

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Thursday, December 13, 1973

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to give oral notice that I intend to move tomorrow, seconded by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, the following motion:

Whereas the British Commonwealth Games will be held in the City of Edmonton, the capital of the Province of Alberta, from August 3 to August 12, 1978 and whereas it is deemed felicitous that Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second and His Royal Highness Prince Philip do attend;

Therefore be it resolved that this Assembly do request the Government of Alberta to extend a cordial invitation to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second and His Royal Highness Prince Philip to visit the City of Edmonton at that time and to attend the Games.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, sir, and through you to the members of the Legislative Assembly, a distinguished Canadian and a distinguished parliamentarian who, Mr. Speaker, is in your gallery; a gentleman who has served his province well for many years and who has recently been the House Leader for Her Majesty's Official Opposition in the federal House of Commons, the Member of Parliament for the Peace River constituency, Mr. Gerald Baldwin.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table two sets of documents: one, which was promised some time ago, is correspondence with respect to the Fish Creek Land Purchases, and the second is the Syncrude Lease No. 17: An Archaeological Survey.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table two pieces of information. One is in reply to Question No. 295 asked by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow on December 11, 1973. The other, Mr. Speaker, is a copy of a letter which was written to the Hon. Jean Chretien. I think there has been some misinterpretation, certainly in a question in the House where an hon. member spoke about such things as rejection of people's requests, and I think the letter may assist the hon. member in assessing the government's position.

I would like to table both these documents.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

ETS Strike

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Manpower and Labour: given the serious hardships that the transit strike is causing in Edmonton, especially for those people who are senior citizens, is the minister now prepared to call the two sides together and use his personal initiative to settle the matter?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I give this information to the House. At noon, for a period of over one hour, I met with the negotiating committee of the employees, and tomorrow morning [I] will meet with the mayor and chief commissioner for the City of Edmonton on this matter.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Manpower and Labour. After he has had these two independent meetings does the minister then plan to have a meeting of the two groups, with himself present, in an attempt to get the matter settled by this weekend?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, in all fairness I would have to reserve that kind of judgment until I have met with the second party and then had discussions again with the senior person of each party.

MR. CLARK:

A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is it the government's intention to bring in legislation at the spring session which would make changes in the present collective bargaining procedure as it affects public service, for example, the transit strike in Edmonton?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, it isn't the intention of the government to introduce such legislation in the spring sitting.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Did the minister say it is, or it isn't, the government's intention?

DR. HOHOL:

I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I said it is not the intention of government.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

School Foundation Grants

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Education with respect to the announcement of school foundation grants. Mr. Speaker, can the hon. minister advise the Assembly whether the government proposes to proceed with the recommendation on school busing operational costs which would, in fact, reduce the provincial commitment from approximately 90 per cent to between 75 and 80 per cent of the operational costs?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I don't think the interpretation as to one of the four financing suggestions that were made in the report is entirely accurate. But as

I mentioned to the school trustees, we have not taken any position on the report - a rather detailed and comprehensive one - that was tabled in this House recently. We are now awaiting feedback and response from the school trustees as to their suggestions and reaction to the report and certainly we would welcome any further suggestions or amendments to the proposals for financing that have been put forward.

We have been viewing, with very keen interest, the recommendations made with regard to bus safety for children. We would expect, after receiving the feedback from the trustees, to be acting on appropriate parts of the report during 1974 and 1975.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can the minister advise the House whether the government has set any time-frame objective for making an announcement as to funding of school bus operational costs?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the announcement being made during the spring session with regard to changes deriving from the report. I think the trustees would like at least a number of months in order to assess the report before making recommendations. But as soon as we get a definitive reaction from all of them in the province, or representatively from the association, we would get at the question of deciding on new regulations and new policies regarding school transportation.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question dealing with grants to school divisions. In the light of the falling enrolment in many rural school divisions, has the government considered any sparsity factor to bring up the average per capita payment to rural divisions to cover the increased costs?

MR. HYNDMAN:

For some months, Mr. Speaker, we have been exploring a number of alternatives with regard to the question of enabling smaller communities - particularly small towns, villages and hamlets - to retain, if there is sufficient community involvement, a smaller local school in that area if those people feel that the school is a crucial and integral part of the community. We are looking at a number of alternative financing arrangements which might be explored in that area, and I would think perhaps we would have further information in that regard at the spring session.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall followed by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

Senior Citizens Assistance

MR. HO LEM:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Premier. In view of the inflationary pressures on senior citizens and Albertans on fixed incomes, has the government considered any special financial assistance to senior citizens for the Christmas season?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, we just were involved in a program this fall with regard to the senior citizens that went on top of the plans that we'd had, which were very significant in terms of the senior citizens of the province and involved the question of Medicare. I think our expenditure was some \$9 million of additional funds.

The reactions I have, in terms of the mail that I've received from the senior citizens, particularly within the last few days, is that they've been quite pleased with it, and we've assured them that there will be ongoing programs in this direction.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the answer the hon. Premier has given, but I'm just wondering if it would be possible at this time for the Premier and the Executive Council to give immediate consideration to all senior citizens receiving a guaranteed income supplement in the way of a special Christmas bonus.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, if I might add to the answer just given by the Premier. The situation in regard to the recently begun monthly payments to senior citizens from the provincial source, in addition to the old age pension and guaranteed income supplement - which they receive from the federal source - was deliberately rushed through the difficult course of having to make arrangements for payments to 75,000 or 80,000 Albertans in time for Christmas. We know these payments have been received just before Christmas and I think it has been very pleasant for those receiving them.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

Crowsnest Pass Symphony

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation. The question is: has his department been able to make any contribution to that unique cultural entity, the Crowsnest Pass Symphony Orchestra, thereby, Mr. Speaker, endowing the province with great ...

[Laughter]

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member not wish the minister to answer?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, the quality - especially that of the conductor - and, of course, also the enthusiasm of the members of the Crowsnest Pass Symphony Orchestra has been recognized by the provincial government, and a \$1,000 cheque was forwarded to them last week.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Greenhouse Operations

MR. WYSE:

A question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. It's a question regarding the greenhouse operators in the province who are experiencing some difficulty with the rising costs while the prices of their goods and produce remain fairly stable. Is the province considering changing their base of assessment from an industrial to an agricultural base, or at least lowering their assessment?

MR. RUSSELL:

Not at the present time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WYSE:

Supplementary question, then. Does the government consider this a problem, and are they studying it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question is clearly a question of opinion rather than of government policy.

The hon. Member for Smoky River followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

B.C. Hydro Dam

MR. MOORE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Does the minister have any information from Ottawa or British Columbia regarding an application by B.C. Hydro to construct a second dam on the Peace River?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, about two and a half months ago the Government of British Columbia informed this government that British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority had applied to the federal government for a permit under The Navigable Waters Act to build another dam on the Peace River about 14 miles downstream from the W.A.C. Bennett Dam. This is to be a dam about 135 feet high to impound only about 175,000 acre feet of water.

MR. MOORE:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister or his department commenced any studies regarding the environmental impact upon Alberta in the event of the construction of a second dam?

MR. LOUGHEED:

We're going to have an export tax, Bill.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the Government of British Columbia had invited the Government of Alberta to participate in a joint study on hydrometric and sedimentation aspects of the dam and the effect on the river. However, in addition, B.C. Hydro as I understand, is conducting environmental impact assessments.

Nevertheless, I have written to the hon. Mr. Wooliams suggesting that a task force be established among British Columbia, Alberta and the federal government to determine the possible effects of the second dam on the entire Peace River basin.

MR. MOORE:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has this government entered into any negotiations, or are you planning any, relative to securing an additional supply of power from the proposed dam for northwestern Alberta?

AN HON. MEMBER:

I hope so.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, negotiations along this line haven't, in fact, been conducted with the Government of British Columbia.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Cypress with a supplementary, followed by a supplementary by the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, is the government giving any consideration to a dam on the Peace River on the Alberta side?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the Energy Resources Conservation Board has completed a survey of all possible dam sites on the Peace River system as well as the Athabasca

system. This is phase one of a much more extensive study. At the same time the Department of the Environment in cooperation with the Energy Resources Conservation Board has identified one site on the Athabasca for detailed studies with respect to a possible hydro-electric installation some time in the future after sufficient studies have been done.

The present site selected on the Athabasca River is the Crooked Rapids site, upstream from Fort McMurray. So that, in fact, it would be a dual purpose type of structure, if ever built, and provide flood control protection to the town of Fort McMurray.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands with a supplementary, followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation with a question.

MR. KING:

My supplementary is to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. I'd like to know if the Government of British Columbia has invited us to participate in their resource development in terms of a dam on the Peace River, as for example we have invited other governments to participate in our resource development?

MR. GETTY:

No, Mr. Speaker, we haven't had that offer at this time.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Labelling of Canned and Packaged Foods

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. Is the minister considering legislation to ensure that all canned and packaged foods are labelled as to their exact contents?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, there is some federal legislation now before the House that we have considered in depth. We, along with the Department of Agriculture, will be having a conference of all the manufacturers in Alberta some time in the next year - I'm not just sure of the exact date - dealing with that very matter. We plan to bring the manufacturers and producers in because they, we feel, know best what should go on the label and how best they can accomplish the things the consumers really require.

Food Price Controls

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary to the hon. minister. Is the minister receiving any representations from individuals or associations requesting the imposition of controls on the cost of food in this province?

MR. DOWLING:

No, Mr. Speaker, I haven't.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Lethbridge Winter Games

MR. LEE:

I have a question for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. I wonder if the minister could inform the Legislature as to activities his department has undertaken in public land arrangements in preparation for the 1975 Winter Games to be held in the Lethbridge area?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I do have some information I can report. This is a matter of very great interest to Alberta and especially to the Lethbridge region.

We met with the principals involved in Lethbridge during the southern Alberta cabinet tour in September, and also set up after that an interdepartmental committee to meet with them on their various needs.

With respect to public land specifically, we have outlined in a letter to them the application we would need and we await that application so that we might deal with it.

West Castle Ski Resort

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of the question on the Winter Games, has the minister had an opportunity to discuss with the principals of the West Castle ski operation their difficulties and how the provincial government might be able to resolve them in conjunction with the firm?

DR. WARRACK:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is yes, as I wrote to the hon. member lately on that subject.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Bribery Allegation

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Attorney General. Can the hon. Attorney General advise if he is aware of a police investigation report on an official of the Department of Health and Social Development, the results of which have been turned over to the Deputy Attorney General?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the hon. member has asked that question because it gives me the opportunity of responding to similar questions he asked yesterday.

As I recall, Mr. Speaker, he asked whether I was aware of or had received a complaint and requested an investigation. I indicated yesterday that I didn't have any memory of that. The hon. member's question had not called to my mind the case he had on his mind.

But since yesterday I have had the opportunity to check, Mr. Speaker, and I find that some six months ago a complaint of that nature came to me. I passed it to the members of the department who, in turn, passed it to the City of Edmonton police force.

The second question the hon. member asked me yesterday, Mr. Speaker, was whether I would undertake to ascertain the results of that investigation. I indicated that I wanted to think about that and would let him know later. While that particular question, Mr. Speaker, poses no problem, I anticipated that it would be followed by the question of whether we would make public the results of the work that the police did after receiving the complaint. That, Mr. Speaker, does pose some problems.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that as a matter of policy we ought not to make public the fact of a complaint or the results of a complaint. Really, that is for two reasons.

