

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Friday, October 26, 1973

[The House met at 1:00 o'clock.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 92

The Legislative Assembly Statutes Amendment Act, 1973

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Legislative Assembly Statutes Amendment Act, 1973. This bill will amend certain acts in order to clarify the authority of the Speaker in relation to the staff of the Legislative Assembly and expenditures made in respect of the operation of the Assembly.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 92 was introduced and read a first time.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure today to introduce a group, which is in the members gallery, from my constituency of Calgary West. The Spruce Wood Girl Guides from Calgary with their Girl Guide Leaders, Mrs. Benson, Mrs. Humphrieys, Mrs. Craig, Mrs. Davis, Mrs. Johnston, and Miss Lessing.

I've had an opportunity to visit with the delightful group which has travelled here from Calgary. They will be going on to the Provincial Museum and Archives and staying overnight to visit tomorrow at the Alberta Game Farm.

They avoided putting me in the position of deciding with regard to my constituency and the city of Edmonton.

We are very pleased that they are here from my constituency. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, and through you the members of the Assembly, to welcome them, if they would all rise.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, from Trochu in my constituency, it's a great pleasure for me to introduce the Law 20 class of Grade 11 at Trochu High School.

They are here. They are led by Mr. Al Clemens and Mr. Tom Lynch. I'd ask them to rise and through you, Mr. Speaker, to be welcomed by the members of the Legislative Assembly.

MR. MINIFLY:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to have seated in the public gallery 16 adult students from the Alberta Vocational Centre in my constituency of Edmonton Centre. They are with their leader, Mr. Pat Fahy. I would ask that they rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table for the information of hon. members today the Public Accounts of the Province of Alberta for the year ending March 31, 1973, together with two reports of the Provincial Auditor, as required under Sections 17 and 38 of The Financial Administration Act.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table some more documents for the additional reading, or to satisfy the reading capacity, of the hon. members. These are reports by the Environment Conservation Authority and they are as follows.

(1) The Annual Report of the Public Advisory Committee to the Environment Conservation Authority.

(2) Report and Recommendations on the Environmental Effects of the Operation of Sulphur Extraction Gas Plants.

(3) Summary of the Public Hearings - Environmental Effects of the Operation of Sulphur Extraction Gas Plants.

(4) Parts I and II - Proceedings of the Public Hearings of Land Use and Resource Development in the Eastern Slopes.

(5) Prospectus for the Alberta Peace-Athabasca Delta hearings. This is being tabled because there is a copy in Cree as well as in English. I believe that this is the first time that a document in Cree has been tabled.

(6) I'd like to table the Authority recommendations in regard to the Burnco appeal against a stop order, having to do with gravel operations on the Bow River.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file a return to Motion No. 255.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a reply to Return No. 265, proposed by Dr. Buck, regarding the Early Childhood Services program.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

ECA Hearings

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Lands and Forests. In light of the report of the Environmental Conservation Authority on the Eastern Slopes hearing, I'd like the minister to indicate to the House what procedure the government will now be following in dealing with those recommendations.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, that is an important question. I think the procedure would be somewhat at variance dealing from one to another. In one of the instances it was recommended by the report that we proceed to allow further assessment of the recreation resource inventory, and as a result of that recommendation we have gone ahead and done that.

In other instances it's suggested that there be some further analysis. We will in turn ask that the proposers do that further recommended analysis and then come back to us with the results. We will then be in a position to consider their applications further.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. What procedure should individuals follow who made application for lease land in the Eastern

Slopes, and have been told that they should wait until the hearings were over? What procedure should those individuals now follow?

DR. WARRACK:

I should imagine, Mr. Speaker, that any such proposers of individual developments put those proposals forward before the Environment Conservation Authority hearings at the appropriate time and place. That being done, there would be a report on those proposals that had been submitted to the hearings.

Now that we have those, as tabled recently by the hon. Minister of the Environment, the Environment Conservation Authority Interim Report No. 1 would be dealing with such proposals. We would ask them to respect that interim report and to come back to us on a basis of the recommendations in the report.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. What approach should individuals take for quarter sections or half sections of land who did not make proposals to the Environmental Conservation Authority hearings but, in fact, were told by the department that the department would deal with those requests for use of land following the hearings?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, it would be timely if they brought those proposals back to our attention. It may very well be that we would feel we would need to have the final report of the Environment Conservation Authority hearings and recommendations prior to dealing with those individual matters. That is not far off, and therefore I think it would be timely for these matters to be brought to the attention of the Department of Lands and Forests again.

MR. CLARK:

One last supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the government giving active consideration at this time to purchasing back the existing natural resources leases which are in the alpine region of the Eastern Slopes?

DR. WARRACK:

I can't be absolutely sure of the answer in each individual instance, because as I know the hon. member is aware, there are many. It may very well be that there are some when that is what our approach ought to be, and in other instances in all likelihood, not. But I would certainly be able to say this: we are not, at this moment, considering buying back all of them.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Livestock Facility Development Program

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture with respect to labour assistance for the Livestock Facility Development Program which was announced yesterday. Would the minister advise the House whether the value of the work done by the farmer or his sons will be based on the minimum wage of \$1.90 an hour or the current wage paid to carpenters?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, to make the program work I have great faith in the good judgment of the farmers of Alberta and I'm sure they'll assess that in a fair manner.

MR. FRENCH:

A supplementary question. Is the minister aware that most of this work will be done by the farmers, and maybe their sons, in this new program?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, that's a matter of opinion on the part of the hon. member. I'd rather suggest that the idea was to continue that labour force involved in

agriculture during the summer months to have an opportunity to continue them through the winter months, and thus take them off unemployment rolls.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question. Can the hon. Deputy Premier advise the Assembly whether or not the yardstick for computing the labour costs will be the summer program and further, whether there has been any consultation with the two major farm organizations relating to the question of what yardstick should be used to compute the labour content?

DR. HORNER:

I would think, Mr. Speaker, that that would be a useful yardstick that could be used in regard to the labour content.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Bighorn Sheep - Illegal Trophies

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Has your department received any reports concerning illegal trafficking in trophy bighorn sheep heads between Alberta and the United States?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, quite often when I'm out to public meetings in various parts of the province this matter is brought up and it is suggested that this is occurring. We do the best we possibly can to follow them up. I certainly couldn't say that there are no such instances, but if there is any evidence to indicate that there may be, we follow it up in the firmest possible manner.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has the minister had an opportunity to follow up any evidence relating to what is, in fact, an international racket concerning Alberta bighorns being resold in the United States as desert bighorns?

DR. WARRACK:

We're aware of expressions of concern in that matter, Mr. Speaker. There is a fine line to walk in the sense also of not prejudicing any possible future prosecution in such a case. I think I'd have to be very restrained in any comments - beyond those I've already made - for that reason.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. Could the hon. minister advise the Assembly whether he's received any evidence or any reports about Alberta guides and outfitters being involved in this sort of operation?

DR. WARRACK:

That is something I would have to check, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY:

One final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Have officials from your department discussed possible cooperation with the federal parks branch re law enforcement on this question?

DR. WARRACK:

I can't be positive on that point of detail but I would like to say this, Mr. Speaker, that each year there is a federal-provincial wildlife conference. I attended it last summer in Halifax and on my behalf the hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly attended it this year in Ottawa. These are divided into areas of biology-discussion and areas of enforcement-discussion. Should that be a matter of important concern to either the provinces or to the federal government, I would imagine that that kind of discussion would have taken place.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Visitors

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Premier. When I look at the beautiful Girl Guides from Calgary my question is a little facetious. How come a married man gets all the breaks?

MR. LOUGHEED:

I'll introduce you to them ... [Inaudible]

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Pollution - Contingency Plan

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of the Environment in regard to the November meeting of the Canadian Council of Resource and Environmental Ministers. Can the minister advise if a contingency plan for large urban centres during periods of high pollution will be on the agenda?

MR. YURKO:

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the broad question of urbanization and the rapid trend toward urbanization is on the agenda and will be discussed. In that context I guess the matter will be discussed.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister accept our congratulations on his pending appointment as chairman of this august body?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Harradence Commission - Salaries

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. My question is either to the hon. Solicitor General or to the hon. Attorney General. What are the rates of pay to the chairman of the committee investigating Spy Hill?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, there was no set schedule of pay established for the chairman or the commissioner conducting that inquiry. It is something we will review as the matter progresses.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Do I gather from the answer that the pay will be based on an account submitted by the chairman?

MR. LEITCH:

No, Mr. Speaker, the pay will be based on what is normally paid to persons doing this kind of work.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary. In other appointments then what is the normal pay for doing this kind of work, or does anybody know?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member is getting beyond a supplementary with that.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reword the question. Can the minister, or anyone in the government, tell us the rates of pay for commissioners, chairmen of any investigating bodies in this province?

MR. SPEAKER:

It would appear to be the type of detail that should be asked on the Order Paper.

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway.

Taxation - Reduction

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question today to the hon. Provincial Treasurer regarding a news release by him that provincial revenue this year is far beyond his expectations. In light of the announcement, has the government any plans to announce a tax reduction in the gasoline or income tax field prior to April 1, 1974?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I think if the hon. member can hold his patience until I present the budget, that can be clarified for everyone.

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. I take it from that announcement that we are going to get a reduction?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's supplementary is an interpretation.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway followed by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

Advanced Education Advisory Committees

DR. PAPROSKI:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education. What is the status of the advisory committees, particularly those which were intended to replace the university and college commissions?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, at the time that legislation was introduced last spring both to amend The Universities Act and The Colleges Act, I indicated to the House that I would be establishing a series of advisory committees. I am now in the process of doing so and we will be proceeding with advertisements, Mr. Speaker, early in November.

The six committees which I have established relate to college affairs, university affairs, student affairs, Native peoples' education, further education and vocational and technical education.

Mr. Speaker, as I said then, the purpose of these committees is to involve the public, the student, the faculty and other special groups in an advisory capacity to my department in the areas and subjects of the committees.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Foothills.

Beef Prices

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. Has the hon. minister's department carried out any surveys similar in nature to the survey by the federal Department of Agriculture which revealed that five major food chains in Toronto failed to pass on the total reduction in beef wholesale prices to the consumer, and if he had such a survey, what were the results?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what the hon. member says is correct. We have not, though, commissioned such a survey.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Foothills followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

Calgary Court Reporters

MR. McCRAE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the hon. Attorney General. In view of reports that an electrical recording system is being installed in the new Calgary Remand Centre, can the minister advise us as to the future employment prospects of the Calgary court reporters?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's question is correct. We are installing in Remand Centre in Calgary an electronic recording system. At least something similar has been used in other places in Canada and the world. It is still something we are going to have to assess, its efficiency and cost, to ascertain whether it should be expanded in the future.

With respect to the second part of his question, Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to give an assurance I have given the senior members of the court reporting staff in my meetings with them. I haven't the slightest doubt but that all the reporters now working for the province will be able to work for the province throughout the remainder of their working period, as court reporters.

I also have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that we are now and will continue to be, recruiting new court reporters. The demand for their services is growing very rapidly and those recruits likewise would be employed. As long as they wanted to work as court reporters for the provincial government there would be employment for them in that capacity.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation followed by the hon. Member for Macleod.

Vehicle Safety Devices

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Highways. In view of studies showing that a full half of highway fatalities could have been prevented had the occupant been wearing seat belts, is your department considering legislation governing the use of seat belts or an education campaign to encourage the wearing of seat belts?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, first of all I think it is an assumption that half the accidents could be avoided by having seat belts. We are not planning any legislation requiring the use of seat belts. I think if seat belts were generally used by the public at all times, certainly there would be fewer injuries than there are now.

MR. SORENSON:

A supplementary to the minister. Is the Department of Highways studying the development of airbag protection in vehicles?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, the airbag invention is being researched at this time, mainly by General Motors and other motor car manufacturers. The Department of Highways is not doing any research work on airbags.

MR. SORENSON:

A supplementary to the Minister of Manpower and Labour. Is there any internal rule in the Alberta public service advising the use of seat belts in government vehicles?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I missed that.

MR. SORENSON:

My question was to the Minister of Manpower and Labour.

