on the professional conduct of one of the doctors who was involved. I quote: "He was taken to the mental hospital at Oliver. They had the certificate[s] signed before he even got there, and that can be proven too."

Mr. Chairman, it would be an understatement to say only that the passages referred to are insulting and offensive, even if expressed only as opinions. They are not the sort of statements that any hon. member would readily believe about any public officer anywhere in Canada, today or in recent generations. The statements were directed at all hon. members on this side, as well as at persons employed by the government and its various agencies including the Department of Health and Social Development.

Mr. Chairman, statements such as the ones referred to do not sit well with any person of reputation at whom they are directed. Properly so, then, a judicial inquiry was ordered and among other things the results, the report of the Chief Justice, filed only last week, include these statements. I wish to refer, as the hon. members may have this before them, to page 6 of the report first, and I quote:

Both Dr. Dorran and Dr. Hoskin have testified before the Inquiry and I totally accept their testimony that their decisions to sign the respective certificates for the detention of Frank Joseph Edward Davy were based solely on their best professional judgment and were totally devoid of any pressure from any source whatsoever, whether persons at the Alberta Hospital, at the Attorney General's Department, from other government officials of any sort, from persons at the Workmen's Compensation Board or at the College of Physicians and Surgeons.

That, Mr. Chairman, is a quotation from the findings of the hon. Chief Justice, and I emphasize that his finding was exactly what hon. members would expect to be able to be said about a person who was carrying on a profession, had carried on a profession over a period of years, had done so with no attack on his reputation up to the present time, had competently carried out his duties throughout his career, and then to have the accusations made about him that were made. For the Chief Justice inquiring into it to say, as one might expect, that their actions were based solely on their best professional judgment and were totally devoid of any pressure from any source whatsoever is a finding of fact in those proceedings. Mr. Chairman, further a reference, and several were made, to Mr. Casson, another public servant of the province with some years standing -- on page 8, the Chief Justice says:

Mr. Casson has testified, and I accept, that he received no other instructions respecting what was to be done in the Davy case nor was any pressure of any sort exerted on him by any member of the executive, either directly or indirectly, to have Mr. Davy examined by a physician under the provisions of the Mental Health Act.

Then Mr. Chairman, going on to page 16 of the findings of the learned Chief Justice, he says:

In the result, I can find absolutely no evidence of any misconduct or improper act on the part of the Workmen's Compensation Board of the Province of Alberta or any of its officers or employees or any other persons acting in its behalf.

Further on the same page, the following quotation:

The Honourable Member for Drumheller in his speech to the Legislature has stated that the Board refused to grant Mr. Davy a pension advance for the purpose of obtaining an operation to rectify his back problems.

The inference is clear that Mr. Davy, because of lack of funds, could not get his back repaired. Any such suggestion is totally unwarranted by the facts.

That again, Mr. Chairman, the finding of fact by the learned Justice heading the inquiry. Further on the page 18 of the findings:

There are several other allegations in the speech of the Honourable Member for Drumheller upon which I feel I must comment. It is contended --

And this was the reference made a moment ago, Mr. Chairman. Returning to the quotation now:

It is contended that the certificate committing Mr. Davy to the Alberta Hospital was signed before Mr. Davy even arrived at the Hospital. There is not a shred of evidence to support this contention...

That was the statement the hon. Member for Drumheller had made earlier saying: "And that can be proven too". Then, Mr. Chairman, on pages 20 and 21 where the Chief Justice made the summation of his findings, he said, among other things:

In summary I report as follows:

6. There was no misconduct or improper act on the part of:
 - a) any member of the Executive Council of the Province of Alberta; or
 - b) any employee, agent or other person acting on behalf of the Government of Alberta; or
 - c) the Workmen's Compensation Board of the Province of Alberta or any of its officers or employees or any other persons acting on its behalf,in connection with such admission and detention.

Quoting further, Mr. Chairman:

8. There is no foundation whatsoever for thinking Mr. Davy was a political prisoner in any sense.
9. There is no foundation for any suggestions that any improper pressures, political or otherwise, were brought to bear upon the admission or detention of Mr. Davy in the Alberta Hospital, Edmonton.
10. There is no foundation whatsoever to any allegation or thought that Mr. Davy has been refused advances to procure medical attention. In fact, a grant is offered for such purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I had to conclude when the hon. member returned to the subject -- admittedly for the reasons he gave yesterday, but he returned to it nevertheless yesterday -- that he is so insensitive to the understanding that legislators have in this country, of the demands that are made upon them in their own characters and the conduct of their office in respect to the rights of

Canadians -- so insensitive is he that I suggest he actually believes that anyone in this Legislature could actually have had the callous attitude he described. That is the type of imputation, Mr. Chairman, from the hon. Member for Drumheller that I personally resented when it was made.

Therefore, there is not only the serious question of whether the statements were made by the hon. member without his knowing whether they were true or not. There is the further serious question of whether he made them knowing them to be false.

Mr. Chairman, it's my hope that as matters proceed during this Legislature and subsequent sittings of this Legislature we will grow beyond that type of imputation by any hon. member; we will grow beyond the type of feeling that causes one member to say that about another and always dismiss from our minds the possibility that such gross and ugly charges could be believed about any person in this chamber.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister has put the decision of the hon. Chief Justice on record. I certainly put my side of the question on record previously and I don't intend to repeat it. However, I do want to say in connection with the letters to the hon. minister that on January 2 the first letter went to him under the name of Mr. E. Davy. In that letter it said the man was admitted December 19. Consequently, there was only the one day he was admitted -- on December 19.

The letter that came back from the office of the hon. minister was on January 23. On January 25 I wrote and then included the full name of Mr. Davy. Now I admit there is some fault in including only one name, but I did include the admission date which was a distinguishing factor from the other Davy. January 25 to February 19 was quite a while and there was still no answer, at least I received no answer.

In connection with correspondence to the doctor, the hon. member suggested I should have contacted the doctor. That I endeavoured to do also. On January 2 I wrote to the medical superintendent and received a reply on January 8. From the report of Dr. Cornish who replied it appeared that Dr. Dorran was away on holidays and would be back on January 5. At that time I had expected to receive more information, but more information didn't come from Dr. Dorran. So an attempt was made to secure the information from the doctors involved as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Ready for the question? Mr. Strom.

MR. STROM:

I would like to ask the hon. minister a question in regard to the rotation program that was proposed some time ago. Has that been practised in the department or in the departments? Would the Minister for Manpower and Labour know?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Chairman, the assumption when we came into office was that the rotation system was at least inferred to be part of the staff development system that began with recruitment, selection, placement, transfer and promotion. So on that proposition, which we feel to be sound personnel practice, we have attempted to refine and establish procedures that are written down for employees to be aware of and to discuss with their personnel administrators in the departments and with personnel in the office of the Public Service Commissioner.

We've spent a good deal of time in the Executive Council and in caucus on the matter, because it has the capacity to be misunderstood. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, it has the capacity to be misused, mostly because of uncertainty sometimes as to its intended application. So the question is very well put.

The intent of that particular system with respect to staff is purely that of staff development. We are indicating to people who enter into the employ of the government at this time that the whole program of staffing includes the predictability and the possibility, in fact the intent, to move people about the province -- certainly not casually -- certainly not for any other reason than to move people who have promise and competence to larger positions and to greater responsibilities.

It is not a punitive program and it is not a program intended to move out people who may not fit the program in which they happen to be. That is a totally separate matter. It is a matter indeed, but a separate one. The rotation system needs refinement and further work and this we will address ourselves to. We will welcome any assistance or ideas we can get from any member of the Legislature

MR. STROM:

I can certainly appreciate the problems that would come as a result of trying to practise a rotation program, but I would like to suggest to the minister that I think there is a great deal of merit in it, particularly where governments are trying to establish coordination between the various services that are offered by government to people.