First of all, many of these complaints are wholly unfounded and in some cases, indeed, they're even maliciously motivated. Making public the fact of the complaint might do a great deal of what I think is wholly unjustifiable harm to the person about whom the complaint was made.

There is a second reason, Mr. Speaker, for not making public the complaint, and that is that law enforcement to a very significant extent depends on the public informing law enforcement officers of what they believe are breaches of the law. If those persons were aware that they might become involved in a public discussion of the matter, I think it would materially reduce the number of such persons who would bring to the attention of the authorities breaches of the law.

Coming now, Mr. Speaker, to the specific question the member has asked me today, I feel that once the fact of a complaint and the fact that the police are looking into it has become public from some other source, it is then perfectly proper for us to say publicly the results of that investigation.

As that has occurred in this case, Mr. Speaker, I feel I am free to say that I have since yesterday learned of the status of the investigation. At the present moment there is no information in the hands of the police or in the hands of the department that would justify or warrant the laying of charges.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, on the matter of public information, once charges are laid in either of the situations I have mentioned that [fact] does, of course, become public knowledge.

MR. WILSON:

One supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Attorney General. Can we then assume, sir, that there is no substance to the allegations?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member is clearly asking the hon. Attorney General to rephrase what he has already said.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney General. Is this particular employee referred to in this investigation still an employee of the department in the same capacity?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, that is the very kind of question, it seems to me, that is wholly improper for me to answer.

These kinds of complaints - the public discussions of these things - puts a cloud over people and it puts a cloud over, in many, many cases, Mr. Speaker, innocent people. In my view it is a wholly improper thing to do.

While I have no desire whatsoever to withhold any information from hon. gentlemen on the other side or anyone else, it seems to me we have to balance the disclosure of that information with the honour, the reputation, the character of the people involved, and when we do that in questions like that, it seems to me we can reach no other conclusion but that they shouldn't be answered.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. To clarify my question, I think that the very fact, if that the man is innocent ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. We are getting into a difficulty here and possibly the Chair is to blame for it since the answer of the hon. Attorney General went considerably beyond the scope which is ordinarily allowed for an answer in the rules. The reason that was done was because there may be a reputation at stake and the Chair felt, rightly or wrongly, that under those circumstances the matter should be fully answered.

But if we now explore the matter further along the lines just suggested by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall, we will in fact be getting into the kind of situation which a lengthy answer often leads to, and that is a debate at a time when debate is not permitted.

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican followed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

Fireworks Legislation

MR. DIXON:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct my question today to the hon. Premier. It is regarding complaints about our present fireworks legislation, in particular where people are concerned that you have to have a permit to put a sparkler on a birthday cake.

Has the government taken any action, or is it contemplating any action, since the submission of the Canadian Fireworks Manufacturers Association that was made to the Cabinet and members of the Legislature?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, to be assured that I haven't been in breach of some provincial government regulations as a result of the nature of that question, I will very quickly refer it to the Minister of Manpower and Labour.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, representation was in fact made and I reviewed the amendments to the particular legislation we brought before this House and that was supported by everyone in the House in the spring of 1972.

Having reviewed the circumstances that brought the legislative amendments to bear, I and the government are more convinced than ever that that legislation should remain. There is no intention whatsoever to rescind those amendments.

MR. SORENSON:

Supplementary to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Is the minister contemplating any new safeguards or legislation on toy safety?

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly the hon. member could ask his question later as a main question. There seems to be some lack of connection between sparklers on birthday cakes and other toys.

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

National Petroleum Company

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. I would like to know, in light of the fact that the provincial government is involved in the oil industry through the Alberta Energy Company, whether the Alberta government is considering participating in the national oil company.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, we certainly haven't seen the edges or any details about the so-called National Petroleum Company. But from the little bit I have heard, Mr. Speaker, and knowing that the real energy assets are in this province, I would think Albertans would much prefer to invest in those energy assets and the energy development in this province, and not be particularly interested at this time in the National Petroleum Company.

Oil Sands - Saskatchewan Participation

DR. BUCK:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister or the government received a specific formal request from the Saskatchewan government to participate in the oil sands development?

MR. GETTY:

The hon. member is referring to the remarks made by the Premier in the House yesterday, Mr. Speaker, in which he indicated the Province of Saskatchewan has indicated a very real interest in the development of the oil sands.

Yes, we have received that indication of interest and we certainly are going to follow it up.

Alberta Energy Company Head

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Has your department finalized who is going to head the Alberta Energy Company?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, in terms of the responsible minister, it will be the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. As far as this management is concerned, that's something that has not as yet been resolved.

MR. LUDWIG:

Where does Dickie come in?

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Has the government received applications from other provinces in connection with joining?

MR. GETTY:

I think the term "applications" might be misleading, Mr. Speaker. We have discussed them. I guess, to summarize, we have discussed the matter with Ontario and Quebec, both of which have indicated a real interest. We have had recent interests indicated by the Province of Saskatchewan. One, a little more blurry I would say, referred to by the Premier of British Columbia, I have a little more difficulty in tying down, although he has referred to it at one time.

Both the Premier and myself, in trying to recall in what context that offer came, do recall a comment that there appeared to be lots of good investments in Alberta, and should we ever require a source of funds, the Province of British Columbia realized these investments were here and would be interested in investing.

MR. TAYLOR:

A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the government established any maximum percentage to which other provincial governments could reach?

MR. GETTY:

No, Mr. Speaker. However, the Premier has indicated that at a time in the future there will be more definitive policy guidelines for future development of the oil sands. Perhaps the matter might well be handled at that time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Little Bow followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West.

Senior Citizens' Housing Projects

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. In view of the serious shortage and numerous waiting lists for senior citizens' accommodation in the Province of Alberta, is the minister considering a crash building program of senior citizen accommodation in early 1974?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, there is a current program under way now which, I think, will substantially relieve the situation to which the hon. member refers. That is the program of construction of self-contained units sponsored by non-profit organizations, which is getting off to quite a nice start as a result of the Act the Legislature passed this spring. Of course, insofar as specific building programs for 1974 are concerned, those will be announced at the appropriate time.

MR. MOORE:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Are there currently any lodge-type senior citizens' homes under construction?

MR. RUSSELL:

There are currently six lodge extensions of 10 beds each and eight complete new lodges, either in the construction or final planning stages at the present time, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the hon. minister indicate to the House just in ball park figures, how many people there are in Alberta who are looking for senior citizens' accommodation? Just in ball park figures, Mr. Minister.

MR. RUSSELL:

No, I am unable to do that, but I would be pleased to get the figures for the hon. member, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Is there any consideration being given towards making retroactive the financial arrangements in the new plan for senior citizen accommodation which has been completed this year under the old plan?

MR. RUSSELL:

If I understand the member's question properly, Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes. In fact, the new high-rise development in Calgary, Murdoch Manor, has had that application applied to it and the citizens there now are paying rent geared to income rather than flat rates. Roughly, that means many of those senior citizens are paying \$32 a month rather than the flat \$80 under the old arrangement.

MR. TAYLOR:

A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, and if the hon. minister wishes to defer the question I have no objection. I am wondering if the splendid accommodation that was recently opened in Carbon, largely through the work of a young man the hon. members on that side of the House know well, would qualify for these better financial arrangements as far as rental is concerned?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I'd prefer not to try to attempt the answer in detail because I'm not aware of the arrangements of the facility, insofar as the construction and financing were concerned. But I'd certainly be pleased to get additional information for the hon. member.

DR. BUCK:

A short supplementary, Mr. Speaker ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the last supplementary on this topic.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Minister, in your consultation with senior citizens groups, are the senior citizens favouring lodge-type accommodations as opposed to self-contained units? Can the hon. minister ... [Inaudible].

MR. RUSSELL:

I believe it fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is a heavy demand for both kinds of accommodation. With respect to the self-contained accommodation, of course, that was one of the beauties of the Act which we passed this past spring.

Just to give you an example of the variety involved, there is a village of mobile homes going up in Daysland and a new high-rise apartment going up in

Lethbridge under the terms of that Act. In both cases they appear to meet a very specific local need.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge West followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly.

Rail Line Abandonment

MR. GRUENWALD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House what his position is on the rail abandonment in southern Alberta which is a real threat down there. And also when the minister is up, would he indicate whether he will attempt to have some representation from his department in Lethbridge at that meeting which will be held tomorrow afternoon?

DR. HORNER:

The answer to the latter part of the question, Mr. Speaker, is yes, we will have some departmental people present.

In regard to our position on rail line abandonment, it has been a joint operation between myself, in regard to the grain situation, and the Minister of Industry and Commerce. The House will recall that one of the positive things that came out of the WEOC conference was, in fact, a commitment by the federal government to freeze any rail abandonment for a further two years.

It is my view that if we can continue our policy of gradual and dispersed growth in this province, rail line abandonment will not be as important a question as it might.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Crowsnest Pass Symphony (Cont.)

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation. It should really have been a supplementary question after the question raised by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

Would your department consider assisting that symphony orchestra from Crowsnest Pass to present their arrangement of Chinook music in this city, particularly for the benefit of the members of this Assembly?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation is certainly, at any time, prepared to accept any kind of application to give audience to an orchestra like the Crowsnest Pass Symphony.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Aviation Fuel

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals has had a chance to pursue the matter of aviation fuel?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I haven't been able to get the final figures, we have [on] two refineries, but we hope by tomorrow to have [them for] the other two refineries and I'd be able to finalize the full report for the hon. member at that time.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Party Cooperation

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to either the hon. Premier or the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, or to the Minister of Mines and Minerals.

Is there any unanimity of action between the provincial government and the Alberta Conservative MPs in their efforts to obtain ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member's beginning has already sufficiently indicated the direction of the question.

The hon. Member for ...

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary. May I then pose another question to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, in view of the fact that that one might be embarrassing?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

MR. LUDWIG:

But I'd like to ask another question, Mr. Speaker, not related ...

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member will be recognized later, in turn, for the further question.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

Propane Price

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities.

Can the minister tell the House whether he has received any evidence that the wholesale price of propane has risen at all since the introduction of Bill No. 97 in this House?

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I understand that there will be a meeting of people in the propane industry in Calgary tomorrow discussing the import of the government's legislation. I have had one unconfirmed report that there was a price increase yesterday with one producer.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise the Assembly whether or not it is the intention of the government, when they achieve a rollback in prices, to insist that a rebate be made to the consumers of propane?

MR. FARRAN:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. In light of the extremely bad harvesting conditions this fall and the heavy use of propane for grain drying, has any consideration been given to a rebate for this purpose, if a rollback is arranged?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question is clearly hypothetical. Perhaps he might ask it again after the rollback, if it happens.

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

Hog Processing Plant

MR. WYSE:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Has the provincial government provided any financial assistance or any kind of commitment to the proposed hog plant in southern Alberta?

DR. HORNER:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. Did the company apply to the provincial government for any kind of loan, and is the government still considering it?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member is aware, and so are the principals involved in the hog plant, that there are opportunities for anyone to apply for loans through either the Alberta Opportunity Company or the Agricultural Development Corporation.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. Did the proposed hog plant in southern Alberta ask the government for a loan, and is the government considering it?