[Laughter]

Is there any internal rule in the Alberta public service advising the use of seat belts in government vehicles?

DR. HOHOL:

I missed that, Mr. Speaker, and obviously I should have because again it would be an appropriate question for the Minister of Highways.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, seeing that the ball has bounced my way - I believe it is generally understood that for the occupants' own safety they wear seat belts. They are to my knowledge in all the vehicles without exception. There is a sign inside every truck saying, be sure to fasten your seat belt. In all the modern vehicles there are devices which, unless connected, are real annoying if you don't do something about your seat belt.

StopCheck Program

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the avoidance of accidents, could the Solicitor General report on how effective the StopCheck Program has been and what the response has been to date?

MISS HUNLEY:

Really it hasn't officially started to any great extent - not until November 1. Maybe I should have missed that question too.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Macleod followed by the hon. Member for Little Bow.

Feed Grain Marketing

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. The Manitoba Feed Grains Marketing Commission has announced it will prosecute anyone selling grain to the Federal Agricultural Products Board. Is the Alberta Grain Commission considering such an action?

DR. HORNER:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BUCKWELL:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, when will the Alberta Grain Commission study be completed on the grain requirements of Alberta?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, might I answer it in this way; in our discussions with Mr. Lang on the feed grains policy, I've outlined to the House before the four major factors we wanted in that policy. That doesn't relate frankly to the so-called APB price at all.

Our negotiations are ongoing, and we intend to have senior personnel in Winnipeg in the early part of next week to try to finalize arrangements with the Wheat Board with regard to what price feed grains will be available to farmers in Alberta. In addition to that, we would hope for some early resolution of the trade equalization program that Mr. Lang promised us with regard to meat products going east.

I think if we can get those things we will have a reasonable feed grains policy which will give us that balance we require between the feeder and the coarse grain producer.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Little Bow followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

Hutterite Education

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question was to the Minister of Health and Social Development. While I am on my feet I would ask the question of the Minister of Education.

Has the minister any further information with regard to the Vulcan presentation with regard to Hutterite education?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I'll have that information on Monday, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff followed by the hon. Member for Wainwright.

Rail Line Abandonment

MR. WYSE:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. Has the provincial government completed the study regarding rail line abandonment in southern Alberta, and its effect?

MR. PEACOCK:

No, Mr. Speaker. That study is continuing, and will be continuing, for another six months.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. Will this report be made public when it is completed?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, it is the intention to have meetings with all the communities that will be affected by any chance of abandonment.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wainwright followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight.

StopCheck Program (Cont.)

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Solicitor General. In the material distributed to members relating to the program StopCheck, there is reference to the operation of up to 120 such check spots. Are these predetermined spots or places, or are they general areas?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Do you want to know?

MISS HUNLEY:

If the hon. member is asking for some advance information, I am afraid I am not prepared to divulge it. Seriously, Mr. Speaker, that will be determined by the police forces who are instigating it. The signs will be available throughout the province and it will then depend upon the good judgment of the police as to when and where they are used.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question to the minister on the same matter. With respect to the increase of deaths in 1972 over the two preceding years as outlined in the material, has any assessment been made of the increased deaths in relation to the increased number of outlets for alcoholic beverages?

MISS HUNLEY:

I was asked a similar question before, and I personally have not done any research on it, and I don't know whether that information is being researched by anyone at all. I think it stands to reason that the law of averages speaks - that the more people who drink, the more people who are liable to drive. The whole intent of our program is to try to discourage it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McKnight followed by the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray.

Fish Creek Provincial Park

MR. LEE:

I have a question for the Minister of Lands and Forests. Could the minister report to the Assembly on any progress his department has achieved in the planning and development of the Fish Creek Provincial Park in Calgary?

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think I can give a useful report on that matter in two ways. One, the primary amount of land acquisition east of the Macleod Trail towards the Bow River in Calgary that would be on the area contemplated for the Metropolitan Provincial Park in Calgary has been done. That acquisition has occurred. Because we now have made that land acquisition, it becomes worthwhile to begin the public involvement process in the development planning that we wish to achieve. I expect to be in a position very shortly to announce a parks development advisory committee for the Calgary Metropolitan Provincial Park and Fish Creek.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray followed by the hon. Member for Drayton Valley.

Syncrude Employee Transport

DR. BOUVIER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is actually a repeat of a question I asked the Minister of Manpower and Labour, whether any feasibility studies have been made into the flying of people to work in the Syncrude project. He said it would probably be dealt with in the report which he later tabled, but I find nothing about it in there except a little bit about commuting to work from Fort MacKay. I wonder if the minister has an answer yet?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, the answer is simply that people in the construction industry, the clients of the construction industry, Syncrude itself and its representative, Canadian Bechtel, the Canada Manpower people and several departments of this government are working together to the end that we train on the job, in houses or in classrooms - in every way possible to obtain enough people to man the jobs in the construction phase, in the design stage. I should mention among those who are working with us toward this end, the labour unions and the Alberta Building Trades Council. So certainly a great deal of effort, planning and work is being done.

DR. BOUVIER:

A supplementary. In answer to my supplementary of that day, the minister said he would check into the proposal that had been submitted from the AEC, Lac La Biche, and he would give me an answer later.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, my response has to be the same and it's a fair and reasonable one. It's simply this: we are getting many separate and different recommendations and proposals. My response then and now has to be that we have to look at the scope and intent of all the proposals and develop an approach that is consistent with the facts of distance, time, cost of housing and so on that have to do with this particular project.

So it isn't going to be one particular project of one particular group that will embody the answers to the very complex and difficult problems at Fort McMurray. It will be a composite of many proposals and parts of several that will ultimately attempt to resolve the problems, and they won't all be resolved, at least in the initial stages.

DR. BOUVIER:

One supplementary then. Do I gather from the answer that no action has been taken on the resolution that was passed - which was of course emasculated to make it very general - the resolution about commuting and the feasibility of the same that was passed at the fall session last year?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, if hours and hours of work on that proposal and other proposals throughout the week and on Saturdays and Sundays is emasculation, then the member can put his own interpretation on what happens to proposals properly prepared and presented to this government.

We have given them and will continue to give two proposals, not one proposal, but two from that community, with respect to the use of people indigenous to the Fort McMurray area. That is the position of the government with respect to those and every other proposal.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Utilities Systems - Repurchasing

MR. ZANDER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities. Mr. Speaker, there has been an ongoing concern about the smaller villages and towns wishing to buy back their utilities and join the farm co-ops that are developing now. Is it possible to do so now or in the future?

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, my impression is that the ultimate authority for granting a franchise is the incorporated urban municipality itself and that it has the right to purchase a utility system from a supplier and to alter the franchise privilege.

I believe there is also provision in the Act for the Public Utilities Board to adjudicate on a price if they cannot reach agreement. I can think of several precedents. The town of Camrose recently bought its water supply from Calgary

Power. There is an old tangled case in the town of Vulcan where the franchise was changed from one gas distributor to another.

If a check of the law, Mr. Speaker, provides information that my impression may be wrong, I'll amplify on Monday.

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly if the further answer requires a check of the law, the hon. member might make that examination himself.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, could I place a supplementary question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer for clarification. Would municipalities seeking to buy back utilities be able to borrow money from the Municipal Financing Corporation?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member, I think he possibly is not aware of the fact that in order to treat all municipalities fairly, the administration of the funds available under AMFC are done on a per capita basis, which incidentally was increased a few months ago from \$50 to \$60 per capita.

This is so that we do not treat differently a municipality which happens to have a utility it wishes to own from one which chooses, through its local decision-making process, to not have and to have it privately. To do otherwise would be to be unfair to some municipalities.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Drilling Incentive System

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals concerning the proposed petroleum or oil incentive plan.

Could the hon. minister advise the Assembly what target has been established in making plans for the incentive scheme, as to the surplus revenue which should be ploughed back by the oil industry into further exploration in the province?

MR. DICKIF:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is referring to our drilling incentive system. We haven't set a target as to the amount of revenue involved. We can announce, however, that a committee of our department has been set up to review with representatives of industry the various proposals that might be beneficial in a drilling incentive system. It may be that after completion of the review, a decision can be reached so that we will have some idea of the figures involved.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has the government established a preliminary target for negotiation with the industry?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, no preliminary target has been set.

MR. HENDFPSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister could advise the House as to whether he is also re-examining the negative effects of the federal government's recent oil policies on the government incentive program?

MR. DICKIE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, those are continually under review.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Parole System

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Solicitor General. Does the National Parole Board parole prisoners from Alberta's correctional institutions?

MISS HUNLEY:

I can't answer that question at the moment, Mr. Speaker. I believe they do. But because of my lack of experience in the department I just simply can't answer it. I can find out and let the hon. member know.

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you very much. I wonder if the minister or the Attorney General could also, at the same time, advise the House if the provincial department has any input with the National Parole Board prior to them granting parole?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps it would help if I gave answers to those questions because those areas have been my responsibility up until just recently.

The answer to the first question is yes, the National Parole Board does grant parole to persons within the provincial institutions. Regarding the second question - whether there is any liaison of information between the provincial and federal authorities - again the answer is yes. In fact, as I recall it, the parole board does rely to a great extent on information gathered by provincial personnel in determining whether and when parole should be granted.

MR. TAYLOR:

One further supplementary then to the hon. Attorney General. Has the government given any consideration to having an Alberta parole board?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, we had and, in fact, have made representations to the federal government urging that the question of parole for those persons within provincial institutions be turned over to the provincial government. A federal body went across Canada and I understand gathered information in that area from a number of the provinces.

Perhaps the hon. Solicitor General can add to this, but it is my memory that this is one item which may be discussed in future meetings between the Solicitor General of Canada and the Solicitor General or Attorneys General of the provinces.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Senior Citizens

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Premier. Is it the intention of the Premier to appoint a minister in charge of a department of senior citizens?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, no it's not.

We have reached the conclusion that as far as we're concerned there is a wide variety of activities involving the senior citizens of the province. As hon. members are aware, the matter of increased support and involvement of the senior citizens has been one of the priorities of our administration. But it cuts across most departmental lines and we think that for that reason our cabinet committee structure gives the appropriate coordination. We think that the record, the number of items we have been involved with in terms of supporting senior citizens - whether it be housing or Medicare or educational

property taxation or involvement in recreation or involvement in the history of the province - lends itself better to an organization that is across-the-board, one in which all members of the Executive Council are concerned with senior citizens.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. Premier advise which minister should be contacted as the senior citizens' advocate?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, if it's not within a particular specific concern of a department, I'd be quite happy to receive the request directly. It's important in our view that the senior citizens in this province as much as possible be more involved, be a part of the mainstream of life in Alberta and not segregated.

I think particularly what I'm interested in is seeing if we can do a great deal more in these historical societies throughout the province. I've been privileged to visit a few of them where they really feel still an important part of the community and the society of Alberta. So if the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, has a specific concern, or if one of his constituents does, and it doesn't fall clearly within the responsibility of a particular ministry, I'd welcome the communication directly.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Government Departments

MR. HENDERSON:

Related to that, in light of the Premier's statements, is the government considering phasing out the department of youth, a department that wouldn't be substantially missed?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is likely to remember from about six years ago some remarks I made. On reflection, I think we've found that the merging together of youth, culture and recreation - particularly in view of the splendid, energetic and enthusiastic minister - at this stage is working very well.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Legislature Building Environs

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Public Works. Are any of the extensive land holdings of the government north of the Legislature Buildings slated to be landscaped and perhaps turned into park areas?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, the details of this program are not as yet finalized, but I think I could say that any programs we are considering can lend themselves more to aesthetic disposition of the area rather than purely material and office space.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, are the architectural designs and plans in progress at the present time for the underground parking structure for the area north of the Legislature Buildings?

DR. BACKUS:

Well, as I already said, Mr. Speaker, the plans are not finalized. They are not even fully developed in the conceptual phase, therefore it would be

premature for me to make any statement on the detail of parking structure of anything else.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary to the minister. Has an architectural firm been engaged to do the design, or is this going to be a DPW design?

DR. BACKUS:

An architectural firm has not as yet been engaged. There is a possibility that, in fact, the total development might be put out for a competitive type of design for Alberta architects generally.