I was wondering if the hon. minister could be more specific and advise the House if there are any levels of service at the present time wherein there is a direct application of the rotational system. I'm thinking in terms of the deputy level and maybe two or three levels down, heads of branches and so on, wherein I think there is some real merit in practising the rotational system.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the hon. Member for Cypress. The system developed during the year and it has the obvious problems of moving people. It has to do with school children, moving in winter, and these are always considerations. But the rotation system will in particular refer and have reference to people in the field across this province. As hon. members know, we have many people who work for and represent government across the breadth and length of this province. We feel it is in their best interests, and in the interests of ourselves and the people of Alberta, to develop from a staff development and confidence concept the system of rotation, so it is primarily in the field personnel that we will see most of the movements.

However, the point the Member for Cypress makes is also part of the concept. The rotation system will permit lateral transfer within departments and also indeed between departments. The personnel attitude and definition today in terms of management concepts fits this kind of approach because the proposition stands up effectively that an administrator or a supervisor or a manager who has that kind of capability and that kind of competence can work in many different fields, given some time to adapt and adjust to the particular kind of new enterprise in which he is placed.

So we are looking for movement also in senior staff based on the proposition that supervisors can become more senior executives, and junior executives can become more senior executives, not necessarily moving in the line of the department in which they happen to be, but moving from a junior executive position to a more senior executive position in a different department, though movement in same department will certainly not be a matter of exclusion in our personnel policies.

I should recall to you, Mr. Chairman, and the hon. members that I committed myself yesterday, and will do so I hope by tomorrow, to leave in your mailboxes or have sent to your desks the system on paper at least. It will be of some assistance to you because it carries the statement of intent for the system and the criteria on which the judgments will be based.

I want to summarize, Mr. Chairman, by saying that is the working paper for the rotation system. The way it actually works is that the supervisor and the person for whom a move is contemplated sit together and look at the reasonableness and the sensibleness of that kind of move. Should there be cause or reason that is fairly apparent, if not even obvious, then a move is not going to be made just for a move's sake. It is intended to develop good staff and a better staff.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, just two final questions that I'd like to ask. Has the government given any consideration to contracting rather than having people on regular civil service salary? And secondly, has this been a matter of negotiation at the civil service level or has it not reached that particular area as yet?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Chairman, I would make two comments in response to the question from the hon. Member for Cypress. One is that there are a number of contracts and there were when we came into office. Contracts have a peculiar kind of problem of their own because they are not in the pay schedule. You contract for a service for a period of time and the fact is that when you circumscribe the time it is difficult to equate the salary you will pay an executive or a management person with the pay that we assign to permanent personnel of a department that may appear to be more or less in the same kind of category. So that creates a particular kind of problem.

Another problem is associated with the question asked by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican yesterday with respect to pension benefits for people who come into government service based on contracts. We have checked that out just a bit further and what I indicated yesterday was that a person coming in for a short period of time such as two years cannot enter directly into a pension plan but would have to apply to the pension board. On the basis of his offer of service and our contract with him he could then buy into the pension plan.

With respect to the question on the Civil Service Association, I would really have to update my impressions and feelings with respect to how the CSA feels about this. But my recollection is that they concede there are times and circumstances in which a contract appears to be the best relationship between the government and someone offering service to the government when the government seeks that kind of service. But I think it is also fair to say that they feel on a long term, in most circumstances, the best arrangement is for hiring a person onto the permanent staff of the government.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to touch on a point similar to what the hon. Member for Cypress was talking about to the minister. It is regarding a situation that has happened -- your own government started practising it -- of looking round to contract, to get rid of say, some of the civil service.

We have a case now in Calgary where the federal government has apparently given notice to workers. For the life of me I can never understand this because whenever there is any money to be saved they always start at the lowest bracket of people.

I can remember when the Calgary School Board was told a couple of years ago that they would have to cut down because there weren't going to be enough funds available and there were great big headlines that they were going to cut the staff. But the only ones they cut were the janitors, the lowest paid in the ranks.

We have done it as a provincial government here just recently. We are talking about contracting it out. I hope we don't go through with it because all you are doing with those types of people is to get moonlighters taking their place. So that somebody who takes over with a contractor nine times out of ten is somebody who has got a job somewhere else and he is only doing that on a part-time basis -- he or she, whoever they happen to hire.

I remember when we were in government and when the chemical plant east of Edmonton closed, they were talking about cutting off some of their staff. There was a great how do you do on this side of the House about "be sure that the workers get months of notice" and it was a wonderful thing at that time.

Now I just wonder, isn't it about time that maybe the labour department take a look at this too and treat a case where quite a number of men will be laid off, to be replaced by a contract, so that they be given notice comparable maybe to the years of service they have had with the company, or at least a reasonable lay-off period. Because they have given faithful service for so many years and then all of a sudden we can save a few dollars, and as I said earlier on when I got up, we always try and save money at the lowest salaried rank.

The federal government is doing it. Some companies are doing it and yet I feel that those are the kinds of jobs that when they are taken over by the contractor usually end up with the contractor hiring people who already have other jobs, moonlighting jobs. Some of them are even replaced by people who have a very good job but they want to moonlight for an extra few dollars when they could well afford to live on the one salary they have. I think it is a situation that should be looked into, not only by your department, Mr. Minister, but by the Department of Health and Social Development.

I feel we could do more in this field. These are the kind of people we can use, that have had difficulty either through alcoholic problems or physical disabilities who can use these kind of jobs, and I think they would feel a lot more secure once they did get a job if they were actually working for a large company or any company or a government, rather than some contractor whose contract may last just a year or two and then it is up for renewal and may not be renewed, and therefore their jobs are in jeopardy again.

I can see where we need contracts, as the hon. minister has pointed out, for some special services where we may have one or two men that we could use for two or three years and would have no need of their services after that. But I am beginning to feel quite strongly on this issue that the people at the lower level need more protection than they are getting from governments at the present time, especially those in the lower income fields of employment. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Ready for the question?

MR. CLARK:

Just before we ask the question, in light of reports that some of the members heard on the news, would it be fair to ask the minister if it is true that the tentative strike at the Royal Alex has been settled?

DR. HOHOL:

Under different circumstances -- you know when someone gives a speech and permits questions from the floor, you go along nicely. But I have found there is always a point at which one should have sat down and said the question period is over. That should have been just before the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury asked this question.

But levity aside, I must say in all candour and honesty that I have not heard the media this evening. Circumstances were such that I was not within the capacity to hear the radio. But the question is well and properly put, and as I indicated this afternoon on the floor of the House, progress with respect to that particular dispute had been made and was continuing to be made. I've been in telephone contact throughout the day with the mediation headquarters.

However, the hon. members will recall that the formal and time-honoured approach to announcing any agreement or even memorandum of agreements, much less ratification, is always a joint statement of the two disputing parties. But I give that in the way of information which everyone has. The fact is that I have not been notified by the chairman of the board or the parties in dispute, but I want to reconfirm and indicate additional progress which I reported this afternoon.

I should like, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, just to comment very briefly on the remarks of the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, and to simply indicate substantial agreement and to remind ourselves that there are two kinds of contracts. I believe the hon. Member for Cypress was talking about executives being hired under contract and you say we're talking about groups. I agree that the concept of trying to save a lot of money by quantity release of low paid people is simply not a good and proper way to go. To the extent that my department and also the department of public service commissioners and that of Health and Social Development in the government can indeed look into these matters and control them, then we will do so.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I spoke to the minister on Vote 1769, which was the civil service nursing department and which has increased 151 per cent, in light of the fact that every Albertan is covered under Medicare. I was wondering if this service is used as a snooping service. Do they check to see if a person doesn't show up for work, or maybe after a day or two do they go to find out if he is actually ill? Or are they there to see if he is not well and don't worry whether he gets back to work or not? I just wondered if you do carry that out. I have heard reports that they do that in this area, and I'd like the minister to confirm just what is the policy? What do we supply in this health service? Is it a lot of aspirins or birth control or what is it?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Chairman, that sounds a little bit like a mini-Watergate. As a matter of fact, what we have is a nurse transferred from the Department of Health and Social Development, probably in the days of the prior government. This makes fairly sound institutional sense with respect to routine health matters. I personally would support this kind of approach in industry and in social corporations like school boards who employ large numbers of teachers, caretakers, stenographers, maintenance people and have many students.