DR. HORNER:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. Is the plant still going ahead?

DR. HORNER:

I have no idea, Mr. Speaker. It is not my responsibility to build the plant.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Toy Safety

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'll repeat my question to the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. I am wondering if he is contemplating any new safeguards or legislation on toy safety? This could even include hearing apparatus for snowmobile operators.

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, at the moment we do keep in fairly close touch, as I have indicated, with the federal departments responsible for the sale of goods over the counter, and make known any complaint we receive to some of the people responsible there. However, we are, as you would obviously imagine, re-examining the legislation that now comes under our purview. If we feel the need is there, we will make the necessary legislative changes.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Dow Chemical Plant

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, my question today is to the hon. Premier. It's regarding a press release that was made on November 5 by the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. I was wondering, Mr. Premier, how we are able to obtain an option from the Dow Chemical Company of Canada to participate in ownership - the news release goes on to say, "the project will not involve any program of government financial assistance" - without putting up any money?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member's question is a representation in the nature of debate.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think it is a genuine question.

My question is, how is the government going to participate then, Mr. Premier, in these plants?

MR. SPEAKER:

The supplementary would appear to be hypothetical. If the hon. minister wishes to deal with the question briefly, perhaps under the circumstances it would be allowable.

MR. GETTY:

If you agree, Mr. Speaker. The economic planning committee of cabinet did deal with the matter. Perhaps just to remove some doubt that the hon. member might have, or might have left with the House, the company feels, Mr. Speaker, that there is an opportunity to invest in Alberta and to invest in the resources of Alberta. Knowing the value of that resource, they would like to have Albertans invest in the company. They would like to have that in return for an opportunity to invest in the resource of the province. They do not need any kind of grant or that type of thing, Mr. Speaker, in order to provide an opportunity to invest.

MR. DIXON:

Could I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Then we have no actual option spelled out by the company? It's only a suggestion then rather than an option, as stated here?

MR. GETTY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. The company, as the hon. member knows, has some further hurdles which it must achieve, and of course there are other projects also proceeding in the province. In any event, it is at a sort of exploratory stage, but something they are interested in doing.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Oil Export Tax

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs can advise whether he has met recently with the deputy minister of Energy, Mines and Resources with regard to the federal government export tax?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, it is the government's policy that the ministers of our government should meet with ministers of the federal government and we do that on many occasions on a variety of matters. When we are meeting at the ministerial level, deputy ministers often accompany us in those discussions. I have not, within the last few days, had any meetings with the deputy minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, although I'm certain that discussions have been held at other than the ministerial level with members of the federal department.

MR. LUDWIG:

Has any specific proposal been made or discussed with regard to the removal of the export tax following January 30, 1974?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, as I've mentioned in the House before, we have explored alternative methods of handling the export tax because we feel there are other methods that would recognize provincial ownership and jurisdiction as well as the Canadian interest. Those discussions are ongoing, and it's difficult - as a matter of fact, I would not like to elaborate on them at this time. Other than that, nothing else.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary, has there been a certain amount of compromise between the Alberta position and the federal position on this issue at the present time?

MR. GETTY:

If the hon. member is talking about the principle of the export tax, definitely not.

CRDERS OF THE DAY

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Department of Mines and Minerals

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the hon. Provincial Treasurer, Gordon Miniely, on Thursday, December 6, 1973, gave you and the hon. members a progress report on the status of the Syncrude project. I am pleased today to give you a further report on the status of the Syncrude project.

Hon. members will recall that on October 10 I tabled in the Legislature a copy of a letter of intent between the government and the Syncrude participants, dated September 14, 1973. The letter of intent contained three conditions under Section G, Clause 21 on page 22. Essentially they covered:

- (1) Labour agreement;
- (2) Federal tax advice;
- (3) Pricing.

Following the signing of the letter of intent there were discussions with representatives of the federal government by representatives of our government and by the federal government with the Syncrude participants. On November 15, 1973, the government and the Syncrude participants agreed to extend the date set forth in subclause (B) of Clause 21 from November 16, 1973 to December 16, 1973.

Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that today the government and the Syncrude participants signed an amended letter of intent. The amended letter of intent does not contain the conditions dealing with the federal tax advice or pricing.

Mr. Speaker and hon. members, the Syncrude project is now go, subject only to a satisfactory labour agreement to assure labour stability throughout the construction of the project.

Mr. Speaker, with your approval and the approval of all hon. members, I'm prepared to now table an amended copy of the letter of intent, dated December 13, 1973.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, in commenting on the announcement made by the Minister of Mines and Minerals, we on this side of the House certainly welcome the announcement that the Syncrude project is now go, subject to negotiations as far as the labour portion of the agreement is concerned.

Might I say that we're extremely pleased that the minister has made this announcement today. Might I just make this suggestion. Immediately after tomorrow, when the Minister of Labour gets the two parties together as far as the Edmonton Transit strike is concerned, that despite the weather he takes off his coat and rolls up his sleeves and comes to grips with the labour arrangements. Work a little harder.

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS
(Second Reading)

Bill No. 95 The Petroleum Marketing Act, 1973

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Speaker, in my many years in the House I have developed some sensitivities and some allergies. From time to time I hear things which cause me to cough and to huff and to puff, but it seems at this session I have had so many of these that now I'm driven to a paroxysm which you'll have to endure.

I appreciate the latitude that has been allowed in this debate and I hope the hon. Speaker will not think my premeditated breaches of rules are completely unacceptable.

Before I go too much into some of the things I want to say, I do want to refer to two or three of the things referred to in this House. First, by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo who drew to our attention the fact that he thinks there has been a sort of natural evolution in our Confederation. I wonder whether this has been a natural evolution or whether it's been something else.

When I read history I remember the days when we were glad to be part of this Confederation; when we liked the fact that Ottawa gave us a gift to build a capital, underwrote our public debt, did so many things for us. I think the evolution which he called "natural" is probably only the evolution that is always going on, that of a youth growing up and feeling that he would like to be completely independent from any suggestion from parents.

He spoke of regional maturity. I don't know that I understand regional maturity because, if we truly have the spirit of Confederation, this regional maturity will contribute to an overall maturity.

He spoke of discriminatory action. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if any of us were for a little while in Ottawa, we would soon realize that Canada is a place of great divergence and that there are very few issues upon which a government can take action without discriminating against somebody. Any time you right a wrong, you deprive that person who has been profiting from the wrong.

He spoke of the petulance which we all regret, and to the impugning of things. I suggest that we are not entirely free from that in this House. In fact, there were a few members who seem to be masters of this same petulance. I suggest that perhaps we're wrong to impugn things to people. But for each of us there is one heart into which we can look and be sure of getting all the answers, and that is our own.

I was certainly led to admiration when our Premier was not going to be led into answering such silly things as were said by the Prime Minister of Canada in Ottawa. Certainly it bespeaks a stature which is important.

Another member who mentioned some things that nettled me a little bit was the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc - it was not necessarily in this debate - but he drew to the attention of all Albertans, I think even in the newspapers, the fact that there is not room in this province for two Conservative parties. This has been said about Social Credit ever since I can remember, that it's just another Conservative party. But the thing I was led to wonder about was why he didn't realize this when he chose Social Credit as the party presenting him with the opportunity to gratify his political aspirations; why he didn't offer that as an excuse for ...

MR. HENDERSON:

On a point of order. Am I allowed to respond to the remarks of the hon. member?

MR. SPEAKER:

I wonder if the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc can point to an appropriate rule or precedent for what he now proposes. I'll be glad to hear of it.

MR. HINMAN:

It's nice to have somebody hold somebody you want to win.

I was also going to say that as far as I know he has never said publicly that this conservatism was the thing that made him not only desert his position as chef in our kitchen but to resign from the whole staff.

I think I have to say, too, that perhaps there are only three party types of politics in Canada today. We have the Conservatives and the Liberals; we have Social Credit and we have a new kind of party which embraces what I call 'hashism'. It indulges in this cattle-breeding thing where you cross exotic breeds and in the end you hope to get a superior product. It crosses, for instance, socialism with centralism, and then when it gets the offspring it crosses that with communism. The ultimate, of course, is supposed to be some kind of a political theory that everybody in Canada will fall for.

If the hon. member from Leduc wants to do something unique maybe he should organize that party and become its leader.

I don't want you to think that I don't see much merit in the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc. I think he has certainly contributed a great deal to this House and to the thinking of Alberta.

Now I want to say a word or two about those who have talked of windfalls. I want to say that to me windfalls are perhaps something designed by a great providence, that there is nobody in this House who can wholly say that the good things that have happened to him were well deserved, that there was not some element of windfall. The fact that you're here and not in India has something to do with it. The fact that this is a place of plenty and peace has something to do with it.

I often think of the old prospector who spent not only his money but who worked diligently every summer so he could go into the north of Saskatchewan and Alberta seeking gold. He didn't find any, but he became aware of a strange kind of mineral up there with properties he didn't understand. He finally had to give up prospecting. Then he heard these rumours about uranium. He read about it and he knew that what he had found was uranium. So he went back and staked the claims. It wasn't long until he sold them for a very handsome amount of money, almost five per cent of what they were worth. It was a windfall for him and it was a windfall for Canada.

I want to say that as long as people will invest and work - I, for one, do not always want to call their successes windfalls, and I don't want to be one whose cupidity and covetousness makes me want to rob them of it.

Now perhaps I can get at the thing which is important. Less than two decades ago a few Americans, financed by capital from all around the world, went in to the Middle East. They went to land which wasn't worth 10 cents an acre. It was a desert land with nothing but thorns. But they suspected that underneath it God might have left something of value. They explored and they drilled and they struck oil. These were lands ruled by sheiks, leaders who had

inherited their position and these men, in their experience, thought that as long as they were able to assure these leaders of money that certainly they would be left to reap the harvest of their own diligence over there.

But this was sort of an important day in history. Nobody read about it at that time; nobody thought about it when those men took their equipment in to the temperatures of 120 degrees. But the result was what we have today.

A lot of things happened. The oil was close to the surface. The market was expanding, which they knew. It was central to the world and getting the oil out wasn't difficult. They had not anticipated the one thing, that the sheiks would learn the American system; that they would learn that sell less and get more is a pretty good slogan. And they are not the only ones who have used that principle.

So, in the end, these very people taking advantage of a war - a war between Mohammedans and those who subscribe to Judaism, both of whom have peace and friendship as a basic tenet - a war which we all regret; a war more or less provoked by covetousness, by jealousy which resulted in this so-called crisis which we face today.

It isn't exactly a crisis for Alberta. I regard a crisis as something which has come to a peak where it is going one way or the other and you must act quickly to have it go the right way.

For Canada, for parts of the United States and perhaps for Central Europe there has developed a crisis. The real crisis hasn't come yet. The temperature is only about 102 degrees and before it gets 4 degrees higher and becomes a crisis we may have others. Food may be a crisis. There may be others than food.

But for Alberta, the only crisis was that it provoked us to make the decision as to whether or not we give up the traditional values to which most of us have at times said we subscribed.