MR. LUDWIG:

One more supplementary. Have architects been retained to proceed with designs for any of the projects intended for the area north of the Legislature Buildings?

DR. BACKUS:

Not as yet, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, in view of it being near the Department of Agriculture is there any chance that the minister consider a farmers' market in that area?

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, could I just make a very, very brief explanation before I ask a supplementary?

Some years ago the chief bridge engineer of the province submitted a very excellent plan of building right over 97 Avenue and beautifying the front of the building and providing parking. Has the hon. minister seen that plan?

DR. BACKUS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I've seen all the plans that have come forward and certainly more than one has been brought forward since the whole idea of developing this area first came up.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Oil Import - - - Statistics

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, just before the question period ends, I'd like to correct an error I made in presenting statistics on petroleum distillates imported into Canada during 1972. The statistics should read: the average imports for 1972 into Canada of gasolines, heating oils, aviation fuels and fuel stocks were 141,000 barrels per day - I inadvertently said per "month".

Lethbridge Sewage Plant

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to reply to some questions which were asked of me by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West several days ago. He asked me if I had received any complaints in regard to the operation of the Lethbridge sewage plant and I indicated that I would look into the matter. I haven't received any.

Then he asked me what we were going to do in terms of bringing the plant effluent up to a safe standard, and I would just like to read the reply from the department in terms of this matter.

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly the hon. minister could table the material he's about to read.

MR. YURKO:

I can.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

MR. ANDERSON:

... [Inaudible] ... for Taber-Warner. I've never asked that question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican followed by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

Pollution Control - Motor Vehicles

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. It's a follow-up from the announcement he made in the House the other day that 80 per cent of the pollution in Calgary is caused by motor vehicles. I was wondering if the minister, or his department, is doing any research on the problem arising from unnecessary stops at stop lights? In other words, are you doing any research on having cities computerize their traffic lights which they claim is going to be the greatest thing to cut down on pollution?

MR. YURKO:

One of the things we are doing, Mr. Speaker, is setting up a model study of each of our two major cities in terms of the manner in which pollutants are released, where they are, tonnages and so forth. This model study will show up the reasons for intensive pollution releases.

I might also say I was asked if there were a contingency plan in terms of what we would do if the automobile levels got very high. I indicated at that time that we didn't have any contingency plan, but that didn't mean to suggest that we weren't working on contingency plans - we are.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking followed by the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray.

Pollution Control - Rapid Transit

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of the Environment. In view of the high percentage of pollution in Edmonton and Calgary caused by automobiles, is the government planning any action which would act as an incentive to these cities to construct rapid transit systems?

MR. YURKO:

I think I indicated earlier, Mr. Speaker, that we are seriously examining a policy permitting using natural gas or propane in the municipal buses. But this policy hasn't been passed as yet or considered by the cabinet, but it will be shortly.

However, in terms of rapid transit, we haven't taken any definitive steps in this regard from the point of view of pollution control.

MR. DRAIN:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Is not diesel fuel far more amenable to less pollution than gasoline? If that is so, is he considering emphasizing the use of diesel motors?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the cleanest fuel which we can use in buses is natural gas and the next one is propane.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray.

GCOS

DR. BOUVIER:

Yes, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Mines and Minerals. I am wondering if the minister could advise the House whether the Alberta Energy Resources Conservation Board has reached a decision on the Great Canadian Oil Sands application to increase its production from 45,000 to 65,000 barrels a day?

MR. DICKIE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the report has been issued on that.

DR. BOUVIER:

Supplementary, could he advise the House what the answer was then?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, they have approved an additional barrel production from 45,000 barrels a day to 65,000 barrels a day.

DR. BOUVIER:

Supplementary, to the minister. Are negotiations presently under way with GCOS reviewing their royalty agreements with the government?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, when we first started discussions on the question of the Syncrude royalty, we did have discussions with representatives of industry on the question of the principle involved in the royalty. During those discussions representatives of GCOS were there. We advised them at the time of the decision for the Syncrude royalty that we couldn't make that information available to them until it became public. It then became public when we tabled it in the Legislature on October 10. We haven't had a meeting with representatives of GCOS since that time.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question. Can the minister advise the House whether any steps have been taken to monitor the pricing policies of GCOS on an on-going basis?

MR. DICKIE:

I am not sure exactly what the hon. member is referring to. If he was referring to the sale of the price of crude oil, the hon. Provincial Treasurer and I had some meetings with them dealing with the question of how the price of the crude oil was determined. I believe that the hon. Provincial Treasurer compiled certain information in this Legislature dealing with that.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, just to supplement my colleague's answer, the Provincial Auditor did an examination for us. His responsibilities to the Legislature and to each member make him an excellent person to examine that question raised by the hon. member. That was done and he reported back to us and we were satisfied that the sale of GCOS products was relative to the agreement which had been made with the province at that time.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the concern expressed in some quarters at the university about the pricing policies, would the Provincial Treasurer be prepared to table that report in the Legislature so that it can be made public?

MR. MINIELY:

It really, Mr. Speaker, is not a report. I think that I could certainly give consideration to the fact. The report is in the form of a letter from the

Provincial Auditor to myself and to the Minister of Mines and Minerals. I think that I could certainly consider that.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question ...

MR. SPEAKER:

The time for the question period has elapsed. We are about a minute over. Perhaps the supplementary might be asked on another occasion.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Human Rights Commission

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the appointment of the members to the Alberta Human Rights Commission.

The function of the commission, authorized under The Individual's Rights Protections Act, is first, to forward the principle that every person is equal in dignity and rights without regard to race, religious beliefs, colour, sex, age, ancestry or place of origin.

Second, to promote an understanding of, acceptance of and compliance with this Act.

Third, to research, develop and conduct educational programs designed to eliminate discriminatory practices related to race, religious beliefs, colour, sex, age, ancestry or place of origin.

And fourth, to encourage and coordinate both public and private human rights programs and activities.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we have been able to secure the support of an outstanding Human Rights Commission made up of seven outstanding Albertans who give a broad representation from all walks of life in the province.

I am pleased to announce the appointment of Dr. Max Wyman, the President of the University of Alberta, as Chairman of the Alberta Human Rights Commission and the following persons as members: Mr. Vince Cooney of Calgary, Mrs. Jean Forest of Edmonton, Mr. Marvin Fox of Cardston, Muriel Venne of Edmonton, Mrs. Connie Osterman of Carstairs and Mrs. Nomi Whalen of Calgary. I note with interest that the females outnumber the males on the commission, Mr. Speaker, by four to three.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Wyman, currently a member of the Kirby Commission investigating the lower courts system in Alberta, will assume the chairmanship of the commission on July 1, 1974, at which date he retires as President of the University of Alberta. In the interim an acting chairman will be appointed from among the other six members.

Mr. Vince Cooney, a former judge of the Court of Canadian Citizenship for Southern Alberta, is currently practising law in the City of Calgary. Mr. Cooney has been involved in arbitration and conciliatory matters for the provincial Board of Industrial Relations, and I think he brings particularly important background to the commission.

Mrs. Jean Forest is a trustee of the Edmonton Separate School Board and Deputy Chairman of the board; a director of the Alberta Catholic School Trustees Association; a member of the Board of Administrators of Newman Theological College; a member of the Board of Governors at the University of Alberta and a member of the Senate. A very distinguished Edmonton citizen.

Mr. Marvin Fox of Cardston is a Director of the Kainai Community Services; President of the Indian News Media; Chairman of the Old Sun Campus - Lethbridge Community College Advisory Board on Native American Studies; and Acting Chairman of the Provincial Native Action Committee on Alcohol and Drug Abuse.

Muriel Venne is currently with the Metis Association of Alberta, involved in job placement, employment opportunities, counselling, human and social relations, equality of women and Native education. Ms. Venne was instrumental in the development of the Outreach Project and her present position includes coordination of this project in Fort McMurray, Lac La Biche, Grande Prairie and High Level.

Mrs. Connie Osterman chaired a committee for over seven years in which she spearheaded the need for changes in The Surface Rights Act. Mrs. Osterman is involved in community work in the Carstairs area, a member of the local school board in the County of Mountain View and a member of the educational committee for the county with respect to the Educational Opportunities Fund. Her husband is farming in the area.

Mrs. [Nomi] Whalen, a former school teacher, administers The Art Pouse in Calgary, a school and studio facility in the Victoria Park area. Mrs. Whalen is also involved on a part-time basis, as a therapist at the medical school out-patient clinic.

Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of the government to hold an organization committee with the members of the Human Rights Commission to get them launched on a date, December 10, 1973, which is the 25th anniversary of the Declaration of Human Rights by the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we are indeed very fortunate, and I think it speaks well for the society of Alberta, in being able to secure for this commission such an outstanding group of Albertans who come from a broad spectrum of society. I'm sure that all hon. members will want to join me in wishing them well in their important responsibilities.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House certainly welcome the announcement made by the Premier today in filling the Alberta Human Rights Commission.

I would be less than fair if I didn't say that we feel that the appointment of the Alberta Human Rights Commission is long overdue. But having said that let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I believe on this occasion the government has made a number of very excellent choices. It's my privilege to know a number of the people involved. On occasions I have been very critical of government appointments, but on this particular occasion might I say that as far as the Chairman is concerned and the people on this committee I believe the government has made excellent choices.

After having said that, Mr. Speaker, might I say it's my sincere hope that one of the very highest priorities the government and the Alberta Human Rights Commission will have in dealing with this whole area is some emphasis on the problem of equal pay for equal work, which has been lingering on the Human Rights Commission desk and the administrator's desk for some time. I sincerely hope that will receive very high priority.

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

2. The hon. Premier proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Dr. Backus:

Be it resolved that, the hon. Premier report to the Assembly respecting the operations of government during the period of the adjournment of the Assembly to the 10th day of October, 1973, and that said report be received and concurred in.

MR. MCCRAE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a privilege and a pleasure for me to address the Assembly on this motion today.

Let me first, Mr. Speaker, thank all the members of the House for their enthusiastic welcome on my arrival here. It is my hope, but not my expectation, that it will be as enthusiastic each time I rise to speak. It really makes me feel very humble indeed.

Let me caution the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that my very short remarks the other night on closing debate on this motion should not be construed as

precedent-setting. I expect that in due course I will follow the logic of the many members on the other side in being brief and concise in my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, might I offer my congratulations to the new Solicitor General. I'm sure she is a woman of great integrity and great enthusiasm and will do a tremendous job in her new position.

Traditionally a new member's first speech is in response, Mr. Speaker, to a throne or budget address. In this case there is no throne or budget address, but with the permission of the Assembly I will stray from the motion under discussion and make some general references to matters of my constituency, then come back to the energy matter under discussion and conclude my remarks on constituency matters during the third session of the Seventeenth Legislature in February.

It is a privilege and pleasure for me to be here today as the elected representative of Calgary Foothills, although my pleasure is tempered severely by the loss of a good friend of yours and mine, the late Hon. Len Werry. Len was a friend of all Alberta and a devoted servant of this House. It was my privilege to know him and to work with him. I know there was no member of this House more devoted to the advancement of the interests and causes of the less fortunate and the disadvantaged. He was a real credit to this House. It was a sad loss.

Mr. Speaker, the Foothills constituency that I have the honour to serve is a typical cross section of southern urban Alberta. It is growing community of approximately 20,000 voters with the oldest homes in the area being 10 to 20 years of age and the newest still abuilding.

It is nestled in the northwest section of Calgary and abuts Nose Hill. It houses the University of Calgary and anticipates housing more elementary schools in accordance with the enlightened policies of this government.

Foothills is made up of the several communities of Capital Hill, St. Andrew's, University Heights, the various varsity properties, Silver Springs, Dalhousie, Brentwood, Collingwood and Foothills Estates.

Mr. Speaker, what I hear from my constituents is that they are, by and large, happy with their government and applaud the vigour, the dedication and the direction our Premier and his government are taking. Occasionally there are aspects of our policy decisions which concern them, but they are happy that the government listens, evaluates on the merits and responds.

