

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, November 5, 1974

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report to the Legislative Assembly that the Legislative Assembly Select Committee on Regulations in the province of Alberta has completed its deliberation and has arrived at certain recommendations.

I regret however to advise hon. members that the amount of time required to provide printed copies of the committee's report is greater than expected and these are therefore not available for tabling.

I therefore propose to this Assembly that, as soon as possible, copies of the committee's report will be deposited with the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly for simultaneous distribution to all members at a rate of one copy per member. I further propose, Mr. Speaker, that all relevant documents now in the hands of the committee be deposited with the Clerk for safekeeping, subject to the further direction of this Assembly, and that the original copy shall be laid before this Assembly by Mr. Speaker within 15 days after the opening day of the next session.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I earnestly recommend that all associations, organizations or individuals who have submitted briefs, either written or oral, to the committee, including the news media, receive copies of the report and appendices from the Clerk, free of charge.

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Select Committee on Foreign Investment, I wish to report that although the preparation of the final report is close to completion, it does not appear that a printed copy can be tabled before prorogation. Therefore the committee requests authorization to deposit the original copy of its report with the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly as soon as practicable during the period in which the Assembly stands prorogued, together with copies for simultaneous distribution to members of the Legislative Assembly and to members of the press gallery, provided that the original copy shall be laid before this Assembly by Mr. Speaker pursuant to this order on opening day of the next session.

The committee also requests that the Speaker, in consultation with the Member Services Committee, be authorized to decide the number of copies to be printed and the distribution thereof.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member wish to make a motion accordingly? Or does he wish to make the motion later? The motion would be debatable. If it can be handled now without debate perhaps it could be made at this time, otherwise a motion incorporating what the hon. member wishes to accomplish might be made at another time.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, under the next item of business I will be giving notice of a motion to receive and concur in the report just made.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to give notice of two government motions which may, with leave, be moved this evening by my colleague, the hon. minister, Mr. Foster.

The first motion is that the report of the Select Committee on Foreign Investment be received and concurred in. I emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that simply is a report asking for an extension of time to complete the study. It is not a motion for receipt and concurrence of recommendations.

The second government motion of which I would like to give notice relates to the report of the Select Committee on Rules, Orders and Forms of the Legislative Assembly, which I understand from the chairman is imminently forthcoming, within hours, to members of the Assembly. That motion, which would be moved by the hon. minister, Mr. Foster, would be as follows: that the report of the Special Committee on Standing Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta be received and concurred in and that the Standing Orders as amended become effective forthwith upon prorogation of the Third Session of the Seventeenth Alberta Legislature.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 78 The Unfair Trade Practices Act

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Unfair Trade Practices Act. The act is intended to provide legal remedies for consumers who have suffered loss or damage due to an unfair act or practice and to prevent the continued use of an unfair act or practice by a supplier found engaging in such activity.

Mr. Speaker, it is not intended that this act proceed to Royal Assent at this time in order that we may provide the consuming community and the market place an opportunity to react to its contents. It will therefore die on the Order Paper at the end of this session and will be reintroduced early in the spring of 1975.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 78 was introduced and read a first time.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, I have pleasure today in introducing to you and to the Assembly a class of Grade 9 students, 18 in number, from the Eastwood Public School located in my constituency of Edmonton Norwood. They are accompanied by the Assistant Principal, Mr. Dwayne Eberly. I would like them to rise and be recognized by the House. They are in the members gallery.

MR. FLUKER:

Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you and through you to this Assembly some 41 Grade 8 students from the Racette Junior High School in St. Paul, accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Pierre Laroux. They are situated in the members gallery. I would ask them to rise and be recognized by this Assembly.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure today to introduce to you Canada's finest string of cowboys, a group of them, who are contesting down here in Edmonton, at the Gardens, for the Canadian Cowboys National Finals Championships.

These supreme athletes, who are sitting in the members gallery, are the choice of the top ten in the events in which they compete. I notice in the first row the champion boy steer riders. I watched them last night; they are superb. The older boys behind had better look out because these young fellows are trampling right on their tails, with a lot of ability.