So what we found was a large employee staff of this government attempting to be serviced by one nurse here in Edmonton to do the routine, reasonable check where the common sense of a professional person may save someone a layoff of three, four or five days, by referral to a doctor or by sending the person home and so on.

So what we did in No. 1769 was to face up to the fact that we either had to drop this kind of service because this one lady could in no way meet the commitments of government in this appropriation, and so we added a nurse at Calgary and one at Red Deer. The staff of each office will have a registered nurse and a stenographer, Mr. Chairman. The estimates also provide for an additional nurse at the Edmonton office which would make two nurses here in Edmonton.

The other expenses for 1973 include furnishings and equipment, materials and supplies, a slight allocation for travel, wages, employee fringe benefits and miscellaneous for the total as is indicated in the appropriation.

MR. DIXON:

I was wondering about the material. I can understand a nursing service. Somebody gets a splinter and goes down and wants a Band-Aid put on it or something like that. But what do we supply them with over and above? What is the service other than the first aid? Do we provide other things, aspirins for example? What other drugs do we supply besides the usual Band-Aid?

DR. HOHOL:

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the most reasonable response would be to indicate that the materials and supplies are those you would normally find in a medical unit or station that supplies an interim kind of assistance. Once you buy these, most of them are permanent. Some are disposable like the aspirin, the Band-Aids, wrappings and bandages, the kinds of things you use up.

While the \$4,380 appears high, I would indicate to you, Mr. Chairman, that it is because we added two nurses and intend to add a third in the fiscal year.

We are increasing staff from one nurse to four and are adding three stenographers and increasing equipment and supplies and materials accordingly. So the initial establishment account will be next year, for example, when these offices are set up.

MR. DIXON:

One final question, Mr. Minister, through the Chair. We have several buildings with many people in them. How could the nurse possibly service, say, the Madison Building, for example, with hundreds of people in that when she is over here in the Legislative Building? You could have an ambulance there quicker if it was a heart attack or whatever it was. I was just wondering how you can carry on this kind of service with so many buildings spread over the city, from the inner core to the outer core. Yet everybody is entitled to the same coverage if they are working for the government.

DR. HOHOL:

The inference the hon. member makes is accurate, Mr. Chairman. The question of adequate nursing for a government whose offices are all over the city is a real problem. The judgment decision that had to be made was either to drop the service or increase it, but increase it reasonably. We felt that whatever the circumstances and location of personnel, with mobility being fairly accessible for the nurses in terms of movement from building to building, two nurses in Edmonton, one in Calgary and one in Red Deer would provide a basic kind of health service of a preventive sort on an immediate kind of diagnosis. This is what we have done.

I believe this is a proper program. For example, if a worker is in a state of momentary dizziness, a check by a professional nurse could be the difference between the person saying it will pass, continuing to work and then finding he is sick from something quite serious, and being sent to an emergency unit by a nurse who is qualified to make that kind of judgment. Who knows that the risk should be taken? I would support and defend the appropriation and the approach used by government here, but I agree with the hon. Member for Calgary Millican that it has some pretty obvious problems.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, I didn't notice if the minister actually answered my question regarding the nurse going out and checking up. Do they actually go out and check up to see whether the worker or the employee is actually ill, or is it a checkup to see whether he is, as we used to call it in the air force, trying to dodge the draft?

DR. HOHOL:

Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, I was trying to answer that by making reference to the mini-Watergate. But yes, that wasn't answer enough. No, that kind of service is not done except in unusual circumstances and mostly by request of the employee or the personnel officer or by mutual consent. There is no intent here to get in the way of the normal relationships between the employee and government, the supervisor or his personnel manager.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well, no further questions?

MR. STROM:

Maybe this has been raised before but I didn't recall that it has. On the exams that are provided for boiler inspectors and so on -- is this a routine exam that everyone has to take or is it an exam provided by an inspector, so that it is not a written, routine exam?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Chairman, if I follow the hon. member's question accurately, then I would answer by saying that for all the inspection services with specific reference to boiler inspection services, there is a specific examination for entry into the service of boiler inspection -- if that is the gentleman's question, sir. I'm not sure it is.

MR. STROM:

I'm sorry if I left that impression. I am thinking in terms of the operators having to get a certificate. I had a complaint made to me that the procedure for taking this exam was such that they could be kept from getting their certificate, even though they had adequate training and were capable of handling it. That's what makes me wonder what kind of exam was given to them, and if there was permission for a great deal of leeway on the part of the examiner in determining whether individuals would qualify or not.

May I say to the minister I wouldn't press this; I would be very happy to discuss it with him, maybe outside of the House sometime. It is a matter that was raised with me, and I thought I ought to raise it here before we pass the --

DR. HOHOL:

Yes, I think the question is of sufficient import to make a brief statement; then I would be pleased to discuss it further with the gentleman privately.

Not only in the boiler inspection services but in all the inspection services, and indeed in the apprenticeship qualification and the trades training qualifications certification, there is a goodly number of people who aren't certain that they were adequately or properly tested.

The matter of examining for competence and capacity is difficult. There are people who can perform on the job, but have difficulty with written examinations. Some have language problems if they come from Europe, and they have a good deal of training, or sometimes not so much training. It's difficult to equate. We attempt to do this through examination. One of the things we have done in the last two years, and likely before I'm sure, was to attempt to

have nation-wide examinations, and to attempt to mix both a practical or a demonstration part of an exam, attested to by a competent person right on the job; in addition, a written exam; but if a person can't take a written exam an equivalent oral examination, or if it's one that is manipulative, then he performs in that base.

So, let me summarize in two ways, Mr. Chairman. I think the examinations over the years, not just in this province, but across the nation have been too rigid. So we are trying to develop modes to make them more flexible. At the same time I am sure the hon. member will agree, that as the matter stands, it is a pretty serious business because most of these have directly to do with the safety of people, whether it's boilers or the fire inspection branch or the elevator inspection branch. So while we must place very heavy emphasis on the fact that the people who work with these know what they are doing, at the same time we must devise ways to make sure that when they do know what they are doing, we have ways to permit them to demonstrate this so they can be properly certified, certificated, and be given government service.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The question has been called. All those in favour of the estimates as presented to the Committee of Supply yesterday for Manpower and Labour say aye. Those opposed say no.

[The motion was carried.]

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Chairman, I move the resolution be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

Department of Treasury (Cont.)

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Department of Treasury. If the members of the Assembly will refer to Hansard of April 6 there was agreement that there were some questions raised by Mr. Henderson. Mr. Henderson, do you wish to continue here?

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say I have received the returns. The only question remaining was that -- I asked the minister if he could simply tell us -- there was some money, a nominal amount, in one or two places for task forces and he didn't recall the appropriation number or the amount and I think he was going to provide us with that.

There is one other subject I want to comment on very briefly and get the minister's reaction to.

MR. MINIELY:

These votes for task forces are in various departmental votes and the general administration vote. Rather than a breakdown, I think what is significant to the hon. leader is that they total approximately \$30,000 in various administrative votes. The amount is relatively insignificant.

MR. HENDERSON:

That disposes of the question, but I would like to make a brief comment on one matter that has come up before we finalize the appropriation.