An example of this was the government freeze or holding policy on new school construction, pending review and evaluation of trends and occupancy levels. Our people are concerned that there be spending priorities in government and applaud the government's efforts to put a stop to the continuation of the old style brick and mortar permanent type of school construction that is excessively costly and very often is outmoded and unused long before the mortgage is paid.

Our communities of Dalhousie, Silver Springs and part of the varsity area are new communities and lack any or sufficient schools to house the children of elementary school age. A school in a new community is something we have come to accept as a social necessity and a right. Although the arguments flow back and forth as to whether or not busing has any harmful side effects on school children, the facts are, at this point in time busing seems to be socially unacceptable, at least insofar as elementary children are concerned.

I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, to go into the merits of the argument, but I do applaud the statement of the hon. Minister of Education, given in this House on Tuesday, October 16, as to the relaxation of the school building freeze to permit selective construction of elementary schools of the new modular design. I am also assured that the relaxation of the policy in this area should be of some considerable comfort to the Calgary school board. We are looking forward with anticipation to a recommendation by the school board for a new school or new schools in our constituency, as may be required.

Mr. Speaker, the University of Calgary is situated in our community. It is an institution that all Calgary and, indeed, all Alberta is proud of. It has had tremendous growth in but a few short years and has striven for excellence, rather than sheer size. It has had its frustrations. It is concerned not only with growth but with autonomy; and while we recognize that our educational institutions must be responsible ultimately to the taxpayer, within that constraint they need and require the understanding of the government in their concern for independence. It is encouraging that the minister is so aware of this sensitivity. It is also encouraging and satisfying that we have the

minister's assurance that a new school of law will be established at the University of Calgary in the near future. The school can meet the needs of all Calgary and, indeed, all of southern Alberta.

In this connection I found it very satisfying to listen to the Member for Calgary Mountain View the other night in response to a question concerning the law school, when he conceded that it was not a political question. I certainly agree with that contention and I'm sure that in the next paid issue of The North Hill News, when the member reports from the Legislature, he will give due consideration to the government and the Conservative MLAs for participating in the exercise which will eventually give us a law school.

Our university, being new, needs continuous growth. I am confident our Minister of Advanced Education will continue the consultative process and the dialogue he has entered into with the university officers in an effort to allay their concerns and satisfy their aspirations, within the priorities of our provincial budget.

Mr. Speaker, the constituency I represent is populated by young married couples with growing families. In common with all of society we have increasing leisure time - time to spend with our families in enjoying the outdoors and the many out-of-door activities possible in this wonderful province of ours; camping, hiking, skiing, hunting, fishing - a great variety of activities. Faced with the ever-increasing demand on the facilities available, because of population growth and increased leisure time, we applaud the commitment by the Minister of Lands and Forests to triple the financial spending on new parks and upgrade existing park facilities over the next three years - such action to be taken, where appropriate, in conjunction with the private sector.

We are also awaiting with eagerness the final report of the commission conducting the Eastern Slopes Hearings, recognizing that there must be a balance between those who would completely conserve and those who would totally commercially exploit our forest areas.

Many of our constituents and indeed many Calgarians in general and southern Albertans are concerned this year with the scarcity of pheasant in southern Alberta. While we recognize that no blame attaches to the government for this situation, we are concerned that corrective or remedial measures be undertaken so that this valuable recreational resource, and indeed tourist resource, be substantially improved.

We applaud the efforts undertaken by the minister through his "Buck for Wildlife" program to improve an increased habitat production for this game. We are concerned, however, that the moneys collected through this effort may not be sufficient to reverse the decline in bird population. We trust that the Minister of Lands and Forests, together with the Minister of Tourism, and with the cooperation of the Provincial Treasurer, will find sufficient funds in the provincial budget to cause massive infusion of dollars into this area so that we might anticipate habitat improvement and construction of hatcheries for birds. We would also like to see the cooperation of the various local fish and wildlife societies in these programs. We are aware of the minister's commitment and his department's commitment in this area and look forward to improvements.

We are very pleased in Calgary with the action taken by the province to create and establish a park near Calgary known as Fish Creek. We think it is a tremendous thing for all Calgary. On the north hill we have Nose Hill, which abuts my constituency. We think it will become a park through the auspices of the City of Calgary. We hope and trust that if the city runs into problems, the province will come to its assistance through legislation, at least.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words today on the Syncrude question. While it is not my intention to speak at great length or to belabour the points that have been so well expressed by previous speakers, I would like to address myself to several aspects of the question.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of reasons why Syncrude should go ahead at this time, not the least of which is the need for technological advance in ... tar sands techniques. It is axiomatic and a matter of record that the GCOS plant has consistently lost large sums of money at its plant. It is imperative that a further plant or plants be proceeded with in order that some of the risks may be reduced through experience. As the Premier indicated in his remarks tabled earlier in this session, we presently appear to have about a five year lead time over the development of the Colorado oil shales. But if we are to maintain or increase our advantage, we must assure that further developments take place at this time.

I think the recent and tragic events in the Middle East adequately demonstrate the instability of energy supplies from that area and a very compelling need why we should be straining every resource at this time to assure a secure North American supply of energy that may be available, not only in this area and the years to come, but may also be available if the pipeline extension occurs down east to serve the area east of the Ottawa Valley.

I think anyone who has looked at the decline curves with regard to production in Alberta at this time must be seriously concerned about how much energy or oil and gas will be available in ten or twelve years unless the decline curve is reversed.

In spite of very successful drilling incentive programs initiated by our government last year, oil discoveries have failed to offset production. So if present discovery trends continue, our Alberta conventional production will soon peak and decline, and unless we develop alternate supply sources, we here in Alberta may well experience an energy crisis as elsewhere in North America.

Syncrude is the opportunity to reverse this trend and not only to develop valuable reserves, but also to gain valuable technological experience in the recovery of synthetic crude.

Mr. Speaker, others have adverted to the critical energy shortage in the United States, and the fact that they will in all probability be expending billions of dollars in an alternative search for energy sources, be they from the Colorado oil shales, coal gasification or nuclear energy. I think we can all concede the very great expertise they have down there and that they do have the ability to find alternate sources if they set their minds to it. I think that unless we show willingness to proceed with the development of this resource at this time, time will pass us by so that our tar sands will be of nothing more than historic interest in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I've heard and read references to the Syncrude project being a corporate rip-off, a sell-out to foreign corporations. In Alberta today we are producing approximately 1.6 million barrels of oil per day. The maximum throughput of the Syncrude plant is projected to be 125,000 barrels per day in approximately 7 years, at a cost of \$1 billion.

Those who would suggest that the province should develop this resource by way of a Crown corporation might reflect on the many, many billions of dollars that would be required to match present crude deliveries, let alone increase them for future needs. And then consider the very high risks involved with no assurance of profit before suggesting that the people of Alberta or Canada should finance this type of resource development through taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the option we have of taking a 50 per cent net royalty profit, or 7.5 per cent gross royalty profit, and the option of the Alberta Energy Corporation to elect to participate somewhere between 5 and 20 per cent in a working interest in the plant, such option being exercised after the plant is in operation and its viability known, is a tremendous opportunity for Alberta.

The Premier and his energy committee deserve the full support of all Albertans for their very successful negotiations. I feel confident that they have secured for us the maximum advantage available to us at this time.

To paraphrase the hon. Member for Cypress who spoke several days back of making decisions now which may in hindsight appear to have lent themselves to different decisions later - the time for the Syncrude decision is now, and to push for further advantage at this time may well have jeopardized the whole scheme and cost Albertans dearly.

The tar sands resource is of vast and real extent. The Syncrude project, Mr. Speaker, covers only a very small part of that area. There will be ample opportunity for future analysis of the terms of future schemes. The important thing is that Syncrude go now.

I was surprised to read several days back in a report from The Edmonton Journal, dated October 23, in remarks attributed to the Leader of the Alberta Social Credit party that he was critical of our government's inroads into the business world through such vehicles as the Alberta Energy Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I'm really surprised to learn that the Leader of the Official Opposition objects to the corporation concept. I wonder, what does he oppose in AEC? Surely not the idea of giving Albertans and Canadians the opportunity of participating through investment in the development of our resources.

One of the six guidelines expressed by their house leader was in the development of the tar sands. His condition was, namely, that there be an opportunity for Albertans and Canadians to invest in this project.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Alberta Energy Corporation is the vehicle chosen by this government as a means of giving Albertans the opportunity to participate in the development, between 5 to 20 per cent in Syncrude, 80 per cent in the pipeline and 50 per cent in the utility plant.

Surely the suggestion is not that the AEC shouldn't participate in any of this undertaking. Is it the Suffield evaluation that is causing him discomfort? Surely he is aware of the special circumstances pertaining to this area - the drainage of gas through wells on the perimeter of the Suffield reserve, and the fact that the surface is presently under federal jurisdiction, circumstances that have motivated this government to carry out an evaluation drilling program, while continuing efforts to have the surface returned to the province. Is he seriously concerned that this evaluation drilling carried out under these circumstances, drilling which will tremendously enhance the value of these lands when they are turned over to the AEC, is an unnecessary incursion into the business world? Surely not, when we have the statement of the minister that the AEC will be entering into an arrangement with private enterprise to have the Suffield natural gas block developed and marketed, once evaluated.

Surely after the apparently successful Alberta Gas Trunk experiment, all hon. members of this House must applaud the efforts of the government to give Albertans the opportunity of investing in the development of their resources.

Mr. Speaker, I read in the morning press where Mr. Douglas, the energy critic for the NDP in Ottawa, had called for the creation of a federal-provincial Crown corporation to develop the Alberta tar sands.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, it would be a tragic and sorry mistake to expend taxpayer money in an attempted exploitation of this resource. It is an extremely high-risk area. The GCOS experience must certainly satisfy us on this point.

Government can assist in this area through tax incentives for research work done, in collaborating with and coordinating in research, and generally, in establishing good business conditions that will encourage investment. But the risk itself must and should be left to the private sector. The resource owner may have a presence in the development of various projects as an alternative to royalty deriving from its position as the owner of the resource. But beyond that, in my estimation, Mr. Speaker, the government should retain its traditional role of governing and, subject to the necessary controls, leave the business world to business people.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to speak at great length on the regrettable actions of the federal government in imposing a 40 per cent export tax on oil and the price freeze on domestic sales of gasoline and heating oil. That lamentable action has been eloquently reviewed by other speakers in this Assembly. Suffice it to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier has our complete confidence and support in his efforts to redress this situation.

I would like, however, to say a few words on the need for an early resolution of the new provincial royalty rate and the new drilling incentive program to be offered to the industry. The industry has been under a cloud for several years now, during the years leading up to the adoption of the present federal tax act and also during the continuing parliamentary discussion on foreign investment, and more recently the federal actions in imposing the tax and imposing the price freeze.

Industry means jobs to all Albertans. Directly or indirectly, one out of three jobs in Alberta is attributable to the petroleum industry and it is important to the province's continued prosperity that we assure them, the industry, of the terms and conditions under which they may continue to operate, at an early date and with long-term stability. It is imperative, Mr. Speaker, that these terms and conditions recognize the very high-risk nature of this business and the sensitivity of capital to political uncertainty.

Mr. Speaker, we are vitally concerned in this province with the creation of new jobs and the attraction of new industry. We must be even more concerned with providing an environment that will assure the continuance of the jobs and the industry we now have.

Mr. Speaker, I and my constituents have every confidence in the wisdom of this government and this Assembly, and look forward to seeing all Albertans

enjoying the promise of this great land through the combined efforts of government and business consulting and working together in harmony.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Applause]

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in Government resolution no. 2, I would like to start off by congratulating the hon. Member for Calgary Foothills on his maiden speech in the Legislature. I would say his speech has indicated that he is off to a good start. We look forward to more of his participation and input in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in listening to the hon. Premier when he started this debate, I would have to say that the government accomplishments were very, very well covered. However, Mr. Speaker, I think that perhaps the government mistakes weren't covered quite as well.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Covered up.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps the government accomplishments have been covered completely adequately in many areas and many of the government mistakes have been covered. And not wanting to be repetitious, I would say that the energy and economics and things of that nature have been well covered.