It's a fine show, because first of all it has all the top cowboys from Alberta, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and elsewhere in Canada competing. They've also got the champion broncs and bucking stock. This stock, Mr. Speaker, is picked by the cowboys to be the toughest in the circuit. They certainly are having a real competition down there.

You know, Mr. Speaker, they would make fine politicians, these cowboys, because they believe in the true efforts of free enterprise. They put their money on the line for the ability that they have to produce, and that's a rare commodity today. They are also very

nimble, Mr. Speaker, because if you watch them down there performing, you know how well they look after themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask them to rise and be recognized by the Legislative Assembly.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I have the opportunity of responding from the opposition side to the guests who are in the members gallery. We wish to welcome them. We know what cowboys have to do and I'm sure they know what private enterprise is. I was just going to tell them that their very genial introducer has also learned a lot about pulling leather - he's been in politics for awhile, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor today to introduce a visitor to our province of Alberta from a family that is very, very active in politics in the Canadian federal scene. We have with us today in your gallery, Mr. Speaker, Gilles Caouette, son of Real Caouette, leader of the Social Credit Party and former member of the House of Commons. Mr. Caouette.

TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the annual report of the Department of Mines and Minerals.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to file a study on volunteerism. Copies will be available for all members of the Legislature.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Department of Mines and Minerals

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like today to acquaint hon. members with an important announcement for the petroleum industry in Alberta.

Hon. members are aware of our effective drilling incentive program. The objects of the drilling incentive program were to stimulate the exploration industry and thereby enhance the job security of those Albertans associated with it, and to encourage the search for new oil and gas fields. After the first year of the program it was reviewed and hon. members will recall, earlier this year the program was expanded in keeping with the obvious need to meet the growing Canadian demand for additional oil and gas supplies.

Today I am pleased to announce that the Alberta government is taking another important new step towards maintaining the necessary level of petroleum exploration activity in the province. Effective January 1, 1975 the Department of Mines and Minerals will implement a geophysical incentive program designed to stimulate the level of seismic exploration activity in Alberta. The government recognizes the positive effects that modern seismic programs have on drilling success rates and feels seismic work must be encouraged as the search for the less obvious hydrocarbon accumulations is pursued.

Geophysical activities, primarily in the form of seismic surveys, provide the initial technical basis on which many exploration "plays" for new oil and gas deposits are planned. Such surveys have performed a key role in finding many of the large reef deposits of crude oil in the Alberta plains, and geophysical data are essential to interpreting the complex rock structures of the foothills which are expected to contain major new deposits of natural gas. Since seismic surveys normally precede drilling activity by many months, it is vital to maintain a high level of geophysical work in all parts of Alberta to ensure the continuity of the search for new oil and gas reserves. Consequently, owing to the close relationship between geophysical and drilling activity, it seems desirable at this time to provide incentives for both phases of the exploration industry.

The main features of the geophysical incentive program can be summarized as follows:

1. The incentive will apply only to the new seismic surveys registered with and approved by the Department of Mines and Minerals after January 1, 1975.
2. The incentive credits will be given to the operator who files the plans for the program.
3. The incentive credits will be determined from a formula based on the number of miles of subsurface recorded, and also on the area of the province in which the survey was made. For example, surveys carried out in difficult terrain in the foothills and northern

Alberta will receive a relatively larger incentive credit than less costly surveys carried out in the plains region.

4. The incentive credits will be applied against revenues owing to the Crown by the registered owner in the form of petroleum and natural gas bonuses, fees and rentals, royalty and mineral tax.

In summary, the implementation of a geophysical incentive program is designed to complement the existing drilling incentive program by sustaining the necessary level of geophysical activity which precedes and directs exploratory drilling in many areas of our province.

An important benefit will accrue to the smaller low-budgeted Canadian-owned oil companies by making lower priced exploration information available to them.

The program verifies the Alberta government's interest and concern in maintaining the healthy level of exploration activity necessary to the successful search for new oil and gas deposits in our province.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, we welcome the announcement made by the Minister of Mines and Minerals today regarding the drilling and the incentive for seismic work. However, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the minister's announcement will be completely insignificant if the federal government in its budget, which comes down on November 18, doesn't make a number of substantive changes.