Should we then fly in the face of constitution; should we depart from the free enterprise concept; should we substitute confrontation for negotiation? The issues were these. Shall Alberta exact from this crisis the last drop of blood and pound of flesh? Shall we retain our autonomy over our resources at all costs? Shall we sustain the ego of the government - and I mean both sides of the House - or is it perhaps some of each of these?

Historically, over the years we have cried out to Ottawa for embargoes and tariffs when they were advantageous to us and against embargoes and tariffs when they were an advantage to the East and a disadvantage to the West.

We have decried the inequities of transportation costs, not recognizing the economic facts but hoping that Ottawa would react in our favour. We have reacted against misplaced subsidies and called for others just as much misplaced. We have cried out against credit inequities and said that we were subject to Bay Street when we should not be. Yet we have cried out also for special treatment, that Ottawa should get into the great business of crop insurance; that Ottawa, at the expense of all of Canada, should pay a good share of the costs of storage of wheat; that they should pay milk subsidies; that they should get in to the irrigation which is peculiar to the West; that they should sponsor ARDA and its regional development.

All I'm saying is that we ought to be careful to realize that this is still a Canadian family; that we have been as guilty as any other part of Canada in developing the antagonisms and the tensions which are there; that we have been ready to receive - but not as ready at all times to contribute.

Are we going to be party to the oil blackmail? Are we going to exploit the family - the other Canadians - the historic markets in the States; the partners who have been our suppliers and our market; or are we going to look at some of these things, I suppose somewhat selfishly because that is human, but with a little bit of statesmanship too?

Now, I'm concerned with the second aspect - the autonomy of Alberta. I'm as anxious as anyone in this House to keep Ottawa's long nose out of our business. I'm as anxious as anybody in this House to put down if we can the petulance and displays of power that sometimes work against us.

But I would say that we could be just as wrong if we fail to explore and to evaluate the offers made by Ottawa. How do we know when they propose an energy company of their own that they will not merely make available to us the capital

which is necessary to develop the tar sands? As I say, we can look into only one heart and that happens to be our own.

I think we have to be careful in evaluating such things as royalties to make sure that we could not really benefit just as much from the taxation, equitably shared, as we could from the royalty, all the time being sure that their actions and ours are in the best interest of the country.

As to item three, I don't think it is a time for us to be too jealous of our autonomy if it is just for ego's sake. I think he who takes offence where no offence is meant is a damn fool. I sometimes think that he who takes offence where it is meant is a fool too. But sometimes it pays us to overlook these things in the interest of the greater good.

I would be completely inconsistent if I didn't use such an opportunity as this to point out to this House what I consider are some basic things we must not forget when we get so involved with what we call crises.

One of these is that among the windfalls which are ours is that we belong to that small portion of the world - that small portion of the population of the world - whose people have some say in how they are governed, some say in the laws by which we carry on our lives. Among these heritages, these windfalls, is the right to live and to live, hopefully, free from fear. Among them is the right to be unconstrained in thinking, in speaking, in movement and in enterprise, and last of all, the freedom to enjoy the fruits of our labour, the fruits of our initiative and frugality, if you wish, our resourcefulness as these relate to property rights.

I said once before in this House that government, by definition, is that body charged with the monopoly of power. Only government has the right to take from us our life, if it so decides. Only government has the power, the legal power, to constrain us to govern our thinking, or at least make us think quietly, to keep us from speaking, to keep us from moving. These are the restraints which cover a good share of the world today. Only the government has the legal right to take from us our property and the fruits of our initiative and our labour.

Now having confined government to those three purposes you would not have among us that feeling which is characteristic; that it is fun to be able to dominate somebody's life; it is good to be able to constrain somebody's actions; it is good to acquire property, if you wish, by rip-offs.

But I would like to say that in my opinion, it is just as sinful for an individual to take part in the actions of a group which are contrary to the moral laws or any other laws as it is for the individual to do these same things personally. It is just as wrong for us to sit here and go along with governments taking from us our property to give to people who do not deserve it as it is to take it from our neighbour. It is a concept which means a very great deal to me.

Here I want to say a word or two about principle. The first thing I want to say is that over the years I have finally learned that it is usually when our arguments fail us and the things we have accepted as true prove false, when our emotionalism gets no result, that is the time when we try to stand on principle. Many times the principle is ill-conceived. Some times one principle is a little more important than another. One of my principles is that the loafer shall not eat at the expense of the labourer and yet I cannot bring myself to say that I will question every man who comes to my door hungry to see if he might not be a loafer, before I feed him. There is a law which supercedes the first principle.

Now if the government's purpose is to guard us against the domination, the constraint and the "rip-off", as the new word is, and if it confines itself to that, you are not going to have any yielding to minorities and vested interests. You are not going to have groups who are persuaded to approach the state to protect some against the natural consequences and competition around us. You are not going to have governments subsidizing some at the expense of others. You are not going to have governments taking over the business of improving everything. You are not going to have governments getting into the development business.

And if you don't have governments entering into these particular activities, then you are not going to have either government or elected members or [the] civil service or anybody else in a position where there can be the thing which has become Watergate. There would be no incentive to seek political favour. There would be no need to fear government disfavour. There would be no anticipation that flattery and bribery would displace the workings of justice

and fair play. There would be no justification for mistrusting all politicians - and you have seen it happen.

But I can't impress upon you too much that the reason for all this is because government gets itself into positions where its influence can affect people, where flattery could be advantageous - and the great bureaucracies which make it possible.

If we kept out of these businesses we would develop what I would like to call a national conscience. And in that conscience we would think that fraud and misrepresentation and insincere emotionalism are really theft. We would have the concept that browbeating and threatening and blackmailing are enslavement; that greed-sponsored distribution of harmful drugs, abortion and neglect of safety precautions are indeed murder. And when we had those concepts perhaps we would overcome some of the great problems that affect the world today.

I know some of you will be thinking, oh yes, he is talking about laissez faire. But I am not. There would be no room for laissez faire if we had that national conscience. There would be no need for centralization of authority, There would be no need for creeping socialism.

I think perhaps I have time to tell you a little story - it isn't a bedtime story so please don't go to sleep. It is the story of a village; a prosperous village where there was a baker who made bread that became famous. And there was a candy maker who made candy that became famous. And there was a hairdresser whose styles became famous. And there was a man who operated a recreation centre to which people were attracted from far and near. And there was someone who had a tourist information bureau and facilities which attracted many people to stay over.

Then there came to that village a great do-gooder. And he said to the people, you don't have any day care centre and that is awful because the mothers have to stay home and can't get together and really take part in the affairs of the world. She pointed out many other things that they didn't have and she said, there is a way to do it. Because the others protested that they could not afford a day care centre.

And so she said, lets do it this way. Lets all bake homebaked bread and donate to a booth and sell it. The proceeds will look after the day care centre. Lets all make candy just before Christmas and sell it. The proceeds will go to the day care centre.

And so they went. The idea was that they would develop a public camping ground and build a fine recreation centre which they would run publicly, and through the proceeds these would pay for themselves. Everybody fell for it.

Then strange things began to happen. The candy maker put up his house for sale and moved away, and there was nobody to buy the house. The hairdresser discovered that the city was a better place to be than the village, and she moved away and took her family with her. Naturally the baker went where there was another market. Pretty soon there was nobody left in the village but the preacher who had all the good ideas.

Now this is the way socialism grows on us. It is not the kind of thing I think we want. And the way to keep it from being that way is to keep the long nose of government out of people's affairs.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. HINMAN:

When I say that, I am talking about marketing boards. I was in the government when the first pressures for marketing boards came. It sounded good that we let the hog producer or the egg producer or the poultry producer vote on this; that let him manage his own affairs.

We forgot that in voting we were really taking over the production, and that maybe those people who preferred to handle their own affairs would move somewhere else. We forgot that when you impose a marketing board it costs money. We forgot that when you hire an individual he is more concerned about not making a mistake which might get him fired than he is about initiating programs which might be to the advantage of the people he serves.

So marketing boards have come. We are aware of their abuses, and I'm not sure we like them. I am not sure that the marketing commission which we propose will be any better.

Where do we go next? If we are going to have a marketing commission for our oil, I repeat, where do we go next? Are we going to take over all the other services - transportation and power when it seems that it would be a good idea? Let us not forget that the strength of a nation, economically, lies on its entrepreneurs. It is people who work long hours, who read and think and collect around them teams of people with the same bent who have made this country great. I want us to keep this in mind when we think of abandoning these people; when we get the idea that those who can enjoy the fruits of their labour will always achieve more than those who would socialize it.

We have all around us the proof of the efficacy of the free market. It seems to me a little unique that as long as Canada, the United States and Britain kept away from the temptation to socialize things, we led the world. Nobody could get close to us. But as we began to subscribe one after another to these things, we discovered that we were no longer leaders; that our leadership at least was going back a little. Now to get back to these concepts.

What is it we want to do? We talk about not wanting to lose the advantage to Alberta. Do you mean to the entrepreneurs? Do you mean the shareholders in these companies who have risked and who are entitled to dividends? Do you mean that if we can get it in government it will do more good generally than if it gets in the hands of individuals - if that is what you mean perhaps you ought to think twice. Do we mean that no matter what the cost we are going to think of Alberta first - the old idea of 'me the people'. And if you can get every last cent for Alberta, to heck with the East. They got every last cent when they could. Are you going to forget these alternatives? I hope that this isn't it. I hope we are not being too egotistical in our approach to these things. If we are, I think we are in trouble.

I think we ought to think in terms of price and market determination by somebody other than a government commission. I am going to talk a little bit about the act in a little while. But I think we need to take full advantage of the freedom and the expertise that have been developed by people who work for a profit and who know they will suffer in the end if they do not produce a profit.

My answer to this situation in which we find ourselves - the necessity to define what is in the best interests of Alberta, the necessity to evaluate whether or not we belong to this Canadian family, the necessity to balance these things one against the other - is not marketing legislation.

Now at this point I want to clarify myself a little bit. If I am against the way this is being done, it does mean that I do not have confidence in government. I do. I look along that front bench every once in a while and I can't ever say to myself that I could do a better job than the man who is there. I have confidence that our Premier's motives are as right as can be. I know as well as the men on the front bench that at this time we cannot all be told about the frustrations which have faced them, and that we cannot have all the information that is there.

But I still must stick to the premise that there are better ways; that we must use that patience which is always a virtue. We must not be stampeded into thinking that we can solve this problem in the way that we have gone about it. So if I do not vote for the measure, I don't want it ever to be said that it is because I have no confidence in this government. I am not any surer that my solution would work than, I think, the government can be sure theirs will work. But I do think that they are both worth evaluation.

My suggestion - and the Premier is aware of it - is simply that we should not go too far with this marketing act or, for that matter, with Bill No. 94. We can get them through committee, if you like. I don't want to propose any amendments. I think that's a darn good place to leave them. We can reconvene this House without too great an expense. We are pretty affluent. It is one of the reasons I wonder why we get so excited about getting our full share, when we are in a province so affluent that the very availability of money invokes us to some of the follies which history will record.

My suggestion is that legislation not go any further than that, but that we prepare a bill, a bill which will establish a production and marketing council. On that council shall be a member of the conservation board, perhaps two members from industry, a recognized economist, a businessman of some real stature, someone from the transportation industry and a government back-bencher.