But I would like to dwell for a few minutes on the human factor. Mr. Speaker, I have a constituent who is in her seventh year of employment with the provincial government. However, on seniority she only gets credit for three years. It will take her 11 years to reach the top salary in her department. Another employee, with the same classification, who has been there ten years, gets ten years credit. A new employee, hired today, will be on full salary in seven years. And men doing the same work get more pay.

Mr. Speaker, to me that does not seem right. That seems to be discriminatory and certainly a dangerous precedent in the Alberta civil service. Mr. Speaker, that is one example where I think the government should be taking a more active role in assuring fair play for all.

Another area I am concerned about, Mr. Speaker, is the area of senior citizens. We all know that inflation hurts most those who are on fixed incomes, and the senior citizens, by and large, come into this category. Mr. Speaker, we have ministerial attention and ministerial responsibility for almost all other categories of residents in Alberta. The senior citizens' interests are covered pretty well in all government departments but the coordination of same leaves something to be desired.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that to the public at least, there is considerable confusion as to who is responsible in this government for matters concerning senior citizens. Perhaps the government should name one minister who is at least the senior citizens' advocate.

Mr. Speaker, we would like to be assured that senior citizens have an opportunity to capitalize on all joint provincial-federal or provincial-municipal projects involving senior citizens. We would like to be assured that senior citizens who wish to become more involved have an opportunity to participate in planning their leisure time, planning their housing, planning their involvement, and actually taking a greater role in their involvement in an advisory capacity to the government. As I recall, this was a campaign promise of the government.

Also, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me there is an opportunity for some meaningful input from senior citizens in the area of food costs and consumer affairs.

Mr. Speaker, another example where I feel that a senior citizens' advocate on the front bench of the government would be helpful - last August when we heard the Minister of Agriculture announcing free dental care and free optical care. That is fine. The Minister of Consumer Affairs, as did some other ministers, made similar announcements. But the senior citizen was not informed as to what was done between the date of the announcement and the time he could

take advantage of the project and be reimbursed for it. And so the senior citizen finds that he is carrying out the interim financing on these programs until next year.

Also, Mr. Speaker, when we hear bodies like the Alberta Medical Association saying, and I quote: "Care for the elderly needs drastic change", we need to look a little more closely at this situation.

When it comes to establishment of senior citizens' lodges and senior citizens' recreation projects that involve government funding there needs to be, I would think, a little more care in establishing priorities and the nature of such developments.

Mr. Speaker, another aspect of the human factor that I want to mention is the Gateways Project in Calgary. Mr. Speaker, this is a project that served five city of Calgary high schools - primarily in low income areas - with a professional staff of three plus dozens of volunteers from the private sector, plus support from the two school boards, plus support from over 100 city of Calgary businesses. It had been in operation since May, 1970. The prime function was the training for and finding of jobs for high school dropouts. The first criteria was to try to encourage the high school dropouts to return to school. If that did not seem to be the answer, then it was to train them to win within the system in the business of finding jobs.

The volunteers and the three professional people in this program, Mr. Speaker, would operate right out of the schools. In many instances they would have small offices in the schools so that the school social workers could refer students who were dropping out of the high school right to the Gateways Project people. They would hold pre-vocational sessions with the high school dropouts, sometimes in the schools, sometimes in other public buildings within the community, sometimes in restaurants. They would have meetings where they would invite the high school dropouts to work in groups as well as individually to train them how to fill out application forms. They would have volunteers come from the business sector, personnel officers, to tell them what to expect when they go looking for jobs, to tell them how to go for jobs, how to put their best foot forward.

Mr. Speaker, since May, 1970, nearly 1,000 high school dropouts have been counselled in this manner. Many went out and found their own jobs. But the Gateways Project placed 350 of those students in meaningful and gainful employment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my consternation and concern enters into the picture when this government cut off the funding of this project in June of this year.

MR. DIXON:

May.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, under the heading of the human factor, that certainly disturbs me considerably because there was close cooperation and a working arrangement between the schools, between the business community. Between all involved there has been no criticism of the project. Nobody has said that it was no good. Nobody has said that it wasn't doing a tremendous job. And it is a job that isn't being duplicated by any other service or facility in the city of Calgary. So this was a project that was endorsed by the City of Calgary. It received praise from every angle ...

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member should take back that it was endorsed by the City of Calgary because ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. The hon. minister may rebut if he hasn't already spoken, when his time to speak comes.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the government intentions were in cutting off the funding of this project. If they plan to replace it with a bureaucracy I would suggest, in all sincerity, that there is no way the services could be duplicated by a government, by any government. When you get the private sector

involved, when you get over 100 businesses in the City of Calgary, plus dozens of other volunteers working on a project, who don't want to be associated with failure and who donate their time and their money to create jobs and find employment for these people, there's no way the services could be duplicated by governments at any price.

Mr. Speaker, this Gateways Project was lost to the City of Calgary either through a deliberate torpedoing of the program, through bungling, or through some other reason which isn't readily apparent. Many people in the schools where the service was offered, Mr. Speaker, are appalled at the loss of the service. Now the school social workers who are counselling high school dropouts have no place to refer them to, in order to get the service that the Gateways Project offered.

There are many who are appalled at the callousness shown toward the disadvantaged individuals who are getting services through the Gateways Project. There are many who are appalled, Mr. Speaker, at the resulting waste of manpower that could be put to work if they had the opportunity of being trained as the Gateways Project offered. And, Mr. Speaker, there are many who are appalled at the unnecessary loading of the welfare rolls as a result.

Mr. Speaker, the Gateways Project was so highly thought of by members of the Calgary civic administration and council that they journeyed to Edmonton to ask members of the provincial government to reconsider the funding of the project. Mr. Speaker, I understand that even subsequent to that meeting ...

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. WILSON:

Certainly.

MR. SCHMID:

Since he names civic officials of the City of Calgary and he repeatedly states the City of Calgary, would he kindly name the people in the City of Calgary who were so interested and turned it down themselves?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sit down.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to name names of who I thought was responsible on the government side for turfing out this program or for causing the demise of the program. I didn't feel that I would get into names as to who represented the city at the meeting. But the ministers who were involved certainly know well who visited them from the City of Calgary in this regard, Mr. Speaker. I don't want to bring embarrassment to any one individual because I still have hopes, Mr. Speaker, that the government will reconsider.

You see, Mr. Speaker, I've even heard it said by some of the businessmen who were involved, and some of the businessmen who signed the telegram sent to the government asking them to reconsider, that this program had been endorsed in private conversations, even by the Premier that he had said that he thought it was a good program and that he encouraged this type of operation.

I'm not even sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier was aware that this program has been terminated, until today. But I would welcome, certainly, his comments in this regard.

I'm not here today to try to embarrass any individual in the government, Mr. Speaker; I'm here to plead with them to reconsider, because what we're talking about is a shared-cost program that could be handled under the preventive social service with all three levels of government sharing the cost.

Mr. Speaker, the amount of money that has been turned down by the provincial government was \$15,000. A \$15,000 contribution from this government would have made a budget of nearly \$50,000 available to carry on the Gateways Project in an expanded manner for the forthcoming year. It seems to me that any project with a record such as the Gateways Project should receive the support that has been asked for, and should receive the endorsement of a \$15,000 contribution to give

a \$50,000 program the clearance to go ahead once again and serve in the human factor manner.

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation wants names and so on, I'll be happy to give them to him here or privately, and dates and times. I have copies, Mr. Speaker, of some of the reports that were prepared by other people on this project and if the minister would like to have a look at those, I would certainly be happy to draw them to his attention.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the government to reconsider a gross error which I feel has occurred and I don't want necessarily to embarrass any individuals because of the error. Let's get on with the job and get the project reinstated.

DR. BOUVIER:

Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to speak this afternoon because I didn't think I'd get the opportunity. But since the opportunity has arisen and the motion has been called again, I'd like to say a few words, mainly about my constituency. I'd like to give a few thoughts about the Syncrude agreement and speak about GCOS at the same time.

The benefits to my constituency have naturally been outlined and the main ones, of course, are the benefits to the economy generally, the jobs it will provide, the development of the constituency. I feel these have been covered quite adequately already in the House and I won't dwell on them except to recognize that they are there.

However, the main concerns I want to express this afternoon are the problems which will arise as a result of the development that is going to occur in my area. I want to refer mainly to the problems that have arisen and are arising with the ordinary Joe citizen in the town of Fort McMurray.

With the boom that is developing will come high prices, high rents and lack of housing and so forth. I certainly hope - and the Minister of Consumer Affairs isn't here at the moment - but I certainly hope he will take note of these things and keep an eye on prices generally in the town of Fort McMurray. Because the tendency, of course, is for businesses to raise their prices according to the demand, restaurant meals, accommodation in hotels and this sort of thing. The ordinary citizen of Fort McMurray is really going to be up against it if these are allowed to go completely unchecked because there is a marked lack of facilities at this time. Some people are actually living in tents in Lions Park.

Then, of course, housing. Something is going to have to be done and it's going to have to be accelerated if we're to keep pace. There are projected figures already to the effect that we're probably 2,000 lots behind in the development of Fort McMurray. This is certainly going to get worse as Syncrude progresses.

Schools - well, the schools have been let out. There's been approval and we appreciate that, but as far as the high school is concerned there's no land available as yet. There are two areas now under consideration. They are both publicly-owned but are they available immediately? It's quite obvious that there's not going to be a start on the high school this year and if I'm wrong, I will correct it.

Then there are the recreational facilities of a rapidly-expanding town. Young families are certainly going to have to be considered very carefully if we're to keep pace there, because the community is isolated by distance from the major metropolitan areas of the province.

This, of course, brings me to roads. I was very happy this summer when there was an announcement that an extra 25 or 30 miles of road would be made. However, I was soon to learn that there was no cement available for this and that it would not in reality done.

Now I hope that the announcement wasn't political or that the government [didn't know] in advance that cement wasn't available. My understanding is that they should have known, in that they usually have to provide for cement much in advance when roads are being built. I just hope this was not the case, and I certainly hope that Highway No. 63 will receive the high priority it needs.

But one road that will definitely need some attention is the airport road, not because I use that one more than any other, but it used to be said in the past that if anything was in Alberta it was the responsibility of the Alberta

government and not necessarily that of the federal government. This road, this airport road, was kicked around by the previous administration and it has been no different with this new administration. It is receiving no attention. Certainly I feel that because the airport is some 11 miles away from Fort McMurray the road will need some attention. It definitely should be paved and it should be paved in the near future. If the federal government will not agree to it, then I think the minister should take the bull by the horns - I understand he is used to doing this - he should go ahead and pave it and then fight with the federal government after that has been done.

Still dealing with Fort McMurray, I think the town debt, the debt the town has been allowed to get into, will have to be looked at. I understand it is being looked at, and certainly I hope that something will be done to alleviate the debt these people find themselves in. The development of this new town is costly. Being a new town, it is allowed to get very far into debt and unless something is done for Fort McMurray, along with the consideration being given to other new towns in Alberta, I think the future of its people is going to be very grim indeed.

Dealing with the Syncrude agreement itself, it has been difficult to get information. The Minister of Mines and Minerals has not seemed too enthused about answering question on it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Put it on the Order Paper.

DR. BOUVIER:

Well, maybe we will have to do that.

However, I had to agree up to a point with the Member for Spirit River-Fairview when he spoke about it the other day. But only up to a point, because I certainly believe in private enterprise and I don't feel that the Government of Alberta should be developing the tar sands. I do feel that it is their responsibility to set the conditions under which they are developed.

Up to the present point, Mr. Speaker, the people of Alberta have received in the order of one-third of the returns on the development of oil, this being mainly the oil coming from conventional crude. However, when GCOS came into being, negotiations were carried out by the previous administration. At that time there was nobody in the oil sands, it was a very risky venture, much more risky than Syncrude is today, and the government of the day was able to reach an agreement whereby they got pretty well the same royalties as those being paid on conventional crude. They got at that time an 8 and a 20 per cent return. Now, I don't know - maybe the present administration feels that the government of the day was gouging the oil companies, that they were actually getting too much. We will soon see how the agreement is changed with GCOS, whether the government actually feels that way, whether it feels that it will carry out these tough negotiations and decrease the royalties.