Let me say secondly, Mr. Speaker, that it seems to me this announcement is too late. The minister, in his announcement, talked about the areas of major new finds in the foothills of this province. It was established and is well recognized, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that of the 30 rigs which have left Alberta and have moved south of the border, the bulk of those rigs are the those which have the capacity to, in fact, drill in the foothills.

Regrettably, if the government was going to make such an announcement, it is unfortunate that it didn't do it some time earlier. That might have had some effect, at least on the slowing down of the 30 rigs that left the province, and especially those rigs with the capacity to drill deep holes.

Department of the Attorney General

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, members of the Assembly will remember that the Kirby Board of Review, about April 1 of this year, submitted a report dealing with coroners in Alberta. That report was filed in the Assembly. Members will also recall that there were two basic recommendations in the report. One was to adopt a system whereby members of the provincial judiciary would preside at inquests, and the other was to repeal The Coroners Act and replace it with an act to be known as The Fatal Inquiries Act which would incorporate the concept of a medical examiner. As was to be expected, Mr. Speaker, the report generated considerable response which we have been assessing.

The first recommendation we acted on some weeks ago by appointing members of the Provincial Court as coroners for the purposes of presiding at inquests.

With respect to the second recommendation, I'm very pleased to be able to announce today that the Department of the Attorney General has retained Dr. John C. Butt as the Supervisor of Medical Examiners.

Dr. Butt is eminently qualified for this position as he has for many years specialized in pathology and forensic medicine. He is an Albertan and graduated from The University of Alberta with a medical degree in 1960. Thereafter he did postgraduate work in England, primarily at Guys Hospital and the Charing Cross Hospital Medical School. During those years he obtained a diploma in medical jurisprudence in pathology, and in 1973 became a member of the Royal College of Pathologists of Great Britain, in morbid anatomy and forensic medicine. He returned to Alberta and in May 1974 he received a certification of postgraduate qualification in the specialty of anatomical pathology.

During the past year he has been lecturing at The University of Calgary to medical students on medico-legal cases. He has also been involved in the development of a morgue and forensic facility at the Foothills Hospital in Calgary, and has been doing most of the medico-legal autopsies in Calgary and the surrounding area.

Dr. Butt's responsibilities will be to prepare a plan and to work on draft legislation for the introduction of a medical examiner system in Alberta. In the course of doing that he will be consulting with the Kirby Board of Review, the Alberta Medical Association, the coroners and other interested persons. He will also supervise the existing morgue and forensic pathology facility in the Foothills General Hospital. As a result of this work by Dr. Butt, and the ongoing assessment the government is making of the recommendations of the Kirby Board of Review we will, in the near future, be able to present to the Legislature a bill implementing changes in the present system which will, I'm sure, be supported by the people of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the retaining of Dr. Butt is a very important step toward the introduction of what I anticipate will be the best medical examiner and fatal accident inquiry system in Canada.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Northeastern Alberta Regional Commissioner

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs if the northeast Alberta commissioner has taken up permanent residence in Fort McMurray?

MR. RUSSELL:

No, at the present time, Mr. Speaker, the commissioner has dual residence. He has apartments in both Edmonton and Fort McMurray and is spending most of the work week in Fort McMurray.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it the intention of the government to have the northeast Alberta commissioner take up a permanent residence in Fort McMurray so he would be there the bulk of each week?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, that's something that we're watching very closely because in the initial phases of the commissioner's work he is finding it necessary to spend a high percentage of his time in Edmonton, communicating and working directly with government departments. But he has indicated to me that he expects that within the next year more and more of his time will be spent in the region. It may be that he will reconsider his dwelling arrangements.

Housing Shortage - Fort McMurray

MR. CLARK:

A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the already critical shortage of accommodations in Fort McMurray, what immediate plans does the government have to alleviate this problem, and what recommendations has the northeast Alberta commissioner made to the government on this matter of housing in Fort McMurray?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I think I reported earlier on other occasions about the commitments insofar as serviced land, housing units and direct mortgages for the Fort McMurray area; it's more than in the rest of the province combined. The Alberta Housing Corporation board of directors recently approved a scheduled program of further residential development. We are hopeful that very shortly the private sector will be involved as well.