I think that among the terms of reference we give these people there ought to be a clear definition of our purpose, a clear declaration that we are Canadians first, but that in being Canadians we don't want to be exploited. And having done that, that we assign to these people the task of determining and recommending a program of production in line with the public interest; that we ask them to determine and recommend a marketing and transportation procedure in the public interest, one which will deliver the consumers from blackmail; that we ask them to evaluate the market trends and to recommend pricing numbers - and I mean numbers - in keeping with the policies of this government and the policies of reality; that we ask them to direct or to recommend that direction which will coordinate all of the activities of our oil industry from its production to its marketing; that we ask them to recommend, to work out schedules of royalties and perhaps methods of taxation which will be fair, which will not rob them of all the windfall which alone keeps them investing and working in our province, but which will let us share in it.

I suggest to you that the experience of these big companies in the world makes them susceptible to reason. I suggest to you they will recognize that what we are trying to do is in their interest as well as ours and that the alternative is the takeover of their industries which they have suffered in so many countries.

I suggest that this council ought to be prepared to recommend to the Premier and his government legislation which seems necessary sometimes to achieve these purposes. If we can do that - if we can display to Canada and to our American neighbours who are vital to us that we will not - perhaps this is the wrong way to put it - waste our time in this House creating paper legislation to serve as ammunition in our toy hands, that we will not waste our time building ramparts of biased emotionalism and political froth and try to use these to keep out the rest of Canada, but that we recognize the virtue of patience and recognize that, no matter which way we do it, the solution will not be immediate. I suggest to you that we could waste six months still trying to negotiate in good faith with these people and be just as far ahead as if we give them the impression that the battle is on, because win or lose, battles take a long time and they leave behind them animosities and ill feelings which preclude us from using the good sense which God otherwise has given us.

I suggest we are wrong to spurn Ottawa. I suggest we ought to suggest to them that they sponsor a marketing and determination council of the same type, made up of the same types of organizations represented by the provinces, and only by this method will we come out of this so-called crisis a stronger Alberta and a stronger Canada.

I am going to close, Mr. Speaker, without using up every last minute of the time, by paraphrasing a Canadian of the days when Confederation was new, D'Arcy McGee. You will remember that he was murdered and his murderer was the first person in Canada for whom the death penalty was exacted. And he said something like this:

All we need to do is each for himself to put down contention which can only weaken and impoverish and keep back the country; each for himself to do all that he can to add to her wealth and her strength and her reputation; each for himself, gentlemen, you and you and I, to hail every invention, to welcome every talent, to cherish every gem and every art, to sponsor every gleam of authorship, to honour every acquirement and every achievement, to lift ourselves to the level of our destiny, to rise above all low limitation and narrow circumstance, and above all, to cultivate that catholicity of spirit which embraces all creeds and all colours and all classes to make of this great land, so rich in known and unknown resources, the greatest province in Canada.

Thank you.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I feel there are two reasons for Bill No. 95 which we must consider in this Assembly.

The first reason certainly is to put the government further into the petroleum marketing process.

The second reason, which we understand in this Assembly, is that Bill No. 95 is to be used as a tool to fight [within] the negotiations with Ottawa and to maintain our basic constitutional rights.

On the worth of these two objectives we must make our judgment. From the point of view of the grassroots of Albertans, the message seems clear that they wish to push on and fight the battle with Ottawa, to fight for our constitutional rights with regard to our resource development and our resource supply.

We must judge whether Bill No. 95 can protect our position or whether there are alternate approaches. I must say the alternate approach suggested by my colleague should certainly be worthy of our consideration.

We must discuss and think about government being further into the petroleum business or any other business in the Province of Alberta.

Firstly, we can rationalize that the federal government has set the stage for the provincial government to establish a more highly centralized provincial government: the federal government's activities or actions to, first of all, freeze prices, to decide not to consult or discuss the implications of such a move by moving into a captive windfall benefit area when the province failed or couldn't act, where the federal government refused to clarify what proportion, if any, of the export tax would accrue to the province or the producing province.

They are establishing a national petroleum corporation, moving into the area of building the pipeline to Montreal by working for a one-price national market and by funding research into the tar sands.

We find that the federal government has forced us into taking some of the actions in this Legislative Assembly. It has caused the Province of Alberta and our government in Alberta to react, and I feel that with this encroachment by the federal government on our rights, a certain amount of self-determination and initiative of the provincial government can certainly be lost.

I think we should comment and examine that aspect very carefully in this Legislature. We should comment and decide how, in turn, the legislation through Bill No. 95 can affect the lives of Albertans with regard to their self-determination and their future.

Yesterday we were honoured with the remarks of the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo. He verbalized and did a very fine job, and made a very fine and smooth presentation with regard to Bill No. 95.

I'd like to quote just one paragraph of some of his remarks, and then make a comment or two on those remarks. The hon. member said this:

I wonder and I fear, Mr. Speaker, how the citizens of our country will react when one morning we turn around and find the all-encumbering impersonal arm of the federal government is in every facet of business enterprise, controlling every resource, controlling every basic approach and sapping our individual enterprise, energies and incentives, all under the so-called guise of national interest.

As one Canadian, Mr. Speaker, I find the total concept repulsive and one that I often refer to in even disgust. But, in fact, is this not what is really happening today in Canada and is this not what we are really facing?

As I examine those comments, Mr. Speaker, I again turn my attention to Bill No. 95 and ask myself, are we moving into law-making, into a process that is creating an environment which is the same in the Province of Alberta?

So I'd like to use those words as my own words at this time - and again quote part of these words in saying this, Mr. Speaker. I wonder and I fear, Mr. Speaker, how the citizens of our province will react when one morning we turn around and find the all-encumbering impersonal arm of the provincial government in every facet of business enterprise, controlling every resource, controlling every basic approach and sapping our individual enterprise, energies and incentives, all under the so-called guise of the Alberta interest.

MR. LOUGHEED:

The light went on.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Not over there.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

As one Albertan, Mr. Speaker, I find the total concept repulsive and one that I often refer to in even disgust. But, in fact, is this not what is really happening today in Alberta and is this not what we are really facing?

Mr. Speaker, I only quote that to indicate that we can't always place the problem or the concern at someone else's doorstep. Whether as a government, whether as a back-bencher or a member of the opposition, we must be prepared to examine the legislation and examine the various programs in light of that very fact.

These directions have changed, Mr. Speaker, in our Province of Alberta, or certainly I feel have been done in sacrifice of certain principles to fight the negotiations with Ottawa. The changes that this will bring can be recorded in our early '70s - as once was said in the good old Province of Alberta - as possibly some marks toward a form of socialism. Some people even class it as a time of leaping socialism.

Or if we became rather carried away, we could say that at this point in time a new political party is being ushered slowly and casually into the Province of Alberta. If I had to place a name upon that party I'd most likely call it the New Socialist Conservative Party of Alberta.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

But we must remember that this is done in the best interests of the residents of Alberta. The Premier and his government must recognize, and I'm sure they do, that the people of Alberta support a fight on the issue at hand with Ottawa. But at the same time, these people are trusting that government growth and government interference is held to a minimum.

With the silent ushering in of this new party the leaders of that party cannot be given the total blame. People today are willing to accept giveaways. People today are willing to accept more political expediency and personal expediency and allow government to come into their lives in an increasing manner. I'm sure we can all view that with a certain amount of alarm.

However, what about the other side, the private entrepreneur in the Province of Alberta, the small or the large or the private or the corporate enterpriser, as they may be called? Where are their voices when the governments in Alberta and in Ottawa are laying the groundwork to build a more expensive and expanding government? Their voices also seem to be very silent.

The man who wishes the marketplace to remain somewhat competitive, should I feel at this time, step forward and be willing to stand up for the system which supported him, regardless of the implications to his business. The businessman should realize that today's politician and past politicians are usually led by public direction. Leadership at this time is certainly required in the public ranks.

Where then are the concerned persons with regard to the implications of Bill No. 95? Well, I'd say in private business and particularly in the petroleum corporations. The word I receive is that they are willing to compromise and adjust to the situation as it is. In government, the measure at this time and the men who must make those decisions and those steps have to sacrifice a certain amount of principle in order to deal with the problem at hand.

It is difficult, I am sure, to determine what the long-term benefits are with that sacrifice at the present time. What about the general public that includes many other people? Their attention at the present time is turned to fighting Ottawa, to grass roots when we talk about it on a political basis. That's where their attention is turned. They really are not looking at the implications of the legislation or what is being talked about in this Legislature. So we as representatives must examine the decisions we make, because we are making them when they are not hearing about the real decision that has certain implications. They are only saying, fight with Ottawa and preserve our position as Albertans. That is a good message, but we at the same time must recognize the responsibilities that we have.

As an opposition we therefore have a very vital role to play in the protection of personal and corporate rights against the growth and infringement

of government on self-determination. However, the fact still remains that the Premier and his government are making the request at this time through Bill No. 95 for us to trust and give him powers through law to negotiate with Ottawa.

I've felt in the past that our procedures in petroleum marketing in Alberta have been very effective and very responsible, that private industry and government have had an excellent and a very good working relationship. Bill No. 95 and related legislation, however, as I have indicated, give me much concern because of the precedents they set.

However, I am convinced that we do need a strong position from which we can negotiate with our federal government. I think we must realize that Canada was created as a federation with the provinces working together as a nation, but we were given certain rights, privileges and obligations.

At this time the independence of our province and other provinces is now in question. The rights of the provinces are threatened. The usurping of provincial rights by the Prime Minister leaves questions about some specific things: his intention to keep Canada as a federation whether he may, without invoking Section 92(10) of the BNA Act, assume the suggested powers. It also questions the discrimination against Alberta, one particular province.

The question we must answer in voting yes or no in second reading for Bill No. 95 is whether Bill No. 95 really solves those problems and can be the instrument to do the job. I must say that I don't know the answer to that question totally. I have some great doubts about the principle or the implications behind Bill No. 95. I certainly would hope that there were other alternatives that would not bring government further into the business world of Alberta.

I am in support of the suggestion of my hon. colleague from Cardston. I feel the idea of the energy and production council would certainly meet a number of my concerns. That would be my first choice.

However, I would like to suggest a second alternative I would like the government and the Premier to consider in committee. If they are not able to go along with the first idea, I would like the government and this Assembly to consider the possibility of putting a limited time that Bill No. 95 will be in effect. I am going to suggest in committee - and this is notice I guess at this particular time - that I would like to introduce an amendment which is added to Section 25 saying, after the word "proclamation", "but expires on June 30, 1975".

I feel that the legislation, Bill No. 95, if needed to negotiate and to maintain our position, can be used in the next 18 months to do just that. After that period of time we, as an Assembly, could come together and look at the problem again. As my colleague has said, we can very easily change that particular clause. We can extend it and allow the job to be done that has to be done.

One of the things the amendment does is say to the people of Alberta and to the people of this Assembly that we, as conservative-minded people - with a small "c" - recognize that the country, Alberta and Canada, can be built and furthered by promoting basic, free, private enterprise principles and that we can maintain them. But at this point in time there is an emergency where we need this type of legislation. Through this amendment we can tell the people that we are being sincere about our principles and that we are being consistent, but we need this trust at this time.