It was interesting the other night to listen to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs explain, in a very subdued manner I am not used to, all the benefits of the Syncrude agreement. It gave me the impression that maybe not every day but maybe every other day he runs into the Premier's office and asks the Premier, will you tell me again how good the agreement is? Or Premier checks with Mr. Spragins of Syncrude and asks him to say how good the agreement really is. I was a bit disturbed to see the Premier on TV telling us how tough the negotiations were but how good a deal he got for Alberta, and then to see the President of Syncrude on TV saying how tough the negotiations were and how happy he was that we were able to get such a good deal for Alberta.

Now the fringe benefits are important and I certainly don't want to downplay the benefits of the development going ahead. If the government went to the point of saying, the fringe benefits are so good that it is all right if we give the oil away, they might even carry my judgment on that because after all if I took a very narrow approach to it - it is in my constituency - I might agree that the benefits are so great that it doesn't matter if the rest of the people of Alberta get none of them. However, I do feel that the people of Alberta are entitled to a share in the tar sands development.

I can remember the past administration being criticized because in the development of Grande Cache we were getting only a 10 cent royalty on coal. At that time that was supposed to be a catastrophe and it was very important that the people of Alberta should get a fair share out of the coal in the Grande Cache area.

I feel that possibly an argument could be raised whereby we could put the oil sands in the same category, and maybe an argument could be made that we can't really expect as much return from the tar sands development as from conventional crude. I think I could go along on that up to a point. I certainly hope that in the future the Syncrude agreement won't prove to be an agreement like that with the CNR to build the ARR.

Dealing with other points in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal a bit with the community of Janvier. I remember that last year we got a report - the Premier made a trip to Janvier. The trip was made with the usual fanfare of course a lot of TV cameras and newsmen, and one has to wonder whether the interest was for the community or for the benefit of the rest of Alberta.

However, there were some benefits. I have acknowledged them before and I will acknowledge them again. The wells were certainly needed by the people but I don't feel, and I don't want to sound like I am quoting from the Bible, that people can't live on water alone.

AN HON. MEMBER:

But you have to have water.

DR. BOUVIER:

You have to have water and it is important. But if it is important to have water, then why in the world don't we put some pumps on those wells that will work, because as late as two weeks ago nobody in the community could show me one that was actually still working. The pumps are cheap and flimsy and they will not stand up. The people would like to see the types of pumps the Department of Indian Affairs has on their wells because they are standing up. They are the only ones that were working as late as about two weeks ago, unless something has been done since then.

A contractor who was working in the Janvier area last winter told me himself that luckily he had a welder with him, and he spent most of his spare time over the winter welding these pumps to try to keep them operating. But it was an impossibility and pretty soon the pumps looked like they were just a piece of welding.

However, at the time we were also told that a lunch program would be carried out for the people of Janvier, although we weren't told that it would be just carrying on a program that had been instituted before and that had worked very well. However, the lunch program is a good thing and I commend the government for carrying it on.

After two years in office and since NewStart closed down there is still no program of training being carried out in Janvier. I realize that at the present time we are starting to move the trailers and some will come. But I have to question the 'now' approach when after two years we are just starting to show some action. It looks like it's going to be some time before we can carry out any training. I know the government is going to do a lot of talking about giving them an alternative.

I presented a resolution in this House at the last session. Since there are no roads to many of the communities in my area, the only means of travel is by air. I presented a resolution that would be debated asking for a feasibility study to transport people from these outlying communities to work in the tar sands development, this being the only area in my vast constituency where jobs are available.

The debate was fairly good. When I first mentioned the idea it was well received by the government. But what happened before the resolution was passed? As I said this afternoon, it was effectively emasculated by a couple of members from the peanut gallery who stated they were going to make it better. To date I find that no action whatever has been taken on it.

The airport facilities in Janvier are very bad. Anytime you fly in there you really take your life in your hands. It's like trying to land a plane on a dime. I can vouch that it was no different a few weeks ago, after a rain trying to land on a piece of mud and water ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Use pontoons.

DR. ROUVIER:

I think that's about the only way you could do it.

However, a start has been made on clearing a new strip. It looks like a good location and it looks like it's going to be a good strip, but so far all that has been done is to get the trees cleared off. Certainly we hope and I understand the Department of Lands and Forests which is doing the work will get on with the job and get that airstrip in shape so that it can be used.

If we feel that flying is impossible, that it's going to be too costly for people from Janvier to fly to jobs in Fort McMurray, then the only alternative is to build a road so that they can get out to Fort McMurray.

I certainly have to disagree with the report that was introduced the other day, a general planning report for northeastern Alberta. You will not, this has been proven and I can cite many cases, get the people from Janvier, for instance, to move and stay in Fort McMurray. They run into social problems immediately, the family breaks up and they invariably return to their communities where they can cope with the type of life they have been used to.

The same applies to many other communities in my area. Fort Chipewyan is another one. Again they are isolated and they can't get out. Housing is important and we appreciate the fact that the government is doing something about housing, and in Fort Chipewyan, about recreation - the building of a new curling rink. This is important. But if these people had jobs they could do these things for themselves. The government wouldn't have to go in there and drill wells for them, and give them lunch at school. If they had jobs like the rest of us they could provide these things themselves. I think this is the key to the development of these communities. We have to make it possible for them to get out and get jobs. There are none in the communities. Most of these communities have no resources and very little hope of getting any jobs. Therefore, I feel this is the key. I may be wrong. If I'm wrong I wish somebody would show me where I am wrong.

It was interesting to note the Minister of Northern Affairs washing windows on his trip to Fort Chipewyan. I think everybody gets to know what job he can do best, and certainly I think if they had jobs he wouldn't have to wash their windows for them.

Although there is a road from Lac La Biche to Fort McMurray, there is lots of unemployment in Lac La Biche, especially amongst the Native population. Although there is a road, the distance is too great. Unless we get this 300 mile-an-hour train going to Lac La Biche, then flying is the answer from Lac La Biche to Fort McMurray if people want to live there.

Many of these people are on small marginal farms, farms which are really not a way of living anymore. They can't make a living on it and they have to look for jobs. They have a home on the farm and certainly they don't want to have to give up their home and move into Fort McMurray, where they have to pay more for a lot than the price of their home on their farm in Lac La Biche. It just doesn't make sense to them. If you suggest it to them they think you are really out of your tree. So flying is the only answer. I wish the government would really take it seriously.

When I first mentioned this, the Premier seemed to think it was a good idea and I was very happy. I don't know who has talked him out of it since, maybe some of his cabinet. Maybe they just haven't gotten around to thinking it's a high priority. But certainly I feel it's a high priority, and the people of my area feel it's a high priority. I hope I can impress upon the government that this is a high priority.

Now I would like to turn my attention to the Minister of Highways. One of the roads in my area, Highway No. 36, is very important. It goes through the main farming area of the community of Lac La Biche. Last year all he was able to muster was 12 miles of oiling on this road. We think he can do much better, and we would like to see him do much better. We think he could pave that road if he really made up his mind to do it. He says he can do it. He wants us to go look at the roads in the Banff-Cochrane constituency. I have seen pavement before but I would like to see it in my area, not in his.

Then I would like to see some attention paid to secondary Highway No. 663 because it also runs through the other main farming community of my area. These two roads are the two important ones as far as the farmers are concerned, and we would like to see something done. Mind you, something was done this year but it

was done at the other end; it was just out of my constituency, maybe for obvious reasons.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, as I said I wasn't really prepared to speak this afternoon, I didn't think I would get an opportunity. Although I don't usually don't like to take up the time of the House, I hope that by keeping these few comments brief there won't be too much for the government to look at and they will give them serious consideration.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray permit a question?

DR. BOUVIER:

Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Is the hon. member aware that there was a strike involving the railroads in Alberta last year?

DR. BOUVIER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of that and I'm aware that this was used as the reason for the shortage of cement. I said I hoped this was the reason. I know in some areas the government or the minister has been accused of letting out contracts after they knew there was no cement available. This was the point I was making when I said I hoped that this was not the case.

MR. LUDWIG:

I have a question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Order, order.

MR. LUDWIG:

Would the minister permit a question?

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Probably on Monday afternoon. The hon. Member for Edmonton Calder.

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to participate briefly in this debate today. I have heard all the debate on this motion with the exception of the evening of October 15, when I had to attend a meeting of the Calder Dump-the-Hump committee where we heard a progress report from the CNR. But that's another subject for another day.

However, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you I did read the Hansard for that evening very carefully. I must say that I was impressed with the logic and argument of the Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc. It is obvious that he agrees with the government and foresees quite clearly the dangers to Alberta and, indeed, to Confederation itself, as a result of the unilateral imposition by the federal government of that infamous export tax.

Having worked in the petroleum industry since the early '50s as, I believe, the Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc did also, I can recall a lot of lean years in the industry and an awful lot of dry holes. I can recall working in the field some considerable time before even seeing an oil well. By that time I felt I was becoming something of an expert in the concrete completion technique that we used to abandon wells. I remember that when I got that first discovery down in southeastern Saskatchewan I wasn't quite sure what to do with it. But in due course a Christmas tree arrived from Calgary all disassembled and I recall sitting for some hours at the end of the catwalk with a toolpusher trying to assemble this jigsaw puzzle. He told me that he had been working on rigs for years and likewise had never seen a discovery well. Finally we got it all

together and I am relieved to know that well is still pumping some 20 years later.

Furthermore, during those years it was tough to sell oil. The allowables were low. I think one had to admire the courage of the oil operator who continued to gamble and poured in dollars with little cash flow coming back to help him out. Mr. Speaker, I cannot recall at any time the federal government wanting to get in on the act. They didn't claim any share of the dry holes and neither did the state-control people. I never heard one voice crying for nationalization or for federal government participation. Now all that is changed.

Oil prices are rising and the oil companies are suddenly making good profits and central Canada wants to get in on the act. It's not good enough, in their view, that we have for many years here contributed significantly to Confederation through our equalization payments - payments that have always been calculated using the full revenues from our depleting oil and gas resources.

Here we are, the people of Alberta, for the first time, as a result of rising world crude prices, in a position to enjoy significantly-increasing revenue to the provincial treasury and they apparently want to freeze things for us and cut off this increased income which is rightfully ours. We have only two basic industries really in Alberta, agriculture and petroleum. It is only through the health, revenue and activity of these industries that we can hope to build up secondary and tertiary industry and thus develop a true diversified economy.

If there ever was a worse possible time to put an artificial clamp on oil prices, it is now. All other costs are rising sharply: the cost to drill and complete a well, the cost of lifting the oil, the labour costs - all costs are going up, including the finding costs. The easy pools, of course, have been found. The remaining one-half of our conventional reserves that are yet to be discovered are inherently more difficult to find. They are going to be located in smaller pools in scattered stratigraphic traps that are not readily located by seismic, also in the deep foothill areas where drilling costs are quite expensive. If oil prices are to follow international prices and the revenues are returned to Alberta then the incentive will be here to get out and develop these conventional reserves of oil and gas, maintain or even increase our reserve life index. If the oil export tax is maintained however, and if the price of crude is not allowed to seek a free market level, I suggest to you that the prospects for maintaining the conventional reserve index, and indeed the gas reserve index for that matter is very dim.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose that party unity and loyalty on a national scale is an admirable feature so long as it doesn't interfere with provincial priorities. It is interesting to observe when Mr. Lewis says jump, every NDP leader or hopeful across the land, in effect, appears to spring to attention and ask, how high? I am sure that if Mr. Stanfield ever got anything approaching that kind of blind devotion to national party manifesto, if there is such a thing in the Conservative party, he would be completely overwhelmed because Conservatives are, of course, individualistic and freethinkers.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Did he write your speech for you?

MR. CHAMBERS:

Yet you look at the situation in other oil provinces - Manitoba, Saskatchewan and British Columbia - provinces which will also be hurt if the federal government moves into the export tax, not as much as Alberta of course because their reserves are a lot smaller, but they will still be hurt. What do we hear from their leaders? Nothing whatsoever. The philosophy is left up to Mr. Lewis. Perhaps their very silence is a damning commentary on Mr. Lewis' predictable state-control stance.