MR. CLARK:

A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the northeast Alberta commissioner made a recommendation to the government regarding the question of whether Fort McMurray will be the major development centre in northeast Alberta or will 'Russellville' be built further north?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, as hon. members may be aware, the regional planning that will help us to determine that question is now well under way, and has been since last December. I've told the board of administration in Fort McMurray that, certainly for the foreseeable future, that will be the major service centre and where a second community might be established of course depends on the development of future plants.

Advanced Educational Institutions - Budgets

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, the second question I'd like to direct to the Minister of Advanced Education, and ask him if the 15 per cent increase he announced yesterday, as far as universities and colleges are concerned, will also apply to the AVC centres in the province?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, the announcement yesterday was 15 per cent with respect to universities. I did not make the statement with respect to colleges. We are currently in the budget procedure as the hon. leader, I think, would appreciate, with respect to the provincially-administered institutions. It's somewhat early to say at the moment.

MR. CLARK:

A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. When does the minister plan to make an announcement as far as the public colleges in the province are concerned?

MR. FOSTER:

We are meeting with the public colleges and have been for some time. We have received their budget submissions. In fact, I had a meeting not too long ago in my office with the board chairman of the public colleges discussing finance and other matters. Again, that's part of the budget process. We're anxious to apprise the public colleges as soon as possible in order that they may have the adequate lead time for budgeting purposes. I would hope we can do that later this fall.

MR. CLARK:

A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. When the announcement is made to the public colleges, will the same percentage increase apply to the three agricultural and vocational colleges in the province?

MR. FOSTER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, we can't always paint all institutions with the same brush. However, we're obviously concerned with equity. I indicated, I think, in my earlier response that the regional colleges, for example, Olds, are provincially-administered institutions. Its budgeting system, as the leader realizes, is somewhat different from the budgeting system we go through for public colleges. The guideline of 15 per cent, which is applied to universities, is one that we are discussing with public institutions, both public colleges and our own institutions. But it's too soon to say what that decision will be.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Matrimonial Property Working Paper

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney General or to the Solicitor General. What has been the public response to the working paper on matrimonial property which was prepared and distributed by the Institute of Law Research and Reform?

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I don't have the actual total, or an up-to-date report from Dean Bowker concerning it. The only concern that was expressed to me earlier in the year was that most of the response had been made by women and womens' groups. This is a matter of concern, because the property rights of men are equally important, in my view. It was an area of concern that we had that we weren't getting the same reaction or interest as the paper deserved.

MR. FRENCH:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the time be extended for receiving the representations from the various groups? I believe the deadline was the end of October, if I remember rightly.

MISS HUNLEY:

I haven't checked that either, Mr. Speaker, but I'd be glad to contact Dean Bowker and inquire as to his feelings about it, though the longer we delay the study and the response to the working paper, the longer the legislation will be delayed. In many people's eyes, this is not very acceptable.

MR. FRENCH:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What time factor will be required before it will be possible to introduce legislation in this subject?

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I don't have any idea of the amount of work that goes into the draft legislation. I would expect it would be a considerable number of months after the final position papers are analysed.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