I have had some contact, Mr. Chairman, with a number of people in northern Alberta who are extremely concerned about the changes in federal income tax legislation as it relates to what is now a taxable income. I'm sure the minister and some of his colleagues are aware of the fact that many firms, in addition to the government I think, for many years have paid special allowances for people working for extended periods of time in northern Alberta. This extends on into the Territories, but we're talking about Alberta. It's my understanding that in the last year with the changes in the federal government's income tax, the benefit of which Alberta in effect shares, benefits that were previously non-taxable have now become taxable. The minister may have heard something about it.

In one instance it was reported that an individual in one of the northern oil field communities was flown out for medical reasons at his company's expense -- an emergency situation -- and the income was declared taxable income and he had to pay the income tax on the airplane trip out. While it may not seem particularly significant to people in this part of the country, nonetheless in principle I think it is of significance, even as a matter of provincial government policy, relative to trying to develop the northern half of our province. People simply are not going to go into these places today, if they can find work elsewhere, without some attractions to take them there.

The provincial government very definitely has a vested interest in the matter in the fact that they share in the income tax collected off these previously non-taxable benefits. While the representations I have had have been strictly from individuals and not from companies, there are reports and indications of a sizeable exodus of people from some of these northern operations. I think clearly this would be detrimental to the people of Alberta in total. My experience relates to resource industries and the particular people who phoned me were engaged in that particular business. But I think the matter is applicable even to special allowances paid by government in northern parts of the province.

I was wondering if the Treasurer has had any representations on it or if he has examined the matter. I'm particularly concerned that if he hasn't, would the minister give an undertaking that he would take the matter up with the federal government? It is simply going to be highly detrimental in the long run to the best interests of Alberta in total, the people involved in particular, but also to the general economy of the province. We just won't get qualified, competent people to go in and do the work, whether it's a doctor, an accountant or whoever it happens to be.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to say I'm sure all hon. members are aware we have indicated that by no means are we in agreement as a government with all the changes that came under federal tax revisions. Many of the things we dislike we have indicated to the ministers of finance in Ottawa up until this point at the various finance ministers' meetings that my colleague, Mr. Getty, and myself have attended. So, there are many areas of federal tax revision which, over a period of time as they come to our attention and which we find are inequitable in Alberta's case or unfair to our citizens, we will be making representation to Ottawa on. They indicated at these meetings that with the new tax revisions they will find, with experience over a period of time, that there are revisions that are inequitable and unfair and that they are prepared to make amendments to them as they work out the new system, and work with the new system.

So, certainly as far as I'm concerned, to answer your question, I have not received a great deal of representation on the point that you have mentioned. I'm aware of the fact that it does exist. When the cabinet visited up north there were a couple of people who mentioned something to me about it in informal conversation. But I'm happy to take this, along with other matters that arise over the early years of the tax provisions being implemented and raise them with the Minister of Finance in Ottawa.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, if I could just comment further that the impression that I got from the people who phoned me was one of sheer frustration in simply not having a clue as to where to turn to get something done about it. I indicated to them that I would bring it up in the House with an effort of getting it on record and also of assessing the government's attitudes.

I would suggest in strictly a non-partisan sense that it would probably do the member for that area a considerable amount of good politically if he would convey newer information back to his constituents.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, just one short point I would like to bring up to the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

I'm wondering what cooperation there is between your department, Mr. Minister, and the credit unions? The reason I say this is because the credit unions are becoming concerned now with the amount of assets they are building up. As a matter of fact, in the last year and a half, they've increased their assets from \$237 million -- pardon me, \$173 million to \$237 million.

These are all Alberta people and I'm wondering if you couldn't have a talk sometime with the credit unions, and see if you couldn't work with them -- where you may be able to use some of this money that they are not finding a ready market for. As a matter of fact, you may have read some articles where they are even saying they can lend up to \$50,000 now in mortgages, they have such a surplus of money.

I thought it would be an excellent idea, because you would be dealing with Alberta people; you would be dealing with Alberta investment. So maybe you could work out either short-term borrowing from them or where you could work together anyway in the financial field, rather than what we've attempted to do over the years with trying to get Alberta people to invest. Maybe if we get the credit unions to invest, which would be a rock-bottom security for them so far as the government having it, maybe something could be worked out. But I was wondering if you could take that under advisement, maybe have a chat with them and maybe even in the fall session you could give us a report on whether there is any merit to looking into that situation and doing anything about it.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member raises a point which I am aware of and which we have already been doing some work on.

First, I'm sure that the hon. member is aware that the actual administration of credit unions is in the Deputy Premier's hands. But relative to what you are commenting about, we have done some work, have been giving some consideration to the total pool of funds -- which is really what you are referring to -- the credit unions in Alberta have, and ways that this pool, if you like could, in cooperation with the credit unions be working to the best advantage of Alberta.

This has been done by the Treasury Department in connection also with analyzing other pools of funds that exist in Alberta, which I've spoken to the hon. members about before, which exist in Crown corporations and which when we took office, we found as an example, a considerable part of an Alberta investment portfolio was invested in bonds outside of the province. That doesn't seem to make much sense. But there is a large area here which requires a great deal of analysis. I assure the hon. member that we have been working on this. I can't put any time on it but we certainly will do what you suggest.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, in dealing with this department, I think it would be timely to raise the matter of remarks made concerning inflation and what the government is doing about it.

I got the impression that the government at least attempted to clear itself by stating that it has made some tax rebates to people or will be making them, so that is its remedy for inflation. I would like to suggest that that merely alleviates the problem with some people who are going to get a refund to the extent of a maximum of \$216 and that delays the crunch as it were. It does not alleviate or solve inflation, it merely gives these people a little bit more money but inflation carries on at a very serious rate for most people. So that even with the \$216 that they are going to get from the tax rebate, it will not be too far down the line that a family will lose that entirely through inflation. So we are not really solving inflation in any way at all. We're not suggesting any ideas on how to combat it or how to slow it down.

I think one point that ought to be made is that a major cause of inflation is the three levels of government which spend a great amount of the taxpayers' money and the service industries that do not provide goods which people have to buy. I think since this government got in they are borrowing heavily. The government directly is borrowing quite a lot of money. They are guaranteeing a great amount of borrowing, the Crown corporations are borrowing and it would be interesting to know how much is the total, not just for the government itself, but all its agencies, all its Crown corporations. What is the total amount of government borrowing and guaranteed borrowing including the Crown corporations?

When we talk about inflation, certainly some people will get a rebate of taxes and it will help them face the increased cost. But it does not in any way

attempt or begin to deal with inflation. Gasoline went up 2 cents. Some people feel this was a result of government action in boosting up prices of oil and perhaps gas. But gasoline has gone up and there is reason to believe it will go up again. So no matter what we do, whether we get more revenue, the consumer has to pick it up.

Since this government got in, drivers' licences went up. Liquor prices went up to the tune of \$9 million --

AN HON. MEMBER:

How do you know that?

MR. LUDWIG:

Pardon? I know it because I believe the report -- the reply I got from the hon. Provincial Treasurer -- and I rely on that report in that it is an estimate. If that isn't reliable enough I don't know what can be more reliable, but I must admit it is an estimate; it could be more than \$9 million.

Since this government got in -- I remember when we were in office, that when milk went up they were jumping up and down, what were we going to do about it? Now it's different. Food went up and it keeps going up regularly -- a lot of people are becoming afraid of what is happening -- and so is the cost of clothing, the cost of shelter. The cost of houses and land also went up tremendously and appears to be on the way of going up higher.

So as far as anything being done by this government to deal with the real problem of inflation, outside of perhaps pumping a little more money to some of the taxpayers, there is nothing being done at all. In fact, if one can say anything, some of the actions of this government are inflationary. Raising rates, raising prices and raising our own salaries, setting the trend for a demand by other people including teachers and nurses, that is an inflationary trend and I don't think we dug in or came up with any policy at all to show that we mean business when we're promising to deal with inflation. There was not the slightest indication that we are indulging in any tough budgeting.