Then we have the contribution to this debate from the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, who is not here. Mr. Lewis has spoken and the Member for Spirit River-Fairview appears to be all in favour of the oil export tax, despite the obvious harm to Alberta. He apparently wants to defer development of the tar sands, despite the obvious huge benefits that will accrue to Alberta from this development. The member also throws numbers around in an attempt to show that more money could be obtained from a gross royalty situation than through the profit-sharing agreement. I am sure, of course, that if you put a 100 per cent gross royalty on it you could get more money into the provincial treasury,

provided that you could get some company willing to participate in such an arrangement. ECOS is paying a small gross royalty and yet they are unable to turn a profit. In my view the Syncrude agreement negotiated by our government is the best possible plan for the people of Alberta. Sure, there are technological and political risks because of the federal government's attitude to crude price. This is a huge project, of course, and on a scale that has never been attempted anywhere before. Machinery will be of such a size as has never before been constructed. The workability of many of these giant components will have to be job-proven on the site.

While I am confident of the ability of Alberta engineers to overcome these challenges, I think it does make just plain common sense not to saddle the project with large front-end loads, so to speak, in terms of fixed royalty which would prove onerous to the initial development. Of course, if the project doesn't make it, then nobody gains; not the companies who will be gambling the billion dollars and certainly not the people of Alberta. I am confident, however, that the project will be successful - highly successful. The profit-sharing scheme will result in large revenue to the owners of this resource, the people of Alberta.

When you consider the Alberta Energy Company, its potential for investment by Albertans, 50 per cent of the power facility, 80 per cent of the pipeline - I think everyone here would agree that a pipeline is a sure winner - the entire package is terrific from the standpoint of the average Alberta citizen.

I must say I was quite surprised by the apparent attitude of the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray. In fact I was kind of flabbergasted to hear him say what he did. He started out by indicating that he was in favour of the project and then he proceeded throughout the speech to knock it. He talks about some kind of one-third royalty situation. He doesn't seem to realize, or maybe he hasn't looked into it - the Premier has clearly stated this before, that we are talking here about a 56 per cent profit - 56 per cent of the profits will be returned to the people of Alberta.

DR. BOUVIER:

Mr. Speaker, am I permitted a question? What is 56 per cent of nothing?

[Interjections]

MR. CHAMBERS:

I believe the economic analysis by Foster Economic. I have looked at it in considerable detail and I am convinced that it's completely valid. In fact, if anything, it's maybe on the pessimistic side because the crude prices today are probably higher than the initial prices indicated here. If anything, the profits that will accrue to the people of Alberta will be better than that which is shown in the analysis of Foster Economic.

In my view, never before has a government made such a good deal as has this government. Our Premier, the Minister of Mines and Minerals and the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs are indeed to be congratulated for their successful efforts on behalf of the people of Alberta. I suspect that the weak arguments made by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview and the Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray are due to the fact that they are both green with envy over the deal worked out by this government.

The socialist member said the other day there was no need to develop the tar sands now. What's the hurry, he said. Nuclear energy, geothermal, Colorado shales will not be competitive, either economically or technically, for many years to come. I suppose it's nice to live in a fool's paradise, but I wonder if he is really serious. Experiments with oil shales have been going on in the U.S. since World War Two. Some people feel that our lead time over the shales may be no more than four or five years, while others say the shales may be competitive with our tar sands right now.

The U.S. has large coal reserves and coal liquefaction and gasification could also become significant fairly soon. If the Americans feel we don't want their markets, they may well pour a lot of dollars into subsidizing the production of synthetic fuels. In fact they may do this in any event. I certainly don't think we should underestimate their technology. President Kennedy said in 1960 that they'd put a man on the moon by 1970 and they did. When they feel there are no longer secure sources of supplies of fossil fuel, I believe they are perfectly capable of adapting quickly to a new energy source, whether it be nuclear, solar, magnetic or perhaps some source as yet undiscovered. I think we should look at another fact, that oil is really only

gasoline and heating fuel insofar as any significant quantity use is concerned. When Americans build cars and furnaces that run on other than fossil fuels, how long do you think it will take the rest of the world to follow suit?

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that we are living in a time window, that if we don't undertake massive tar sands development now, if we don't prove-up this technology and demonstrate that we can deliver significant quantities of synthetic fuel to the world to market, then it will be too late. Indeed, then the tar sands may never be developed. After all, the tar is really only a resource that can be mined and sold, and if it can not be sold, then it really just remains a sticky substance covered by moose pasture.

Furthermore, if we follow the advice of the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, and applaud the federal government's decision to apply the export tax and thus stifle the conventional oil and gas industry in this province, we would need massive tar sands development just to meet the Canadian requirements. After all, we're now producing close to, approaching 2 million barrels a day and we're producing at capacity.

I'm confident that under a free market situation the industry will meet this challenge, the conventional oil reserve life index will be maintained but if we don't - if conventional exploration is curtailed, well, I'd like you to consider this - if we are optimistic and say there will be three tar sands plants on stream by 1982, then one per year coming on after that, each plant averages 100,000 barrels per day of output. I think simple arithmetic would show that by about the year 2000 tar sands production will only be in the order of 2 million barrels per day, or about equivalent to western Canada's conventional production. Canada may well require that much synthetic production just to supply her own needs at that time.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Spirit River-Fairview is taking a very short-sighted view of things when he suggests, don't worry about tar sands development, let it go until some distant time in the future.

The NDP member, of course, raised the old state-control question. He wants all the tar sands plants built - however many that may be - by the state, state-ownership. I suppose that from his point of view that's a reasonable enough approach. His philosophy espouses state-ownership while mine is obviously for the free enterprise system. It's been my observation that private business can always operate more efficiently than state-owned corporations, whether they be shoe factories, box factories, or even a post office. Well it really is a matter of philosophy, but does he seriously want the people of Alberta and of Canada to put up public funds to the tune of \$1 billion a plant - \$1 billion a plant at this stage of tar sands development - and assume all the vast technological and political risks? It seems that he does. However, he does agree that development will not occur on a very grand scale.

He also suggests that one of the key commodities to control in the fight against inflation is gasoline, that, of course, the export tax is in his view, a reasonable way to do this. Again I would have to ask, why not the price of lumber, minerals, and manufactured goods? Other materials have escalated in price recently much more quickly than has gasoline. I wonder if the members in this Assembly realize what a good buy gasoline really is, up to this point in time. I suggest you think back over the last 30 or 40 years and ask how much the price of gasoline has increased in that time. I could agree the increases were very small compared to the increases in almost any other commodity you could think of. I can recall as a boy, and I think I'm correct on this, that gasoline back home was about in the order of 30 cents a gallon. Today's product is a much cleaner one and has a lot more power per ounce. Of course, a big reason for this and the low price is the technological advance that has been made by an enthusiastic industry working under the free enterprise system. With the cost of every other commodity today, including labour rising rapidly, the industry must be allowed significant price increases compatible with the world market situation to invest the dollars and the technological effort that is required to find and develop the additional conventional oil reserves we have, as well as invest in tar sands.

Again, if we don't allow the price of gasoline to achieve a realistic free-market level, there will be no incentive to explore, no incentive to invest huge amounts of risk capital in tar sands. We could be in real trouble in not too many years with regard to satisfying Canadian oil and gas requirements, let alone export requirements.

I suppose one might even question philosophically, Mr. Speaker, whether or not cheap gasoline has been entirely good for North America. In Europe, where gasoline has long been more than twice as expensive as it is here, automobiles

have been developed with much smaller, more efficient engines. These, of course, consume less energy and pollute less. So philosophically you could ask if the development of the large engines has been in the public interest. I'm certainly not advocating a higher gasoline price than is absolutely necessary. I think there is some justification in North America for the big cars or the big engines because of the distances that we have to cover and the climatic conditions that we expect our automobiles to perform in.

Recognizing that the international price of crude is rising sharply and will continue to rise sharply in the future, then the cost of gasoline, of course, must go up. Now if the federal government is really serious about keeping the price of gasoline down, why don't they remove the federal taxes from petroleum products?

Mr. Speaker, one other item that Albertans should consider is this: we export what, about 85 per cent of our oil? I could be corrected on that, Mr. Speaker, but I think it is somewhere in that area. At this time about 22 per cent of this comes back to the provincial treasury in the form of royalty revenue, comes back to the people of Alberta. Therefore, it seems obvious that the individual Albertan will enjoy a significant financial benefit from the higher crude prices, even though he may have to pay a little more at the pump for gasoline. So obviously we will pay less taxes overall and receive many other benefits and be money ahead, all of us, because of the additional return to the treasury from the higher-priced export commodity.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to the debate on October 15, the debate on this resolution where the Member for Spirit River-Fairview said "I believe the introduction of the export tax was necessary" - I believe the introduction of the export tax was necessary - I think this is a statement that should be remembered and remembered long by the people of Alberta. Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of young people in my constituency about to enter the job market. They are looking for good jobs, they are looking for opportunities in Alberta, opportunities to grow, to lead a good life in this province. The conventional oil and gas business has been mighty good for Alberta. It's created the level of prosperity that we're enjoying here today. The future looks rosy indeed if the tar sands development that we visualize and are trying to encourage goes ahead as planned. The job potential, as has been pointed out by the Premier, is fantastic: 2,000 jobs per plant during the construction period; 1,600 permanent jobs when in production; 8,000 indirect jobs. The opportunity for Albertans in all walks of life, for every trade and location that you could think of is just fantastic.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that my constituents want this development to go ahead. We in Calder want the jobs for our young people. The people of Edmonton Calder want to see Alberta grow and prosper. Again I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the negative, anti-job statements made by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview will be long remembered by the people of Alberta. I suggest to you also, Mr. Speaker, that the negative statements by the Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray, which could adversely affect job conditions if he had his way in his constituency, will also be long remembered by the people from Lac La Biche. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would call for complete endorsement by the members of this Assembly of the oil and gas policies of our government. I am confident that the people of Alberta strongly endorse our policies, that justice will prevail and that Alberta will continue to maintain control of her natural resources and of her destiny.

Thank you.

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands adjourn the debate?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and the Assembly resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for study of certain bills on the Order Paper.

[The motion was carried.]

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]

* * * * *

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of the Whole Assembly will come to order.

Bill No. 80 The Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, 1973

[All sections of the bill, the title and preamble were agreed to without debate.]

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, I move the bill be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 68

The Public Service Vehicles Amendment Act, 1973 (No. 2)

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one or two comments. At the present time the minimum is \$35,000 and I suppose that when quite a high percentage of our people secure insurance, they insure for \$50,000 or \$100,000. The Public Service Vehicles Amendment Act is now providing for \$50,000. Correction - this is on the reciprocity. I agree with the reciprocity. I want to make a few remarks on this minimum when that bill comes up.

[All sections of the bill, the title and preamble were agreed to.]

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 68 be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 72

The Department of Telephones and Utilities Act

[All sections of the bill, the title and preamble were agreed to without debate.]

MR. FARRAN:

I move that Bill No. 72 be reported, Mr. Chairman.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 74

The Alberta Government Telephones Amendment Act, 1973

[All sections of the bill, the title and preamble were agreed to without debate.]

MR. FARRAN:

I move that Bill No. 74 be reported, Mr. Chairman.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 82
The Alberta Opportunity Fund Amendment Act, 1973

[All sections of the bill, the title and preamble were agreed to without debate.]

MR. PEACOCK:

I move that Bill No. 82 be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 85
The Credit Union Amendment Act, 1973

[All sections of the bill, the title and preamble were agreed to without debate.]

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 85 be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 70 The Workers' Compensation Act

MR. DIXON:

I wonder if I could ask the minister a question on Bill No. 70. I have had a number of people write to me and talk to me on this Workers' Compensation Act, and they wonder just how far the government proposes to go in putting public funds into an insurance or a guarantee program for workers in the employment of industry within the province. We have been doing it now for a number of years, but only on a small scale.

When you start talking about \$2 million, some people begin to wonder how far away we are from giving compensation to people who are injured off the job. Because a workman, as we all know, gets compensation, regardless of whose fault it is. A civilian usually has to prove to the court that negligence on somebody else's part was the reason he was injured. So I have had a number of people saying, what about a program? If you are going to use public funds, rather than having to go on welfare, why can't I come under some kind of compensation scheme?