School Bus Driver Testing

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Highways and

Transport and ask the minister whether he can advise the Assembly what the reasons were for relaxing school bus driver test requirements?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, there has not been a relaxation of school bus driver testing requirements.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, they have been considerably stepped up in a practical way. As of now, a school bus driver has to have a medical every year. He also has to have a driver's examination every five years upon renewal of his licence. And we have recently requested every jurisdiction and superintendent in the school system to report every accident that a school bus driver might have and at that time it would be required that he would have to have a vehicle operating examination.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the hon. minister advise whether either his department or any department of government discussed the question of school bus driver examinations with the Alberta School Trustees Association?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, we work very closely with the ASTA and the ATA and the home and school associations.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question. In light of the fact that the government works very closely with these two organizations can the minister advise the Assembly what advice he received from the ASTA on this matter?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, the home and school association asked for very much increased examinations and the ASTA asked for not quite so stringent ones. We tried to come somewhere in the middle, in a practical way, in which we could give the greatest degree of safety to all passengers, not only in schools but in taxis and all other areas of passenger moving. And, Mr. Speaker, in doing that we hope that we have the finest and best regulations in Canada for the safety of passengers.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for clarification. Can the minister assure the Assembly then that the present driver testing requirements meet with the approval and the support of the ASTA in Alberta?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, you always have some people who are not quite satisfied with what you are doing. You are either giving them too much or too little. And if the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview should ever have the occasion to be in an administrative position, he would soon disgustedly learn that.

School Bus - Accident Statistics

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I suspect the problem is too little.

The supplementary question I would like to pose to the minister is, does the minister at this time have any statistics which would compare the accident rates for school bus drivers for the last two or three years, year by year, and compare them up to the most recent time?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, we have statistics but it is very difficult to compare them with other jurisdictions because the requirements of reporting are considerably different in each province. Here in the province of Alberta, the requirements that we have just requested of all jurisdictions and of all bus drivers will be of the highest standard anywhere in Canada.

DR. BUCK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the last supplementary on this topic.

DR. BUCK:

Does the department require that 65 years of age be a mandatory retirement age or does it depend on the driver's medical?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, in many of the areas school bus operators, particularly part-time ones, are very hard to come by. But we do request that they have a medical, that they are in good condition physically and also, because of the requirement of having a driver's examination every five years, we leave that to the jurisdiction of the local school boards. But basically at 65 they are usually retired.

DR. BUCK:

A point for clarification. Does the hon. minister mean every year or every five years when he spoke about the medical examination?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Medical examination every year and a driver's test every five years.

Mr. Speaker, I might also add that we have a record of school bus operators in this province that is one to be ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

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

Gas Co-ops

MR. STROM:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities. Where a gas co-op has been organized, is it possible for an individual to make private arrangements for a hookup within the franchise area?

MR. FARRAN:

No, Mr. Speaker, except under very exceptional circumstances.

[Interjections]

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, do I understand from the minister's answer that there would be exceptions that are not covered by regulation, or is he suggesting to me that regulations permit certain exceptions?

MR. FARRAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member read the natural gas plan earlier in the spring but he has forgotten the details about individual taps. They can be allowed if it appears that a gas co-op is not forming in the immediate or imminent future, on the basis that they purchase their gas from Gas Alberta and pay a small premium on the gas, which is held in trust as their membership fee in the ultimate co-op that forms. If after five years a co-op has not formed, the money is returned to them.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that not only have I read it, but he wasn't listening to my question. I asked if it was possible for an individual to make a hookup where there was a co-op organized.

MR. FARRAN:

My answer was no, except under special circumstances.

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Seismic Lines Incentive Program

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, this question arises out of the ministerial statement of the Minister of Mines and Minerals in which he stated that there would be an incentive program for new seismic lines in the province. Having knowledge that the foothills have been shot at least five times and northern Alberta shot at least six times, what are the criteria for a new program?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I thought I read that in the announcement. That was all the programs that would be registered with the department starting January 1.

I might mention that we have reviewed the tentative program with the various people in the industry and it was with that in mind that the program was delayed, when we initially

started discussions, due to the fact that the industry was unable to come up with a solution to the question of confidentiality of information. They finally arrived at a solution sometime in August. We had subsequent meetings with them and that is the reason for the program being announced today.

MR. DRAIN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Do I interpret the minister's remarks as saying that the information will be channelled into his department?

MR. DICKIE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the Minister of Mines and Minerals. What is the anticipated number of dollars involved in the incentive credits and bonuses and so on? What's the total figure involved?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, we are presently working out the number of feet that might be required there. After we have determined that with industry we'll be able to assess, approximately, the cost. We have some tentative figures now but I think it would be unwise, until we have finalized the program, to get a more accurate estimate of the cost. Then we will submit that to the Provincial Treasurer.