When you look at new openings for opening of branches and sections in government departments, that is not tough budgeting, that is loose budgeting. It's easy for the civil service to push this government into more spending, more sections, more branches, and this is just the beginning.

There is no indication, Mr. Chairman, that there was any real tough budgeting when you come to travelling expenses in all the departments, when you look at 25 per cent increases in travelling for the departments. Maybe they'll do more travelling. On the other hand, there is no indication that this was real hard-nosed budgeting where they were told that you had better do with as little as possible.

It appears to be a generous budget. Certainly in many respects the benevolence of the government is showing. One should not feel that the government is benevolent and therefore it is a good government because the taxpayer has to know that the government can only be benevolent with the taxpayers' money.

I would like the minister to stand up and show us where he really pared the budget, particularly with the Deputy Premier and \$1,500,000 for travelling expenses. That's a lot of road work. Maybe they need it. I'm not convinced. And I am sure the taxpayer is going to hurt when he finds out, or he already has found out, that they are rather generous with his money.

So all in all, Mr. Chairman, there is no indication that this government has the slightest intention or the slightest clue as to how to approach, how to deal with the issue of inflation. Has there been a debate on whether we will go for price controls or whether we will not? The Conservatives in some parts of Canada are advocating price controls. In other parts they are fighting it. So much for the official stand of the Conservative party.

In this province the Conservatives have stated that they will avoid that issue. It is fine if they want to take that stand, but what are the alternatives? Are there any alternatives to the galloping inflation we are caught in right now? I'm saying that if there are, this government simply has not got them.

I wonder whether we should not take a second look at wage and price controls even though some people may not like them. If we don't like it, let's

ask the people who fight this kind of stand for their alternatives because it may well be that labour doesn't want it. It may well be that the producer doesn't want it, but the majority of the people who are not employed and are not producing consumer goods are caught in the middle. They represent a section of the voters and their voices ought to be heard in this Legislature. It would be interesting to note how many MLAs, if we call them to stand up and be counted, would say that we support things going on as they are now. But let them go merrily on their way, something will break down and we won't have to solve the problem.

This inflation is one of the most serious problems facing Canada, and I think Alberta is really, if not in the lead, in the forefront so far as inflation is concerned because of a buoyant economy, heavy government spending at all levels, heavy education spending and a progressively greater number of older people, people who are not dependent on production or on wages, but people on fixed incomes. They ought to do more than just say we'll give the homeowners \$216. That is a good idea and I support it. But it is not going to mean that much two years from now to people with families who have to pay a lot more for their groceries and with threats of tremendous and almost uncalled for increases in costs of goods.

I read an article the other day which stated it is expected that clothing prices will go up as much as 60 per cent. For a person with a family the \$200 is not going to go very far. We really have returned some of the taxpayer's money to him, but we have done nothing at all, nothing whatsoever to really show that we mean business as far as inflation is concerned.

Have we called labour and producers together to see if they might agree to guidelines, to hold the line on everything for the time being in this country? We have not done that. We have merely ignored the real causes of inflation, but we stand up in this House one after another and say we are doing so much for inflation. I am saying you are not doing a darn thing for inflation. You're not even beginning to know where to start doing something about it. Because, Mr. Chairman, once more I say that giving the people back some money alleviates to a certain extent the problems caused by inflation, but it certainly does not cure or does not stem the increased cost of living.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Are you ready for the question?

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to clarify a point with the hon. minister. He probably wondered why I was worrying about loaning the government money up to \$50,000. I should say that the natural growth of the credit unions has brought them to a point where they are making loans up to \$500,000. That's the reason I thought the government would be more interested in taking a look at it. The situation, as I mentioned of course, that we are mainly interested in is that these people are Albertans. And if they have money to invest, maybe we can use some of it.

The other thing, Mr. Minister, I'd like your comments on is: as you go over your budget you have a heavy reliance on the resource income from oil and gas and related minerals, and I was wondering how long we could keep this cold war on between discouraging gas export until the price comes up in order that gas will be allowed to go out to eastern Canada and to other places.

I've been talking to some of the people in the drilling industry and they have been very happy with the buoyant outlook for the last year with the drilling incentive program by the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. But they are beginning to wonder now, if this cold war as I call it continues, whether a recession can start. Is there any light at the end of the tunnel whereby we can say that within one month or within two months or six months, or maybe should we forget it for this year? This is not only of interest to the industry, but I'm sure it must be on the mind of the government, because when you are relying to such a great extent on the resource industries in your budget, you must be giving it serious consideration.

I wonder if you could enlighten the House as to when a decision will be made or will be close to being made? Because it's not only affecting government and will affect government in the long run if nothing happens, but also the industry at the present time is also beginning to get concerned as to how long this is going to last. It's fine now, but it's starting to back up and it's not a good sign.

MR. MINIELY:

The first statement from the hon. member was one of correcting the amount in the credit unions. I indicated that we have been, in effect, looking at that and we will be continuing to do so.

On the second item, the hon. Premier answered that -- and I'm sure that again, when you are playing a poker game, you are not going to give your hand away to the people who you are playing with. I think there is really no way, Mr. Chairman, that that question can be answered in the best interests of Alberta. To do so would simply be, in effect, giving our position to the people in eastern Canada who we feel have not been working -- and the prices that have not been working to the best interests of Alberta. So I simply cannot answer that question.

We all know that the citizens of the Province of Alberta are with this Legislature and with this government in terms of supporting our pursuit of getting fair prices for the natural gas that goes outside of this province -- and oil -- but the hon. member was referring to natural gas. But to answer the hon. member's question, Mr. Chairman, would not be, at this time, in the best interests of the Province of Alberta.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, in answer to the minister, I know when you are in a poker game and you start spending the grocery money, this is when you start looking around. I think it is fine to say we're going to hold out. But the grocery money in this case -- if our resource industry slows down -- means one of two things, either deeper taxation from other sources or we go higher into debt, and maybe we might have to bury our pride. We're always as interested as everybody else in getting everything for Alberta, but there comes a time when maybe somebody is going to have to make a move rather than all this silence that's going on.

The hon. Premier mentioned in his speech in Calgary that he was going to be a little more lenient toward it, but I haven't seen any action since. I'm serious when I say that some in the industry are becoming concerned, not only in Alberta. But let's bring it closer to home, as far as I'm concerned, to my own city of Calgary which depends so much on the oil and gas industry. This deadlock is going to be ridiculous after a while. We're liable to be losing out to such an extent that maybe we should be looking stronger at some other things. I could think, for example, of the hold-up of the Syncrude application. The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View was talking about inflation. Every year that Syncrude is held up, it costs them an extra \$40 million, because interest rates are rising and materials are going up.

This is what I'm trying to get at. I'm trying to look at the overall picture. I don't want it to be said by anyone in this House or outside this House that I'm opposed to Alberta getting the best deal possible. I'm all for that deal, but I think there comes a time when something has to move. At least some reassurance should be given to the people. But this silence that has been cloaked over this situation is going to be detrimental to us, I think, in the long run unless something is done fairly soon.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Chairman, just to soothe the hon. member's fears, I think it should be clear that there is not a deadlock and nothing happening. There are negotiations going on constantly between Alberta and other parties.

Let's remember that nobody would have expected the kind of negotiations we are in, and the kind of prize that is available to the province and the dramatic impact it will have on Alberta, and that in order to obtain for the people who own the resources adequate prices it would not be easy. After all, what we are dealing with is something that has gone on for a considerable period of time and we are trying to change that.

I just urge the hon. member, when he is in a tough game not to get cold feet now, but rather to appreciate that there will always be a tough time when you are negotiating something like this.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, I think the minister is trying to make out that when things get tough I want to drop out of the race and that's not it at all, but I think

you've got to be careful you don't throw the baby out with the bath water. That's all I'm trying to say.