Can the minister explain - and I know he must have an explanation - how long he thinks we will have to funnel in public funds before the industry itself can make up the difference by assessment?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Chairman, an altogether proper question. I would respond in two ways.

First, there is a distinct difference between the concepts of compensation and insurance, which I attempted to differentiate between in the debate section.

Second, the government has a policy position with respect to this important question, and it is this, that the \$2 million more or less that we are infusing into benefits has one purpose only. That is, that on the recommendation of the special select committee - and the government agreed with it - the benefits had fallen behind in a significant way and we had to do something about that. The choices were only two.

We had one option, namely to assess current industry, in which case we would have had to assess many industries which were not even in operation at the time the worker was injured, the assessment was made and the benefit assigned. There is some degree of unfairness about this, depending on how new the industry is or how old the injured worker happens to be.

The other option was to recognize this kind of unfairness and to feel that it was in Albertans' interests to bring those people on low benefits up to date on the basis of the cost of living, the change in the wages of journeymen and labourers and the governments on the recommendation of the committee. But its view was coincident with the committee's that expending general funds in this way was the proper thing to do.

Once those benefits are cut off - and that will be soon because this is an immediate infusion as the act will take effect on January 1 - once those benefits are cut off to what we feel they ought to be today, then they immediately become the responsibility of industry, consistent with the trade-off between industry and unions when the first Workmen's Compensation Act was put together in Ontario in approximately 1915.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, ...

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I believe Mr. Drain was first, then Mr. Notley.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Chairman, thank you. Unfortunately I inadvertently missed the second reading of the act and the reason was that I felt it behooved me to act as the ex-officio representative of the Province of Alberta when the Deputy Premier of Poland visited Coleman. I did take this particular obligation upon myself and I hope, therefore, the hon. members will bear with the remarks I'm going to make.

I must first, Mr. Chairman, express my great appreciation of the efforts of the members of the committee, and also my appreciation for the amount of information that was made available to the committee by the Workmen's Compensation Board. On behalf of the committee it was my privilege to attend the international conference of Workmen's Compensation Board representatives in Toronto. I was able to interview, in the brief three days I was there, all of the different board members from the various provinces, as well as the Northwest Territories.

I found that generally the progress of workmen's compensation was carried along at a reasonably comparative rate. When one progressive step was made in one particular area it was followed through in another. Interestingly enough, there was one particular thing I noted. I would go through the process, through the kind offices of Mr. Gilbert of the board, of being introduced, and then I would engage in conversation with the various members of the board. Then someone would, at some stage in the conversation say, by the way, what's your position with the Alberta board? And I'd say, I'm an MLA. Immediately there would be a total freeze in the conversation. Quite obviously, the reason was that it has been the nature of politicians over the years to kick the compensation boards around and they are very much aware of it.

In approaching the problem of compensation - but before I leave to go on to this particular subject, I might mention an interesting development that has occurred in New Zealand. There was a representative from there. That is the process, Mr. Chairman, of a universal coverage of everyone in New Zealand on the basis of an insurance plan. Now there's a very interesting thing, something that we can well reflect on here. In New Zealand, which has a socialist-oriented government, the operations of the Workmen's Compensation Board is under a private insurance scheme with all of the drawbacks that you have with the American insurance system. It was very, very extraordinary to me.

I also made a very pointed effort to interview the various operations of the state insurance schemes in the United States, and I can assure you that the efforts they have in that direction in the United States are really pitiful. It gave, I think, the Canadian representatives a great deal of satisfaction to be made aware of the tremendous steps forward that have been made.

The problem the committee was faced with in relation to workmen's compensation in our review was the necessity of reconciling the desirable with the possible. We did at one stage in our deliberations come out with a vast list of what we would like to do. Someone - I think I was the guilty party in this particular case - said, let's get a computer printout on this. We came up with a price of about \$400 million a year so we started to take a walk after that. This was one of the problems that we ran into.

MR. DRAIN:

I would say that this act is a very comprehensive act. It's a good improvement for several reasons. It is clearly written. It is simple. It is something that can be interpreted by the layman without any difficulty. Certainly it is superior to the bill that was introduced by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo which I'm still shaking over because I'm not just too sure where we are going with that one.

However, I did read in Hansard the debates on the Workmen's Compensation Act. I refer now to the remarks of the hon. Member for Drumheller in relation to the section dealing with the penalties, wherein he emphasized that these were too mild.

For the hon. members' information, I might point out that the mechanics of operation, insofar as the way the board operates, and has operated for some considerable length of time, regarding reports of accidents from employers is a procedure something like this. A letter to the employer, no reply; a second request, no reply; a third statement from the board that since the employer has failed to file a report, the board now presumes that the employer accepts the claim and therefore it now disregards any representations insofar as the employer is concerned.

In light of that, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it would not be necessary at all to stiffen up this penalty section. As a matter of fact, it could be struck out of the act without any harm being done. However, it's there and I suppose it won't do any harm.

Looking at the subject of compensation, I wonder, Mr. Chairman - I think all of us have done a lot of soul-searching. Has it indeed got the flexibility to do the things it should do? I would say that it has moved a long way in this direction.

I come back now to the ultimate powers of the Executive Council. There are certain problems that do not fit into any package and there is a responsibility of the Executive Council in this direction. However in saying that, I must emphasize that my personal position is, that the board as such should have total responsibility in administration.

I can cite a worthy compensation case that I encountered in my last trip down to the constituency of a man who had operated on wagon drills for a considerable length of time. Anyone who has operated a wagon drill knows what that does to your hearing. He was nearly deaf. So I said, well there is no question that if examination indicates that this was caused as a result of noise damage, it would be something that could be placed under the purview of the Workmen's Compensation Board. So then I tried to get an indication from him of where he worked. This man is 65. He had worked in many places on so many wagon drills - Alberta, British Columbia, Saskatchewan, the Northwest Territories. To pin down any single employer to this particular damage would require the efforts of someone with the background of King Solomon. I don't know whether - despite our new and very human chairman of the board - whether even he would be able to solve a problem like that.

Then there are other situations in relation to workmen's compensation administration where in fact a man, although only slightly injured, is in reality redundant because of his age, educational background, psychological values and so on, and he cannot indeed be retrained for any particular subject. So the damage in the ratio of examination is far in excess of what can in truth be charged to workmen's compensation.

So then you go back to your thinking on what direction social legislation should take. You assess the implications of the disability position of the Canada Pension Plan. You relate it to the benefits under workmen's compensation and you then conclude, Mr. Chairman, that the right direction that government should explore is the packaging of social benefits in the direction - I can cite the instance of someone who had been injured in an automobile accident which is not within the purview of workmen's compensation but nevertheless is a person who is no longer able to take care of himself.

So I would suggest to the hon. minister that in his deliberations with his colleagues in other parts of Canada, they work towards one packaging of the various social benefits in relation to injuries to all people, including housewives, because a housewife is in fact the producer of 25 per cent of the work output in the Dominion of Canada. So therefore she should be considered. I can talk about a boy who broke a kneecap and had to have it removed because of a hockey game. He got a thank you from the club and a benefit game organized on his behalf.

There is a long way to go, and as I said, Mr. Chairman, we in the committee were very, very much aware of the direction we should go. We have the desire to accomplish what should be accomplished but we had to reconcile that with what we could accomplish.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I have three or four question that I would like to put to the minister. The first, I understand that ...

MR. HENDERSON:

On a point of order, if we are going to start dealing with specific sections of the bill, I would like to suggest to the committee we should go through the bill section by section rather than jump all around with it. I just may be anticipating the hon. member a bit.

MR. NOTLEY:

If we are going to go through the bill section by section that is fine, Mr. Chairman. I will raise the questions ...

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well. If the committee wishes to we can then - any more comments on general principles on it?

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Chairman, in discussing the bill on second reading, the minister had indicated that he would dwell on certain parts, primarily Section 11 and some of ...

MR. CHAIRMAN:

That is a specific section. Will you save your comments for when we deal with that section?

MR. ZANDER:

Okay.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, the section that I wanted is not in the bill. I dealt with it during the second reading, and that is where a person while on compensation is discharged or fired by the employer. I really think this is a serious offence and I would like to see something in the act dealing with this.

Surely when a person is injured in the employ of any employer and is still on compensation, the employer should not have the right to discharge that person during that period. I would certainly like to see this made an offence if that happens, so that it can be dealt with by the compensation board.

MR. HENDERSON:

I wonder if the member could clarify just what he means by that point, because I have difficulty in following it. If a person is injured and put on a total disability pension, he could be on compensation the rest of his life. To argue that where the company has made a financial settlement, a lump sum with the board for the payment of that pension for life, I have difficulty in following the argument that an employer should be liable to maintain that man as an employee throughout his life. I don't think that is what the member probably means, but I wonder if he could clarify further just exactly what it is he does mean.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I am not talking about PDP. I am talking about when a person is actually on compensation. Before the permanent partial disability award has been made and during that period when he is on compensation, he should certainly not be discharged by the employer. Once a pension has been established and the person has shown that he is unable to do the job, that is a different thing entirely. But while that person is suffering from an injury sustained in that employ, certainly the employer should not be discharging or firing that person during that time.

MR. DRAIN:

There is one thing that comes to mind, Mr. Chairman, in relation to the hon. Member for Drumheller's remarks. If this employee - I am not talking about a

major injury, I am talking about an employee who has been warned and has been informed as to the hazards but who has completely neglected the simple rules of safety, which is in effect the responsibility of the employer. I think the employer has the right to tell this man that he has in effect violated the rules of safety and therefore he is not a responsible person.

MR. TAYLOR:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I can't go along with that. A ruthless employer could cut off compensation or fire people for many, many reasons. If a person is injured in industry, industry has the responsibility to pay that person during that period. It is a charge on the production, and surely that is the whole basis of compensation. If we are going to throw that out of the window let's throw the whole workers' compensation out of the window. If a worker loses any part of his or her body in making profit for an employer, surely he or she is entitled to compensation during that time? And while the employee is on compensation he or she shouldn't be fired by the employer.

DR. HOHOL:

Just to make sure that there is no misunderstanding of this very important question, the whole point of compensation with respect to the matter discussed. There are lots of other points, but with respect to the matter under discussion, the act clearly indicates that the injury is in no way assessed to be a fault or not a fault. It isn't part of what happens. He simply gets compensated.

It follows from that that the argument of the hon. Member for Drumheller is accurate, that in a period of compensation there is no fault involved either way and the fault concept is that of the insurance approach. It is not the approach of compensation. So the proposition is accurate. A person on compensation ought not to be fired. It is a matter of employer ethics that we look for here, while the hon. member is recommending that it also be part of the legislation we'll consider.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister a question. Presuming that someone is discharged during the time he is on compensation, is there anything in The Alberta Labour Act that would designate that as an unfair labour practice? Would the individual who was discharged be able to seek redress under The Alberta Labour Act? If that is there we may not have to put it into this act. But if there are not grounds, then it seems to me we have to be more explicit in The Workers' Compensation Act.

DR. HOHOL:

Certainly the point is well made. The labour standards section of the act could be an avenue of redress for a person who is wrongly dismissed.

MR. DIXON:

I would like to ask one short question. Does the Compensation Board still get charged for medical expenses incurred by a workman, such as hospital bills and medical bills, or has that been changed?

DR. HOHOL:

No, they still get charged.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I believe you want to go section by section?

AN HON. MEMBER:

No. We've had the full debate, why don't we pass the act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I believe there was agreement to go section by section. Section 1 ...

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, since the time is two minutes to four perhaps we might commence that next time. I move the committee rise, report progress and beg leave to sit again.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is it agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Mr. Chairman left the Chair.]

* * * * *

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration the following bills: Bills No. 80, 60, 72, 74, 82, 85 and begs to report same. The Committee has had under consideration Bill No. 70, begs to report progress on same and asks leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the report and the request for leave to sit again do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, regarding Monday's business we will simply continue on the Order Paper all those bills which remain to be given second reading with the exception of Bills No. 53 and 53 and consider those bills which remain in committee and perhaps consider some third readings.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until Monday afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

[The House rose at 4:01 o'clock.]