MR. CLARK:

A follow-up question, Mr. Speaker. Will the program be in the neighborhood of \$10 million?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I anticipate it could be in that area.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Stettler followed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

Feeder Cattle - Rail Car Shortage

MR. HARLE:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Has the minister made, or will he make representation to the federal government and to the railways with regard to a shortage of rail cars used for shipping feeder cattle, now that the feeder cattle run has started to flow into the auction marts in Alberta?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I've had several representations from not only the hon. Member for Stettler but other hon. members representing rural areas with regard to the delay in securing livestock railway cars.

We have been in touch with both the major railways and they have assured us that they are going to attempt to meet the demand. One of the problems is that our run this year has been later than usual due to a number of factors. We're hopeful, though, that both railways will be able to meet the demand.

MR. HARLE:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will rail cars actually be available for the feeders that went through yesterday's and today's auction marts?

DR. HORNER:

My information from the railways, Mr. Speaker, is that the delays shouldn't be longer than 48 hours.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Clover Bar followed by the hon. Member for Wainwright.

Ambulance Service

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development and it arises out of a death that occurred as a result of a pedestrian-automobile accident on the streets of Fort Saskatchewan.

My question, Mr. Minister, is: when will your department or the government be in a position to announce if the province will be proceeding with a province-wide ambulance service?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think questions similar to that have been directed to me, during the fall session. I indicated that what we had in progress was an overall study across the province of the existing ambulance service, which would no doubt lead to recommendations in the form of a report, or in the form of government policy.

The situation is that the report has been drafted. It was prepared by the Alberta Hospital Services Commission, but no decision has yet been taken on when the recommendations will be fully considered and made public.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can the minister give the Assembly any idea as to when he will make the recommendations of this study public, so that people can assess the merits or demerits of them?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think the position will be that the people will assess the merits or demerits of the government policy based on the study. The study itself is done for the government by a government commission. I don't suppose there will be any reason the actual report itself isn't published in due course. As to the question of timing, I have had the view that it will be early next year.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, has the minister considered subsidizing some of the small ambulance services in the province that are already in existence?

MR. CRAWFORD:

I missed part of the hon. member's question. I wonder if he would mind repeating it.

DR. BUCK:

The question is: in the small communities that already have ambulance services, would the hon. minister consider subsidizing these services?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the question of subsidy relates to one of the overall issues being looked at by the study. The standards and degree of coverage across the province are important areas. The area of finance, as it relates to municipal obligations and provincial obligations, is also a very important part of it.

I think there's no doubt that when the final recommendations are made known, whether they be in the form of government policy or in the publication of a report, that is one of the issues which will be dealt with.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, can the minister advise whether or not the study is specifically reviewing the whole area of the adequacy or inadequacy of air ambulance service in the province of Alberta, and whether, further, the government has given any consideration to, perhaps, PWA's role in such a proposal?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my memory of the overall guidelines of the report is that it dealt with ground ambulance service and did not go into the question of air ambulance service. My view would be that a separate study of air ambulance service is probably not required. From the operation of it over the years we have quite a lot of information on it. Air ambulance services within the province are really the only ones that concern us.

I think in studying ambulances generally, particularly fiscal policies, accessibility and so on, we were very interested in one or two other plans such as Ontario's. But in the question of air ambulances, every province is so different in its remote areas, in its remote settlements and its landing strips in remote areas and so on. We have been working with it and I think we do have enough information without a separate study on that.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question then. Can the Legislature anticipate action by the government to deal with air-ambulance policy as well as ground-ambulance policy early in the new year, as you suggest?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, what I indicated was that I expected the report, which has been prepared to the point of final draft, would probably be published early in the new year. Either that, or that policy would be declared based on the report that has been referred to. But since that report doesn't deal specifically with air ambulance service - and I have already answered the question in regard to air ambulance service - I don't think I would make any special commitment in that respect now.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wainwright followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge East.