Sometimes people can get deadlocked and governments can get deadlocked and companies and government can get deadlocked and nobody really gets a good deal. All I'm trying to say is I think the time has come, and it should come fairly soon if we are going to give any assurance to the industry or the people of Alberta that something is happening.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Taylor, I wonder if you would permit the Chair to make a little announcement here. For the interest of the members who are present, the final score between Chicago and Montreal was 7 for Chicago, 4 for Montreal. Chicago scored twice into the empty net.

Please continue, Mr. Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I don't like referring to taxation of people as a poker game but this has been done in three or four places and it appears the Alberta taxpayers have had the dice loaded against them this year. Before the provincial government spends all of the money they are expecting from income tax I would suggest they hold back some because it appears there is a considerable amount that is going to have to be paid back to the people of Alberta, according to the act.

In order to expand I would like to say that the act, which was brought in in 1972 says: "For the purpose of this section the percentage of the tax payable under the federal act to be used for computing the tax payable under this section is 36 per cent in the case of Alberta." Now it's "the tax payable."

The hon. members will recall that the federal government in 1972 provided a three per cent reduction from their basic federal tax and on the form it shows the basic federal tax. Then it has a section showing the three per cent reduction so that we then have a reduced basic federal tax, which is the amount payable less three per cent. That is the amount payable. So I contend that the Alberta taxpayers should have paid 36 per cent of the reduced basic federal tax.

But on the form it sets out very clearly that the Alberta taxpayer must pay 36 per cent of the basic federal tax. Consequently, every Alberta taxpayer who has used this form has paid too much provincial tax.

In the case of a person with \$3,000 basic federal tax, he would pay -- 36 per cent of that would be a little over a third, \$1,080. But on the reduced amount, three per cent off the \$3,000 brings it down to \$2,930, and 36 per cent of that means he has paid something like \$25.20 too much on his income tax in 1972.

Now under the act the Alberta taxpayer is going to be entitled to secure the difference between the 36 per cent of the basic federal tax and the reduced basic federal tax.

Under our own act, 36 per cent of the tax payable is 36 per cent of the reduced basic federal tax. And I suppose all the Albertans following the form have paid this 36 per cent on the basic federal tax and consequently have paid too much. So I am suggesting to the Provincial Treasurer that either the federal government or the provincial government start to make provision immediately to pay back the amount of taxes that have been paid in error because of an error on the form which is contrary to the act.

MR. MINIELY:

Well, Mr. Chairman, there are several things that I could say in reply to the hon. member's question. I suppose I would start by saying that it wasn't this government but the old government that entered into the uniform tax collection agreement with the federal government which was in existence when we took office.

The uniform tax collection agreement which was entered into by the old government, Mr. Chairman, said basically that the Province of Alberta was prepared, for the sake of uniformity in the tax system in Canada, to enter into that agreement and have the federal government collect taxes on behalf of the Province of Alberta. That has existed for many, many years. Now in conjunction

with that agreement, it means that the Province of Alberta accepts the tax system of the federal government, although we can make representations to them and say that we don't agree with some things. The prerogative, as long as the tax collection agreement exists, is with the federal government as far as the basic tax system is concerned.

When the federal government made revisions to that tax system, under what they call federal tax reform, they worked with all the provinces at the finance ministers' meetings, ran off the tax yields under the old system, ran off tax yields under the new system and said to all the provinces, under the new system, which we have devised as a federal government, and because we are changing the method of calculation, because formerly the calculation was based on the combined federal and provincial tax, where it was based on a percentage of total tax. Because the system was changed along with that, they said to each province, "In order to yield the same amount of total income tax revenue under the new system as you received under the old system, you will now apply a percentage based on the federal tax rather than a percentage based on the total tax." That's the reason. It's simply the figure the federal government gave the Province of Alberta, and in fact every province in Canada, as a new percentage because it was being calculated on a different base. They made the calculations; they told us the base.

Now, the total yield under either was by the federal government at that time, and until experience shows otherwise, and it hasn't yet, the total yield is to be approximately equal. Now, there are many things in the revisions to the federal tax system, that change, the actual amount of income tax that might be paid by an individual citizen. In other words, there are changes in exemptions; there are changes in the fact that capital gains are now 50 per cent taxable; the fact that the hon. leader mentioned of various benefits that are now taxable. The fact that now the base is changed, the actual rates are changed. The percentages of taxable income between various levels of that taxable income have changed from what the old system did.

So whereas an individual in Alberta may pay a higher or lesser amount of provincial income tax than he did formerly, the total system as the federal government had presented it is to yield the same total amount. The distribution of the burden, which was part of the very reason for federal tax reform, was accepted by the Province of Alberta by virtue of the tax collection agreement even though there were many items we did not like. It was a tax collection agreement that was there when we came into office and that had been there for many years. Mr. Chairman, I think that's about all I can say on it.

MR. TAYLOR:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not arguing about the tax agreement. I'm arguing that The Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act states that the Alberta taxpayer pays 36 per cent of the federal tax payable. That's the basis of my whole argument and consequently the 36 per cent should have been of the federal tax payable which was the reduced basic federal tax.

All the other factors raised by the hon. Provincial Treasurer don't change that aspect one iota. The truth of the matter is the Alberta taxpayer has been taxed more than he should have been taxed. He should have paid his tax on the basic federal tax less the 3 per cent because that is the amount he is paying to the federal government. He pays to the Alberta government 36 per cent of that amount payable. It's as simple as that and I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer, if he expects the federal government to pay this back, should notify the Canadian government that he expects this amount to be refunded to the Alberta taxpayer. If it isn't done, it should be done by the Alberta government. Alberta citizens should not be taken advantage of in this respect. He should secure the advantage given to him by the Canadian government by giving a reduced basic tax. Our tax, 36 per cent, is then 36 per cent of that amount and it's really just as simple as that.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member obviously forgets that the 36 per cent was passed by this Legislature at the time when, in 1973, the hon. Minister of Finance in Ottawa was not sure whether he was going to continue on the 3 per cent reduction of federal tax. So, in fact, at that time -- and you know that Mr. Turner was pressed many times by both the public and by the opposition in the federal House as to whether or not he was going to carry on the 3 per cent reduction of the federal tax in 1973 -- when we drafted that provision of the Act in conjunction with the federal government their tax existed. When that Act was passed by this Legislature it was passed with the intent that the amount referred to in the return, as you see it now, is the federal tax before the 3

per cent reduction, not the federal tax after the 3 per cent reduction. At that time it was not known whether the 3 per cent reduction was, in fact, going to be carried on by the federal government. That's the answer to that question.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I can't accept that as the answer to the question because the Act that was brought in and assented to June 2, 1972 states the tax payable under The Federal Act. The tax payable is the reduced basic federal tax. I'm not arguing about the 36 per cent.

If the provincial government forgot to tell the federal government that they wanted it done on the reduced federal tax, that's the responsibility of the government. But the Act certainly gave the provincial government no mandate to have the 36 per cent charged against the basic federal tax. The Act states that it has to be against the amount payable which is the reduced federal tax.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, I think I answered the question very clearly as to what happened when this Legislature passed the Act. Since then the Minister of Finance of Canada has decided to carry on the 3 per cent. But remember this, the federal government passed it as a 3 per cent abatement. If in fact, they were permanently reducing the federal taxes payable they would do so in the actual rates. They are treating it as a carrying on of the 3 per cent abatement. I think it then becomes a matter of what the intent of this Legislature was when the Act was passed and that clearly ties to without the existence of the 3 per cent and the other becomes a matter of legal interpretation which I am not competent in.

MR. TAYLOR:

I simply want to say that when the Act was passed we said it was the percentage of the tax payable, and irrespective of what people had in their minds I think the law has to be read the way it reads in the Act. It's a percentage of the tax payable and that's the reduced basic federal tax.