Mr. Speaker, looking at alternative one and alternative two, if I am only left with the legislation as is to support, I am going to have to examine very carefully the words of the Premier, the words of the minister, and any other person who speaks in this Assembly before I can finally say that I will give my total support for it. In saying that, though, I am prepared, in second reading, to support the bill so that it moves into Committee of the Whole so we can discuss these two alternatives.

Thank you.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, in participating in this debate, I have spent several days listening to other speakers and trying to sort out in my own mind, as a representative of the constituency of Edmonton Jasper Place, what my approach and understanding of the particular dilemma in which we find ourselves - what my understanding is and what my approach should be. I tried to look at it from

the point of view of industry, from the point of view of my responsibility in this Legislature and from the point of view of the citizen whose understanding of the oil industry and of the constitutional questions involved is probably very much like my own.

I say that, Mr. Speaker, because in the first instance I have not been a participant in the oil industry in the sense of [being] an employee of an oil company or involved in any respect with an oil company. I say that because most of my constituents, the ones with whom I have fairly regular contact, by and large are not executives of oil companies. They are more involved in the service sector of the oil industry. Therefore, I do not get as much of the direct expression of views of the industry as I might otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, with that comment then, I would like to express the thought process, if I may, that I have explored in trying to arrive at my own position on this particular matter.

Mr. Speaker, I think to do that I will have to try to get some idea of the position of Alberta, the position of Canada, with respect to the whole matter of oil supply. In that context then, I think it's important that we recognize what has happened in the last ten years in the oil industry and the provision of oil for energy around the world.

Mr. Speaker, in 1962 world consumption was on the order of 25 million barrels daily. In 1972 it was on the order of 53 million barrels daily. In other words, it had more than doubled in one decade.

In 1962 the imports of oil were on the order of 11 million barrels daily. That's the total amount of oil imported by various countries in the world - 11 million barrels daily in 1962, as contrasted with 30 million barrels daily in 1972. So while consumption had risen on the order of twofold in a decade, imports - international oil movements - had risen about three times during that decade.

Now let's consider Alberta's position, and one might say basically Canada's position in that context, because Alberta produces most of the Canadian oil supply.

Alberta would represent, in terms of her exports, about 1 per cent of the world's imports in 1972. In other words, we are pretty miniscule in terms of the international oil situation. Canada's net imports of oil - that is net imports, not total imports, but our imports after we subtract our exports - would only be about 0.5 per cent.

Clearly, then, Mr. Speaker, we are such a small influence on the international market that market forces, beyond anything we can do, are going to set the international price.

In that respect I think we have to look, then, at what has happened in international price setting. First of all we have had the oil producing countries organized - the OPEC countries. They have organized. They have become a very effective bargaining tool in the last decade. We have had, at more recent date, the Middle East war situation in which the possibility of the use of oil exports as a weapon, in terms of the achievement of the objectives of some of those countries, has become most significant.

So what, in fact, we've had then, Mr. Speaker, is a situation where the reliability for a source of energy for many countries has become much greater on the international movement of oil. We've had the concentration, in terms of the producing countries, the concentration of bargaining power by these countries. We have now had a compounding of that by the selection of oil exports as a factor in determining the political, international policies of these countries.

That leads us then, I think, Mr. Speaker, to consider another item which has obviously become foremost in the last few months, and that is one of national oil supply. The national security issue has been one which the United States has recognized for some time. One may argue that they have not recognized it very effectively, but I think any oil companies operating in Canada would have to admit that operating in the United States under their petroleum administrative divisions, under certain price controls, price restraint, and market allocations, is considerably different than operating in Canada. I'm hoping that, in fact, we would be able to continue our lack of intervention in the oil market. But given the fact that we are not in a position where our amount of oil would have a significant influence on international price, I do not believe that this is possible.

This situation is further compounded by the nature of our oil movements. We transport oil to the northwestern states and to the Chicago market. We supply oil to these markets on the basis of the competitive nature of the industry as it has existed over the period since 1947. We have markets which the oil companies went out and fought vigorously for in terms of business competition, achieved and have retained.

The one intervention of a significant nature that Canada made in this - at least the one intervention which is sometimes thrown up at us - has been the national oil policy of the federal government. That policy, Mr. Speaker, was introduced in 1961 and, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as there have been comments that Alberta owes something to eastern Canada for the provision of the Ontario market during those years, I think it's useful to explore what kind of information was available and, in fact, apparently was obtained prior to the introduction of that oil policy.

There was a commission at that time, a royal commission on energy, called the Borden Commission. I'd just like, Mr. Speaker, to reflect upon a few paragraphs from that report because I think it will suggest to us that the national oil policy introduced in 1961 did not, in fact, leave us with any debt to eastern Canada - if one must use that as an argument. It did not leave us with any debt to eastern Canada.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the report says with respect to what was then called the Trans-Northern Pipeline, which transported imported oil from Montreal to the Toronto-Hamilton area, that the companies, and I quote:

... These companies have stated that they anticipate that the western flow of products through the line beyond Cornwall will terminate by 1962, thus effecting the displacement in eastern Ontario and Toronto-Hamilton markets of the products presently refined from foreign crude in Montreal by products refined from Canadian crude in the Toronto area refineries. Representatives of the companies concerned stated to the Commission that it was considered economically feasible to take over this market with products refined from Canadian crude.

If one goes on to read the report, the report establishes quite clearly from the evidence given by the companies to the commission that, in fact, the companies, prior to that time, had begun to put in place refinery capacity and pipeline capacity based on that very assumption, that they could meet the international oil pricing with western Canada crude.

Mr. Speaker, if I may go on with another reference, this is the one which I think is quite important because it shows how those companies did, in fact, meet international price competition with western Canadian crude.

The Canadian refineries reacted to this increase in potential competition by reducing the posted prices for crudes in Western Canada in March, 1959, by 14 cents per barrel in Alberta and by 17 cents per barrel in the other two Prairie Provinces.

This quotation was taken from a reference to a decline in international prices.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that as far back as 1959 the oil companies which then had refineries in place and pipelines in place, were in fact, pricing western crude into the eastern market without any intervention of a national oil policy such as the Ottawa Valley line.

The report goes on to suggest that the result of the changes which were occurring in 1959, 1960, 1961 and 1962, in fact, had the effect of changing the basing point for determination of wellhead prices in Canada from the international import price then at Sarnia to the international price competition in a different location. They go on to say that in the opinion of the companies, and they reiterate on several occasions, it was quite evident that the companies had planned to transport western Canadian crude into eastern Canada as far as Ontario, regardless of the policy or lack of policy at that time.

If one had the time to dwell further on this report, one would find that there are two minority reports appended to it, because the report, in coming to some of the conclusions it did, was disagreed with by two commissioners who felt that there was even less need for government policy than the majority of the commission at that time.

Mr. Speaker, on the basis of that report, I would contend that the actions of the companies in 1959, 1960, 1961 and 1962, in building their plants, in

building their pipelines, clearly had in mind that they could, in fact, put western crude into the Toronto-Hamilton-Ontario market at no cost to Ontario. In fact they could meet international price competition of imported crudes. Not only did they make their investments with that in mind, Mr. Speaker. In fact, in 1959 and 1960 when international prices were declining, they actually lowered western Canadian prices to do that very thing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to dwell for a moment on some other changes which have hit the industry and which are impressive to me in terms of the challenge before our government at this time.

It's only about two years ago, or a little less than two years ago, that in this particular Legislature Building we held some hearings. At that time the very best information we could get, Mr. Speaker, from the oil companies themselves was an anticipated price rise of 10 cents per barrel per year. One could quote from the submission of the Canadian Petroleum Association, either on page 9 or page 27 in their summary, where they state that very thing.

Mr. Speaker, I also have here a report from Foreign Affairs reflecting upon the oil crisis. It is entitled "The Oil Crisis: This Time the Wolf is Here." This particular author is reflecting upon the problems that have arisen in the United States and their efforts by government to anticipate the course of supply, demand and prices. Perhaps I could indulge in quoting two paragraphs from this particular article to make the point.

As late as February 1970, President Nixon's Task Force on Oil Imports assumed that world price rises would be modest and that the United States could remain essentially self-sufficient in oil. It projected a demand in the United States in 1980 of around 18.5 million barrels per day of oil; of this only 5 million barrels per day would need to be imported, and most of this could come from the Western Hemisphere.

The article goes on, Mr. Speaker, to say:

These projections were spectacularly wrong. Total imports this very year, 1973, will be well over 6 million barrels per day - substantially above the level the Task Force predicted for 1980. Imports from the Eastern Hemisphere constituted 15 per cent of consumption in 1972, and are expected to rise in 1973 to 20 per cent of a total consumption ...

The article goes on to a further paragraph and I quote again:

The errors of the Task Force were not those of isolated academics, as its critics were (and still are) wont to charge. The staff based its projections on information provided by the major oil companies, by the National Petroleum Council and by the Department of the Interior.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is evident that with the best intention, with the best information, the course of events in terms of the supply and demand for oil in the United States, in the international situation were unpredictable.

Mr. Speaker, it is further evident that no government - let alone the Alberta Legislature - sitting two years ago could have determined that it would be expedient for countries surrounding the Persian Gulf to use oil as an international, political weapon in a war.

Mr. Speaker, in those conditions I have not a great deal of hesitation in considering that decisions made at that time - made in good faith, made with the best information we could acquire from industry, from the oil companies, on the basis of the knowledge of the expertise in government staff - have to be reviewed because what, in fact, has happened is that we now find ourselves with prices based on an international market, prices which really do not reflect the market at all. They reflect the will of countries to use oil in terms of a war.

What the price of oil may be two years hence will not, in any way, relate to the true demand-supply situation as it was two years ago, is now, and possibly may be then, but rather reflects the political aspirations and choice of weapons that several countries may choose to use.

We then come to the point, Mr. Speaker, where it is obvious from Alberta's own oil resources and our efforts to find more oil in the past few years, that prices were bound to rise. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because the oil reserves of Alberta, conventional crude, have not increased in the last two years. We are, at this time, I understand, pumping at close to maximum capacity from conventional oil reserves.

In trying to analyze, Mr. Speaker, how or what the future of our situation is, I have tried to identify the major contributors to the cost of oil in Alberta. From industry sources, Mr. Speaker, and from academic sources my information is that the cost of finding a barrel of oil over the past two decades has been in the neighbourhood of \$1 to \$2 per barrel in Alberta.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that the cost of lifting that oil out of the ground and marketing it, in terms of wellhead site with the attendant administrative costs, is in the order of 70 cents per barrel. So for the oil which we have in place discovered up to this time we have a cost - if we presume that at this point in time, it is all sitting above ground at the wellhead; which, of course, it isn't - something in the order of \$2.70.

However, in the last two or three years the cost of finding a barrel of oil has risen. It's disputable what the real cost is because it's affected, of course, by having to travel in more awkward terrain. It is affected by the small finds that have been made, the lack of discoveries in relation to the cost of finding those discoveries and is variously estimated at between \$3.50 and \$5 per barrel. So the nature of the oil pricing is bound to be affected by this kind of consideration and I think, if I may divert for a moment and reflect upon the royalty question, that this factor is going to raise some problems for us.