Rural Gas - Taxes

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Provincial Treasurer. In view of the fact that farmers who paid the capital cost to the rural gas lines in 1973 are having their tax returns reassessed by not allowing the full amount paid as they were led to believe, my question is: has the Provincial Treasurer had any further discussion with the federal authorities on this matter?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, this is an unfortunate situation but in discussion and correspondence, the federal Minister of National Revenue indicated in a reply to me that he apologized for the fact that his department, through the tax offices of Calgary and Edmonton in particular, had given out the wrong advice or the wrong interpretation. Certainly people in good conscience and good faith, based on what they felt was the proper source to have adequate information on the income tax laws, had passed this advice in good conscience and good faith to individual farmers in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, after communication with the Minister of National Revenue of the federal government, it appears as though he is not prepared to take any action other than to indicate that he apologizes for the error on the part of his department.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question to the minister. Would the minister consider making representations to the federal authorities to spread out the payment of the tax on this, because of the injustice that has risen from the statement?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I thought I indicated that I had indicated to the federal Minister of National Revenue and also the federal Minister of Finance that the Alberta government felt it was very unjust that an interpretation of The Income Tax Act had gone from the Department of National Revenue of the federal government which people acted upon in good faith.

I indicated this to the federal ministers. The only indication of any action they were prepared to take was to express their apologies. Unfortunately, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that appears to be the position of the federal government on the matter.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary. Would not the minister consider making another attempt to have this rectified?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I am always prepared to make attempts on matters of this kind.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge East followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Foothills.

Gas Supply - Eastern Canada

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Mines and Minerals. Has the minister any information that Pan-Alberta Gas Ltd. has refused to provide TransCanada PipeLines with additional gas required to supply eastern Canada this winter?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, on the permit which the government approved for removal from Alberta of natural gas on the application of Pan-Alberta, a quarter of that was to go to Gaz Metropolitain in Quebec. The balance of three-quarters, it was stipulated, would be offered to the three utility companies in the province of Ontario. It is my understanding that offer was made and not accepted by the three utility companies. It was also my understanding that an approach was made by TransCanada PipeLines to Pan-Alberta to purchase that gas, and no agreement has been reached. Pan-Alberta hasn't agreed to sell them that gas. It is also my understanding that Pan-Alberta does have other customers who are in a position to take that gas in the provinces of Quebec, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and even the province of British Columbia.

One of the conditions of the Gaz Metropolitain situation was that TransCanada would act as a contract carrier. After that arrangement was reached, TransCanada reversed its position and said they would no longer be considered a contract carrier, although prior to that time they had stipulated on many occasions that they would be prepared to act as a contract carrier. They did however indicate that reversing that policy would not affect the contract with Gaz Metropolitain.

MR. ANDERSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. How does Pan-Alberta plan to deliver this excess gas to eastern Canada?

AN HON. MEMBER:

In pails.

MR. DICKIE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, Pan-Alberta is now utilizing TransCanada PipeLines as a contract carrier. I would assume that if they make further arrangements, say with Gaz Metropolitain, they would use TransCanada again to carry that extra gas.

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary question on this, Mr. Speaker. I was wondering if the government of Alberta - maybe I should be asking this question to the hon. the Premier - has the Government of Alberta made any representation to Ontario which is apparently discouraging the three major gas companies in Ontario from dealing directly and bidding on Pan-Alberta gas?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes. In addition to making such representations, I suggested to the Premier of Ontario that it would be helpful if he encouraged the Ontario utilities to spend part of their financial resources in terms of exploration in western Canada.

While I'm on my feet, I want to make it clear that the Government of Alberta does not intend to move in a policy direction which would put us back in the very unfortunate position of four years ago, in being faced with a monopoly by buyer in TransCanada PipeLines.

Natural Gas Export Prices

MR. DIXON:

A final supplementary question to the hon. the Premier, or maybe to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Have any meetings been held with the hon. minister, Mr. Macdonald, the federal Minister of Energy, or any other federal officials, since the federal minister announced the proposed price of gas for export at the border?

MR. GETTY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues the Minister of Mines and Minerals and the Minister of Industry and Commerce and other officials have had a meeting with the Minister of Energy.