In my view, the Alberta taxpayers are entitled to this refund of whatever portion it happens to be, from five dollars to perhaps several hundred dollars.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, just before we leave the treasury estimates I want to refer to something the hon. Member for Calgary Millican raised about natural gas policy. It's certainly no secret that my views on this matter are by and large different than the government's.

I think there is one area -- I won't rethrash these differences because I think we have discussed them before -- but there is one area I would like to raise with the hon. Provincial Treasurer and the Minister of Mines and Minerals. I have raised it several times in the question period and I noticed in the minister's budget speech that he dealt briefly with it in referring to Section 11 (a) of The National Energy Board Act. It seems to me that this is certainly a pretty important section of the NEB Act because under the authority granted the NEB we could quite conceivably get a substantial increase in the export price of natural gas. But the problem, as I see it, is that the question of who gets the money hasn't really been decided as yet. The minister, I think, made some reference to that in his speech.

Now, the reason I raise this Mr. Minister is, that I have had an opportunity to discuss it with the assistant to the B.C. Minister, Mr. Nimsick, and they are very interested now in pursuing Section 11 (a), of the NEB Act. One of the features they are most interested in is trying to get a commitment, that, in fact, the money will go to the producer. So it seems to me that it might be worth our while in Alberta to see if we can work out a common policy with British Columbia and perhaps Saskatchewan. This might be something that could be considered at the western premiers' conference in late June.

MR. DIXON:

The hon. Provincial Treasurer's vote -- I would like to go back to the 1971 election campaign.

I hate to bring it up and talk about election promises that haven't been kept, but the hon. the Premier was going around the country saying that Alberta was the highest taxed -- income taxed -- province in Canada. I don't know how he

ever arrived at it, but anyway, let's say he was correct. Although it isn't so. I think you'll find that the highest income tax as far as a province is concerned is Manitoba with 42.5 per cent, and a 13 per cent corporation tax. The next is Saskatchewan with 40 per cent and a 12 per cent corporation tax, and the third is Nova Scotia with 38.5 per cent, and a 10 per cent corporation tax. Now, there are three provinces that are using the same rate as we are using, Alberta, Prince Edward Island, and Nova Scotia -- pardon me, Newfoundland.

My question is this: with the concern the Premier had about the high taxes he claimed back in 1971, just what is this government going to do? Are you going to reduce the 36 per cent? Are you going to give the public of Alberta a reduction in income tax? Because this was the impression that was left with the electorate. We are now two years away from that promise and I'm just wondering if it is going to be kept, and if there are some signs that they are going to do something about their promise.

As I look over the situation, it looks to me like we are going higher in taxes rather than lower, and I'd like to have the minister explain to me as well while I'm on my feet, this great claim that there has been no increase in tax in Alberta. As I mentioned a few days ago in the House, what do you do when you get an assessment from the government? With the large increase on the assessment on oil lands, do you ignore that assessment? That's not a tax? Or not an increase in tax? This, I'd like to have clarified.

MR. MINIELY:

I know it bothers the hon. member that, in fact, when we took office, Alberta, I believe had close to the highest which was about the second highest rate of income tax. But since we've been in office in Alberta, many of the other provinces have increased their income tax rates whereas we have been able to keep the income tax rate level in Alberta. In addition, we've been able to directly reduce taxes through what all hon. members know is The Property Tax Reduction Plan. It was a matter of choice. We were of the view that the most regressive tax and the one that punished the people who could least afford to pay was, in fact, property tax, and I am very strongly of that personal view.

I think when you combine that, along with preserving the income tax rate in Alberta and not increasing it, while other provincial governments in Canada have had to increase theirs, and Alberta is about the middle now, rather than the second highest, that's a pretty good record. I really don't know why the hon. member would criticize that record.

With respect to the matter of a royalty. I've stated in the House before that hon. members on the other side, I'm sure, don't really want to accept what is the fact. The fact is that a tax is universal; it's not something that is related to an ownership interest like a royalty. A royalty is clearly an ownership interest and is a wasting asset of this province and one on which we should achieve our fair return for the citizens of the province as a government in Alberta.

I know the hon. members on the other side won't accept my answer. Nevertheless that's my answer.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, just before we move on, I would like to see if there is any response from either the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs or the Minister of Mines and Minerals because it seems to me that regardless of our views on future export and so on, it is very important that on natural gas that is being exported to the United States we make sure that we get as high a price as we possibly can. If that means that we get together as western provinces to see if we can get Ottawa to do something with this section of The National Energy Board Act, then it seems to me it would be prudent for us to act in concert.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can respond to that. First I think I will endeavour to correct the hon. member just for the purpose of the record. It's not under The National Energy Board Act; it's under the regulations. It's not Section 11 (b), it's Section 11 (a). Those are just small differences but I would like to have them clear on the record.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is fair to say that we were the first province to raise this with representatives of the federal government, the Minister of

Energy, the deputy minister. We've had many discussions on it. We have taken the position that where there is an increase in price -- I call that an export price or border price -- of natural gas, that price should accrue to the producer and correspondingly the Province of Alberta would receive its royalty revenue from that. I have also raised it at the meetings that we have had with the ministers of the various provinces that represent the natural resources.

Part of that, of course, is the question of restructuring of the National Energy Board. I would suggest that the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview could be of real service there if he would continue to advocate the restructuring of the National Energy Board. I could say he could be of real service to this province and to the Legislature if he could convince his colleagues in the Province of British Columbia to support the Alberta position on that. This is one of the steps that could be of great assistance. I'm sure if he can convince them that they could support us on that then they could join with us in making sure that the difficulties arising from Section 11 (a) could be brought to the attention of the federal government. We would not only then have two provinces, but I'm sure the other provinces involved would then join in and assist us in getting the point that is absolutely essential in our view established.

MR. NOTLEY:

Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all, I'm sorry if I mentioned Section 11 (b). I thought I did say 11 (a) when I got up.

I would suggest though, with great respect, Mr. Minister, that it really wouldn't be too wise to make this contingent upon British Columbia supporting your proposition with respect to the restructuring of the National Energy Board. That's getting into another debate.

But because of the interest that they are now showing in something where we clearly have the most to gain, it seems to me, of any province in Canada, it would be well advised for the ministers, especially at the Western Canadian conference but perhaps privately among the leaders of government in late June, to see if some sort of common policy can be worked out on at least that matter. I don't know whether you'll get the British Columbia government to support you on your proposals to restructure the National Energy Board; you ought to talk to them on that. But I do know that they are interested in this Section 11 (a).

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Chairman, there was evident at the meeting in Winnipeg a sort of growing interest expressed by the Premier of British Columbia in the National Energy Board. The possibility of the significance seemed to be sort of just commencing in their awareness or at least their real interest in it about the matters that my colleague, the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals has mentioned that Alberta has been relatively alone in arguing.

Perhaps it's a coincidence, perhaps it's not. It has come to my attention that at an officials' meeting in preparing further working papers for the Western Economic Opportunities Conference, the last officials' meeting, the representative from British Columbia has asked whether June 18 would be possible to discuss the possibility of the National Energy Board and this particular matter to be discussed and determine whether it should then go on to the Western Economic Opportunities Conference agenda. So the matter has obviously gained in importance in British Columbia's eyes and it is quite possible there will be considerable discussion on it between our two governments at the premiers' level.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Chairman, one last observation. I certainly want to leave the impression that my door is always open. I feel we have raised it before at these conferences where there are representatives from British Columbia. It's perhaps just lately that they have felt the full significance and impact of it and I can understand that. So I'd like to suggest that if he is talking to him perhaps he would like to bring him over here and we'd be glad to discuss it with him any time.

I think it is, however, gratifying to find out that British Columbia, as well as members of the Legislature, are starting to realize the full significance and impact of Section No. 11(a), because we have felt for a considerable length of time it was very important from Alberta's point of view and we have continued to stress it at all meetings we have attended.