It makes, I think, for a tough decision in terms of what is a fair royalty at this stage of the game. Obviously, the companies which have found oil in terms of the low-finding price which existed when finding oil was somewhat more efficient than it is today in terms of dollars, are obviously in a better situation if they quit exploring right now than companies which are exploring today. The same royalty applied to new oil as applied to old oil might be grossly unfair to new oil and might perhaps contribute to unacceptably high profits in the case of the old oil.

That's a problem, Mr. Speaker, I've tried to wrestle with. I haven't successfully resolved my own conflict on it and I wish the minister well in his efforts to wrestle with it.

However, as long as I'm on that particular point, I would like to make another observation. I've been troubled, Mr. Speaker, for some time about the allegations of high profits in the oil industry; the fact that statistics on the oil industry show that the amount of taxes - in terms of income taxes paid by that industry - are very low and that some companies paid little or none over the years.

My analysis and understanding of this - and it's certainly that of an amateur and a beginner - but my understanding is that unlike most other industries, the oil industry is allowed to write off finding costs against its flow of income. And it may do this until all costs which have been incurred have been written off.

The situation with most industry and commerce is that costs can be written off on the basis of five years forward and one year backward. This is not so in the oil industry. The particular provision was, I believe, introduced into the national income tax act in about 1960, 1961 or 1962 - somewhere at that particular point. It was introduced because of special recognition of the federal government of the peculiar nature of the oil industry. That is, that any company engaging in oil exploration and development is not going to make a profit for many years - the high cost to set up, of exploring, of identifying pools and then getting into production - and, in Canada, getting into production at that time in an economic manner when we could not market all of our oil. In other words, it was one thing to find it and it was another thing to be able to market it and get an income flow from it. So this was recognized by the federal government and that particular provision was made.

Mr. Speaker, it reminds me very much of a wage earner - of a carpenter, if you will, or I suppose a member of the Alberta Legislature - getting a very small portion of his income for several years and then suddenly getting all he had earned before in that final year.

Mr. Speaker, in circumstances like this, it is quite obvious that when the return on that very long period of investment and that very high investment begins to come, that return will be much higher - that profit rate will be much higher - in the oil industry than it will be in some other industries. In other words, it seems to me that the fellow who goes out, explores for and finds oil should eventually, if he is successful, be entitled to receive a very high rate of return - two, three or four times, I would think, what the same amount of money would produce if it were put into most of our manufacturing

operations or our service industries where there is a profit flow generally after the second or third year.

So I'm saying that those persons who get carried away looking at the sudden surge of profits in the oil industry - and by the way, we shouldn't paint the oil industry with too large a brush because some companies are not in that fine position - people who get carried away by saying that profit is astronomical ought to consider the nature of the oil industry, the special tax considerations and the tax law which is being provided to that industry.

I don't wish to judge whether that law was a good law, whether it was proper or whether it was right, et cetera. As a matter of fact, it was carefully studied at the time it was introduced. It was introduced in recognition of the peculiar nature of the oil industry and I think we can assume it was equitable in those circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I have already made a comment with respect to the Borden Commission on the export tax act indirectly, or the export tax as applied by the federal government indirectly.

I would like to get back to my understanding of what has happened to the oil industry and why oil men are confused, why the public is confused and why I am confused. If I may resume the different strings of confusion which seem to me to have been flopped over the industry in the last 15 years, I think I had arrived at the point where I was about ready to reflect upon what happened in September, October and November of 1973.

That, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, was the imposition of the export tax. That tax has been introduced, not in law, but at least announced as federal government policy, on the assumption that it is going to protect the interests of the Canadian consumer, on the argument that the multi-national corporations were making too high a profit, and on various other arguments which the Trudeau government has found convenient and acceptable - at least in their eyes at the particular time they have introduced it.

Mr. Speaker, I have some very real concern about that tax - concern about what it is doing to Alberta; concern about what it will do to the Canadian oil consumption and Canadian oil prices in the longer run.

Mr. Speaker, it is, in my opinion, self-evident that oil prices frozen when all other prices are rising, oil prices frozen when it is clear that the cost of finding oil is rising very rapidly - that is, finding oil in the conventional sense - oil prices frozen at unrealistic levels when we know that the source of future supply for Canada depends upon what we can develop in the tar sands when we know that that is expensive, is a short-sighted policy in terms of Canada's own good and of consumers, not only in Alberta, but also in eastern Canada.

I think the Trudeau government does no one, least of all the public of Canada, a favour in taking such a short-sighted view. In my opinion, it is strictly a convenient political platform to last through the winter - hopefully, I'm sure, in the Prime Minister's mind - to face election when the weather is warmer. It may well be that the frost will come out of the ground and winter will disappear only after the federal election.

But I say that most sincerely, Mr. Speaker, because we've just been through an illustration of Nixon's attempt to freeze the price of beef. The hon. Member for Barrhead has expounded on several occasions to this House as to the effect of that particular price freeze operation. It distorted feed supplies; it distorted meat supplies; it distorted the quality of meat - people held back in the U.S. - and it's now distorting prices in Canada. And it's going to have long-term effects upon us.

I say again that this short-sighted political expediency, which, in my opinion, is the case of the Trudeau government in applying the export tax in the hope that it will provide for cheap oil for consumption, is a wrong move. It is detrimental to the interests of consumers over the long term, and just cannot be maintained over the long term. To me, it is an insult to the intelligence of thinking Canadians that such a policy is even viable on the longer term.

Mr. Speaker, I rather think that I should skip a couple of points I wanted to reflect upon and ...

[Interjections]

... Perhaps in view of some of the comments I have endured in the last hour and a half today and for a while yesterday, I should give a few more volleys.

Mr. Speaker, I would like for a moment, if I might, to reflect upon what I feel is the responsibility of the Alberta government, the responsibility that I have as a member of this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, as the Alberta government, I think we have the responsibility for the well-being of the citizens of Alberta. We have that responsibility within the context of Confederation. We are quite obviously a provincial government, and to carry out the responsibility for the welfare of our citizens, for the welfare of our province under the British North America Act, we had certain resources provided to us.

One of those resources is what we may refer to as the oil industry or natural resources. The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo gave us quite an exposition of the constitutional niceties yesterday and I don't want to get into that.

But I simply want to say this. Unquestionably, when we carry out this responsibility we do it as Canadians first - Albertans, albeit, in the full context of being Canadians. And what we are faced with, I think, is developing the resources of this province in a manner which we will be in the best interests of Albertans but not inimical to the best interests of Canadians. In that respect I think we have a responsibility to contribute to the long run policy of Canada in terms of energy.

It may be that we have a responsibility to subsidize to some extent the cost of energy for Canadians. But certainly we should not expect and not be expected to do so without consultation by the level of government which has a primary responsibility for the total welfare of all Canadians. In other words, we can function and act in the best interests of Albertans only if we can do so in conjunction, in cooperation and in consultation with a federal government which knows where it is going, understands the problems it is facing and is reliable and dependable. That, Mr. Speaker, is something we haven't had.

In short, I think our responsibility here is to develop the oil industry, to develop the tar sands in the interests of the economy of Alberta. And I might say, Mr. Speaker, for those people who think the application of the export tax should be taken lightly - and we can forget about being too aggressive in our approach - that in fact by raising and lowering that export tax, if we would just leave it as it sits now, the federal government has control over at least one-third of the Alberta economy.

At least one-third of the Alberta economy is dependent upon our oil and gas resources, and who is to say, with the little understanding the federal government has shown of the oil industry, that an export tax of 30 cents yesterday, \$1.20 tomorrow and \$1.90 eventually, could not be \$4 later on or might, in fact, be lowered to \$3 later on? Who knows and how can we plan? How can we look to the jobs of Albertans, how can we look to a sustained and evenly balanced economy in Alberta with a third party presumably acting in short-run political interests unless we fight for the right to exercise that responsibility in the manner provided by the British North America Act?

I would like to reflect briefly on the comments about business and industry and confidence in this government, Mr. Speaker.

In my remarks I have already indicated that as far as I am concerned we are dealing not so much with the oil industry as developed in an open economy, free of international forces, but rather we have suddenly found ourselves dealing with an industry which is being whiplashed by forces totally of a government nature, totally beyond Alberta. In the situation under which we have been operating, the price determined for our product is determined by these particular forces. Quite different from two years ago.

Mr. Speaker, we are moving in an area which I very much regret. I regret because I am opposed in principle to undue government intervention. I regret that we have to do this, but I think we are forced into this position by the actions of international forces beyond our control, in the sense that we cannot ignore them.

I think that what will promote industry most in this particular province is confidence by industry that we understand their problems; confidence that we do not intend to take unfair advantage; confidence, Mr. Speaker, that we realize they are being buffeted by international forces; confidence that we are trying to insulate as much as possible their operations in this province from those who

would influence their ability to operate in a random, thoughtless manner without sufficient understanding. I say that, Mr. Speaker, having regard to both the international situation and the lack of understanding so far demonstrated by the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, in that context I have a couple of comments about the marketing board itself.

I hope that in the exercise of that marketing board operation we will use it as an instrument of government policy and we will use it at close quarters to achieve government objectives. Because, Mr. Speaker, as I analyze the situation, it is a situation wherein the forces that we have to contend with are those of government - federal government, international government, et cetera - but not forces of companies, not forces brought about by sudden consumer demand or sudden lack of production on the part of oil companies. Rather, they are forces imposed upon us by government at a national and international level, and in that context the marketing board can only be effective, can only be useful, if it is used as part of government policy to deal with these particular forces.

In other words, I disagree totally and completely with the suggestion by the Leader of the Opposition, that this would be, as much as possible, a non-government board. To make that suggestion is either to misunderstand the problem we face or to be unwilling to try to contend with it in a realistic manner.

Mr. Speaker, my only other comment is, with respect to the decisions the minister has to make. I wish him well in trying to achieve what I know he is trying to achieve - that is, a fair balance for the industry in terms of its profit take. I think that is their due. They struggled very hard to develop an industry when government was either aloof or didn't really care. They have served Alberta and also consumers in Canada well. I might say in that connection, Mr. Speaker, that I think the companies have served government better than the oil company which Mr. Trudeau proposes to set up will serve.

There is no magic, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, and no formula which guarantees that a government-run corporation such as a federal oil company will solve the oil supply problem. In fact, it will not. One has only to look at the dismal results of a couple of federal government initiatives in terms of another problem which we now face. I reflect, Mr. Speaker, upon the tremendous shortage of ethylene I understand Canada is now beginning to face. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the federal government was as all-seeing as they would seem to suggest by setting up that particular company, the Polymer Corporation should have been able to foresee the ethylene shortage and done something about it. If not, then the Canada Development Corporation, which has been in the field, and active and making promises for some several years [should have].

Mr. Speaker, I do not think government is any better in its ability to foresee certain types of problems than industry itself. I think if the public accepts that government is, then they are being misled.

Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware of the pressures upon the ministers. We have lived with it now for some little time and I have observed my colleagues on the front bench here working 26-hour days ...

[Interjections]

That's right. I know jolly well that government responsibilities are many and varied and it is just not possible for one person to be able to look out over the broad expanse of industry and foresee all of the developments which may take place there. But individuals, given much opportunity to exercise freedom of choice, can make their demands known in the marketplace. Individuals, given an opportunity for freedom of choice as entrepreneurs, can meet those demands and ferret them out - and do so, I think, in the best interests of all concerned.

MR. LUDWIG:

... [Inaudible] ... take your pick.

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe the hon. Member for Drayton Valley caught the Speaker's eye first.

MR. ZANDER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Following right behind my hon. colleague from West Jasper Place who says he is not too familiar with the oil industry and its operations, I must say, Mr. Speaker, I am just the very opposite.

Mr. Speaker, it's hard to believe that you can drive anywhere in the constituency and never run out of oil wells. But this is true. I think it dates back to somewhere around 1953. I can only look at the socialist side of it and speak ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. ZANDER:

as far as my constituency is concerned and how they seem to come along and say they have such huge windfalls.

Mr. Speaker, in dealing with my constituency only, I think about seven out of every ten people in the constituency, excluding those under eighteen years of age, are employed in the oil industry. It may seem strange that that ratio is so high. But it is true.

The oil field discovery in 1953 occurred in a developing farm community that was something like 90 or 100 miles west and south of the city of Edmonton. At that time there were no roads, there was no town, there were no streets and there were no highways. In fact, statistics will say that in 1953 in the total area, there were 91 children going to school. But since the discovery of that field, and I have to give credit to the oil industry, because they virtually created that part of the constituency which had no roads into one with roads, bridges and schools. A community that consisted of about 21 people grew, from 1953 to 1972, to a population of well over 4,000.

And it must be remembered that in developing areas as back in 1953, there also occur windfalls for the government.

I recall the first sale in - I have it right here - January, 1954. The government of Alberta at that time received in excess of \$34 million on reservation sales in that one area alone. In the total area - and I thank the Minister of Mines and Minerals - the government has received by natural gas leases, gas reservations, drilling reservations, and Crown reserve and natural gas licences a total of \$210,996,747 since the beginning of 1953 to April 2, 1973, about 20 years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this does not include the royalties. If we added the royalties - and we only use them on the basis of about 10 per cent - I think we could say that we could well come near the \$800 million mark out of the one area, the one constituency alone.

The industry contributed heavily. They had to - there were no other resources - to the building of roads, recreation facilities, streets, lanes. It was basically in a development area under the ID under the Department of Municipal Affairs. There is no question in my mind that if you asked anybody in that area they would certainly have to say that the industry did not bring windfall to itself but also to the area. Because the people who came with the industry in the drilling program - at one time there were 71 rigs drilling within the area - stayed. The drilling rigs moved out but some of the people stayed. Since that time, and especially in the last three years - my thanks to the hon. Minister of Agriculture for his statistics - the number of cattle in that area has tripled to almost 18,000 head.

Mr. Speaker, one concern that I have - and it is expressed by the oil industry in my area - is the irreparable damage that will occur to the reservoir in that area by the wide-open production that must continue if we are to supply eastern Canada and also the United States this winter.

I am not a geologist. I am also not familiar with what is underground. But I can certainly agree with them that there must be damage done to a reservoir when you draw in excess of 3,000 barrels of oil a day out of a well.

There is, however, another thought I have in mind and I spoke to the minister about it. You know, when you have in excess of 6,000 oil wells -

there might have been 6,000 last week, but there are now 6,001 because they are continually drilling in there - but when we have a production area such as that and we only get 23 or 24 per cent of the oil that is there. We leave 77 or 76 per cent in the ground because we can't get it. In 1955 the geologists said that under each acre of land, with the area of production underground assumed at 54 feet, there were in place some 50,000 barrels of oil. If we are only getting 23 or 24 per cent out, then actually we are only getting 14,000 out of every 50,000 barrels in place. And this is what gives me concern. We are looking for oil all over. But I think it is time not only this Legislature but the government itself goes and directs its notice in the other direction - of finding ways and means of trying to recover at least another 50 per cent of the remaining 60 per cent that is in place. This, Mr. Speaker, is the problem I have to wrestle with when I talk with the people out there. How much, or will the government put any money or any funds aside for research in this direction?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in speaking to Bill No. 95, I have to agree perhaps we are forced into the position of having Bill No. 95 given third reading in the House. I can't go along with the thought of some of the members on the other side who say we should leave it there for 18 months and then meet again, because I think when we look at the price of a barrel of oil today - I have the clipping out of the paper, I think most of the hon. gentlemen have read it.

Considering in 1955 a barrel of oil was worth \$2.11 - I think it is now priced at somewhere around \$4 - and I read in The Edmonton Journal of December 12 that Iran is to get a record price of \$17.40 for their crude. Now I'm not saying, Mr. Speaker, that that's a reasonable price. That's an inflated price, I have to agree. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I think Alberta should not be selling their oil for \$4 a barrel while the rest of the world is at least selling their oil at around \$8, or 100 per cent increase.

I think the Premier and the cabinet have worked long hours and as the hon. member has said 26. I would say they probably work 28 [hours] because when they come in in the morning they look as if they had been working, not only the following day, but 48 hours without sleep. I can attest to that because I come to the Legislature quite often and sometimes when the cafeteria opens at 7:30 some of the cabinet ministers are there waiting for the door to open.

[Interjections]

Mr. Speaker, there is also one thought that I have and that is this. I think most hon. members will remember when the price of lumber in western Canada and eastern Canada, I guess, went up all of a sudden over 100 per cent. This affected every young family, every family that was intending to buy a house, and the federal government didn't do anything about it.

But imagine, the oil did not increase by 100 per cent. It was frozen because I guess the Prime Minister in his wisdom thought it best to leave it there. He was not concerned too much because western Canada was still building.

The other part that worries me also, Mr. Speaker, is that when the fertilizer prices rose last year, fertilizer manufactured here in Alberta rose about 25 to 30 per cent in Alberta, in western Canada. But the same fertilizer manufactured in Alberta was selling across the line in Montana and Alberta farmers went over there to get it. They got it for \$20 less because the tin god, I guess, in Ottawa decided that was righteous.

Mr. Speaker, one of the many things I found this summer was that farmers were able to purchase Massey Harris or John Deere tractors, but Massey Harris in particular were manufactured in Canada, selling in Montana for something like \$711 less - manufactured in Canada, and sold in Montana - \$711 less than in Alberta. Now I don't know the reason. Maybe some hon. gentleman can tell me; I don't know.

Getting back to the oil, Mr. Speaker, I think the industry has not lost faith with this province. When I look at the number of rigs being drilled in this province - and just looking at the sale of December 11, I look at the sale in my area and that was the total price paid, \$15.82 per acre there. None of them on there are below \$6 per acre - these are all reservations - and I particularly noticed that one company, in its wisdom, bought over \$1 million worth, so I don't think that either that company or the other companies were losing faith that the Province of Alberta was going to let them down.

Mr. Speaker. I wish to close. I'm not going to speak here for very long, but I will say this to our hon. Premier and to his cabinet ministers, the three or four months that they have worked so hard against all odds, the minute they

thought they had one thing solved, the hon. Prime Minister and his assistant Prime Minister in Ottawa had another subject coming up.

Then this followed in the last three months and I'm sure it wasn't easy for our Premier and our cabinet ministers to work under those conditions. But I certainly hope that when our Premier goes east on January 22 and 23 he has the backing of this total Assembly with him, that I think whatever is right, if it is good for Alberta citizens I don't think we want to belittle or deny the oil to eastern Canada, but I think we should have a fair value of our natural resources and I hope our cabinet and our Premier will see to it that when we meet again we will have a fair price.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to congratulate the Minister of Mines and Minerals in introducing these two very important bills namely, Bills No. 94 and 95.

I was impressed when the hon. Member for Cypress said that in his opinion, in the many years he had spent in this Legislature, these just had to be two of the most important bills ever to be presented and we are all aware of how important these bills are to the people of Alberta.

The vast technology and ability of the oil industry in Alberta never ceases to amaze me. The people associated with this industry are dedicated and in my opinion are some of the most knowledgeable people in the oil industry in the world.

In the Arab countries we have wells that are generally producing from 10,000 to 30,000 barrels a day and, in fact, a well that just produces 500 barrels a day is considered hardly worth developing.

In many parts of Alberta, and I'm thinking specifically of my constituency of Lloydminster, we have an extremely heavy oil, and it has its associated problems. I believe perhaps that necessity is the mother of invention because of the way the people have gone about to develop and be able to pump this heavy oil. Our oil is so stiff that on a day like this you can pick up a gob of it and you hit it on a rock and it will shatter just like glass ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

That's in Lloyd.

MR. HENDERSON:

On the Saskatchewan side.

MR. J. MILLER:

And in Wainwright.

It's slow to move underground and for this reason the pumps move very slowly. In fact, if you see me staring off into the distance at times, it's because of a habit I developed of looking over the fields at an oilwell to see if the head of the jack was going up and down or whether it had stopped completely.

Primary production in our area might result in being able to obtain 5 per cent of the oil reserve and this is only done with good management. If we have a well that produces 10 to 30 barrels a day we consider that quite good.

I should point out that the oil industry has employed much technology to increase the recovery. I would like to draw to the attention of the Legislature some of the methods that have been employed. A few years ago they tried water flooding where they would take a well and they would have a body of water nearby and they would either pipe or haul that water and they would force it down a well hoping that it would push the oil towards the other wells where it could be recovered. This worked quite well for just a short time, and then they ran into a channelling problem where the water would channel through from the well where it was put down over to the producing wells and they ended up just circulating the water.

They then tried the steam injection method where they would heat water and steam and shoot the steam down the well. This worked for a while, but it was quite expensive and it took extensive technology to get this operating.

Now they are in the process of fire-flooding. In this process they are pumping air down the well and they have a controlled fire which, in effect, heats the oil and lets it move towards the wells where it can be recovered. In some cases this has resulted in recovery of up to 30 per cent of the reserve. This also is very expensive because of the many huge air compressors that are needed to get the air under pressure to force it down. I know right well that they are working on new techniques every day to try to improve their recovery.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should all be cognizant of the fact that these techniques have been developed under our free enterprise system by people who take great pride in trying to increase the recoverable reserves. Mr. Speaker, we are going to need these people with their technical knowledge in Alberta and I would suggest that we not chase them away by introducing state control.

The oil industry in Alberta is a comparatively young industry. We can all remember when Leduc No. 1 was discovered, and we can remember the past years when we had a buyer's market and when oil in Alberta had to be prorated. We also should not forget the number of jobs created by the oil industry, both directly and indirectly. I like to think that the oil industry, Mr. Speaker, and the agricultural industry are both very important to the people of Alberta. Both are industries which thrive under a free enterprise system.

Last spring when I went out and seeded my barley crop, barley was \$1.25 a bushel. Then in the fall it went up to \$2 and even \$2.50 a bushel. I guess if you look at it you could consider that a windfall profit. Right now I am just wondering if the federal government is maybe thinking of an export tax on barley and other feed crops.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it is the duty of each and every member of this Assembly to soundly reject any threats toward state control as presented to us by the federal government, and we should stimulate the oil industry to further exploration and development within the Province of Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge East followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands.

MR. ANDERSON:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it the hon. member has leave to adjourn the debate.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move we call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER:

I also take it that the House agrees with the suggestion of the hon. Government House Leader, and accordingly the House is adjourned until 8:00 o'clock this evening.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 5:24 o'clock.]