I think it could become more significant in the future as we examine President Nixon's energy message and look at what the implications of that are in respect to natural gas and some of the steps being taken in the United States on natural gas because this really would put into force and effect Section 11(a). And in that case, that's where the opportunity cost views arise and those prices could be increased substantially in different parts of the United States. As those prices rise then it is only right and reasonable that if gas from Canada is going into those States it should be for the same dollar value. And as a result then we have to make sure that that dollar value does return to the province and to the producers of that province, so that the people in each of those provinces can receive the benefits.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Question?

MR. DIXON:

One point of clarification, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. minister. I wondered why the Provincial Treasurer dropped the charts that we usually had over the years on budgets which are used in all provinces, the circle, showing the percentages, something along this line, which is a quick reference for people who are looking for the income and spending.

Why was this dropped? It's only a minor thing, I know, but it is something I meant to ask you earlier. In your budget speech, you know, it would be -- for example you could see quickly where the money has gone, like in Ontario 30 cents of every dollar for education, interest on public debt 8 cents, health 30 cents. That sort of thing. I wonder why we dropped those charts? Because I think they are most useful and a quick reference.

MR. MINIELY:

Is there more you wanted to say?

In fact, we didn't drop them. I am not sure but I thought all hon. members had two charts which were provided to them when the budget estimates were tabled in the Legislature. They weren't incorporated in the book. But there were charts, pie charts, along with the Estimates and attached to the Estimates when I presented it to the Legislature and, in fact, when I also presented it at the press conference. I thought hon. members had received copies of those charts.

MR. DIXON:

Yes, we did have those charts. But what I'm saying, Mr. Minister, it would be convenient because a lot of these go out all over the province to the people. We can find it as members, we can break it down. That's easy to do. But I was thinking of the general public on the outside who receive the budget speech it would be quite a convenient item to have in the actual budget address, I think, that's all I'm saying. I'm not saying I can't find out or the hon. members can't find out where the money is going, because you have broken it down. But I thought next year, if you would give consideration when you do the actual budget, to insert that page in your budget I think it would be convenient to the people because more and more people are taking an interest in budgets, and as we send them out they'll have a quick reference.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Question has been called. Ready for the question?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The question has been called. Are you ready for the question? Moved by the Chairman of Subcommittee D and seconded by the Provincial Treasurer that the estimates in the amount of \$60,125,700 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974 for the Department of Treasury.

[The motion was carried.]

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, I move the resolution be reported and that all resolutions considered by the subcommittee of supply be now reported.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The supplementaries.

MR. MINIELY:

Oh, call the supplementaries.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

We will just accept the motion that the resolution be reported by the minister. Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

We will now move to approval of the supplementary requisitions. For the members' information you can turn to pages 17 and 18 of the capital accounts summary. It's a combination of the two figures.

1. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$3,510,500 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Department of Agriculture.

[The motion was carried.]

2. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$95,700 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Attorney General's Department.

[The motion was carried.]

3. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$2,350,115.13 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Executive Council.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Chairman, of all the estimates we got in the two books, how did you get 13 cents in this one?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Buckwell, you add the estimates on page 18 and the estimates on page 17. I notice on page 18 the figure 13 cents is there.

[The motion was carried.]

4. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$140,000 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Department of Industry and Commerce.

[The motion was carried.]

5. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$11,102,170 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Department of Manpower and Labour.

[The motion was carried.]

6. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$2,342,796 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Department of Lands and Forests.

[The motion was carried.]

7. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$735,456 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for Legislation.

[The motion was carried.]

8. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$275,000 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Department of Mines and Minerals.

[The motion was carried.]

9. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$1,300,000 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Department of Municipal Affairs.

[The motion was carried.]

10. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$301,620 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for Health Commissions.

[The motion was carried.]

11. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$450,050 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Department of Health and Social Development.

[The motion was carried.]

12. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$206,738 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Department of Public Works.

[The motion was carried.]

13. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$4,345,212.50 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Treasury Department.

MR. STROM:

-- found in the back of the large Estimate book, because I find some of them are --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

[Inaudible]

MR. STROM:

Oh, fine, fine.

[The motion was carried.]

14. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$1,600,000 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation.

[The motion was carried.]

15. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$64,000 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Environment Department.

[The motion was carried.]

16. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$1,220,000 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Department of Advanced Education.

[The motion was carried.]

17. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$850,000 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Department of Telephones and Utilities.

[The motion was carried.]

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, I move that all the resolutions considered by Committee of Supply be now reported.

[The motion was carried.]

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and report.

[Mr. Chairman left the Chair.]

* * * * *

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the committee has had under consideration the following resolutions and begs to report same.

1. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$27,148,544 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, for the Department of Agriculture.
2. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$39,543,810 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, for the Department of the Attorney General.
3. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$286,697,600 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, for the Department of Education.
4. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$13,193,977 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, for the Executive Council.
5. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$126,360,023 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974. for the Department of Highways and Transport.
6. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$6,549,480 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, for the Department of Industry and Commerce.
7. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$31,102,969 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, for the Department of Manpower and Labour.
8. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$30,037,700 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, for the Department of Lands and Forests.
9. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$12,593,281 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, for Legislation.
10. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$2,646,400 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, for the Department of Mines and Minerals.
11. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$114,540,695 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, for the Department of Municipal Affairs.
12. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$290,876,268 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, for Health Commissions.
13. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$167,164,330 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, for the Department of Health and Social Development.
14. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$78,815,920 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, for the Department of Public Works.
15. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$60,125,700 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, for the Treasury Department.
16. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$11,599,050 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974 for the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation.
17. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$16,439,390 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, for the Department of Environment.
18. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$181,538,570 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, for the Department of Advanced Education.

19. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$462,981 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, for the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

20. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$1,569,485 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, for the Department of Telephones and Utilities.

Under supplementary estimates, Mr. Speaker:

1. resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$3,510,500 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Department of Agriculture.

2. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$95,700 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Attorney General's Department.

3. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$2,350,115.13 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Executive Council.

4. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$140,000 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Department of Industry and Commerce.

5. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$11,102,170 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 for the Department of Manpower and Labour.

6. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$2,342,796 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 for the Department of Lands and Forests.

7. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$735,456 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 for Legislation.

8. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$275,000 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 for the Department of Mines and Minerals.

9. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$1,300,000 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 for the Department of Municipal Affairs.

10. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$301,620 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 for Health Commissions.

11. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$450,050 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 for the Department of Health and Social Development.

12. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$206,738 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 for the Department of Public Works.

13. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$4,345,212.50 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 for the Treasury Department.

14. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$1,600,000 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 for the Department Youth, Culture and Recreation.

15. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$64,000 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 for the Department of the Environment.

16. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$1,220,000 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 for the Department of Advanced Education.

17. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$850,000 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 for the Department of Telephones and Utilities.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the report by the hon. Deputy Speaker, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Attorney General that the resolution be now read a second time.

[The motion was carried.]

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, with the leave of the House I move that we revert to introduction of bills.

[The motion was carried.]

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS (CONT.)

Bill No. 3 The Appropriation Act, 1973

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill being Bill No. 3 The Appropriation Act, 1973.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 3 was introduced and read a first time.]

DR. HORNER:

With the unanimous consent of the House, Mr. Speaker, could we go on to second and third reading of The Appropriation Act?

MR. SPEAKER:

Moved by the hon. Deputy Premier, seconded by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, that Bill No. 3 be now read a second time. All those agreed?

[The motion was carried, Bill No. 3 was read a second time.]

MR. MINIELY:

I move, seconded by the hon. Attorney General, that The Appropriation Act, 1973, be now read a third time.

[The motion was carried, Bill No. 3 was read a third time.]

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 1:00 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the motion by the hon. Deputy Premier, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 1:00 o'clock.

[The House rose at 10:15 o'clock.]