MR. DIXON:

A final supplementary question, hon. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Have any decisions been made, will anything be changed as far as the producer is concerned, and his price?

MR. GETTY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd refer this matter to my colleague the Minister of Mines and Minerals.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, we have met with the transmission companies to get their views, and make sure we appreciate how they propose to transmit the border price of \$1 to the producers. We are presently receiving that information and it would appear that it won't be necessary to make any changes that will affect the amount they will be receiving.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Special Education for the Handicapped

MR. McCRAE:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education. In August the minister announced the appointment of a committee to undertake, through independent researchers, an evaluation of the special education programs for the handicapped. I wonder if he might report to the House on the status of those studies.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, certain school boards do receive extra moneys over and above the regular foundation program grants for the extra costs incurred in classes involving special education students with handicaps. The study has been ongoing now for about five weeks. It does cover all the various special education courses at the moment.

MR. McCRAE:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister might consider giving priority to any areas where concerned parents request priority for the studies?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I think if concerned parents in a particular area or with regard to a certain school board's programs made representations, I would attempt to have the committee initiate, in cooperation with the board, studies in a particular area such as the visually impaired or hearing handicapped as a priority, with a view to getting those recommendations out more quickly.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Acupuncture Legislation

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Will the minister be bringing in legislation to restrict the practice of acupuncture to licensed physicians with specialized training?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the government hasn't yet made public a final position on the subject of acupuncture as to what the policy should be. We have kept close track of developments in other provinces and the various approaches that have come up as to how it should be regulated. Because the opinion seems to be widely held that it should indeed be regulated.

In answer specifically to the question about legislation, my belief is that it can be regulated under existing legislation.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, and this question is not intended to needle the minister.

Mr. Speaker, can the hon. minister advise whether the minister will be giving official recognition to accredited Alberta doctors who are qualified to (a) make professional diagnosis to patients wishing acupuncture treatments, and (b) to prescribe and administer acupuncture treatments?

The second part, Mr. Speaker, of my question is: will the minister advise whether these services, when rendered, will be included under the Alberta Health Care insurance program for payment?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think on the question of the health care insurance plan the hon. Solicitor General would perhaps be the one to comment on that.

As far as the role of doctors is concerned, I think it's fairly widely accepted that although acupuncturists may not themselves be doctors no province has yet gone so far as to permit acupuncture without it taking place in a clinic-type setting where a physician is responsible for whatever procedures are carried out.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the hon. minister advise whether or not the department would permit the establishment of acupuncture clinics in Alberta, staffed by qualified doctors, similar to the ones established in other areas?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my only response is that we have been interested in the way it is being handled in British Columbia, which is basically what the hon. member's question relates to, and that does seem to be one of the workable alternatives in handling the entire field.

MR. HO LEM:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise whether or not the government will permit the practice of acupuncture in Alberta hospitals?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter on which we have consulted the College of Physicians and Surgeons, the whole matter of the practice acupuncture, not only in hospitals. I began by saying to the hon. member that the policy had not yet been promulgated in respect to acupuncture. Implied in that is that the recommendations received on the subject, including those from the College of Physicians and Surgeons, haven't yet been fully digested and rationalized by the minister.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary by the hon. Member for Little Bow, followed by a question by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, to the minister. How many people are practising acupuncture in Alberta who are not doctors of medicine or professional doctors?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member would be surprised if I gave him the figure. I think the question is one that is well suited to the Order Paper insofar as the government would be able to ascertain that information.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Agricultural Societies Funds

MR. WYSE:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. I understand approximately \$1.2 million is still not paid to the 1973 projects of the Agricultural Societies association - under the PEP program is it? What is the reason they haven't been paid, Mr. Speaker, at this time?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, the honorable gentleman's information is rather sadly lacking. If he comes up with the right program and gives me some information, I'll answer it.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. When will the government be announcing the funds available to agricultural societies for the building of multipurpose arenas?

DR. HORNER:

In due course, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK:

A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will "due course" come before freeze-up?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, we're having a beautiful fall and I would hope that wouldn't be related to the freezing.

MR. CLARK:

A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is the government prepared to enlarge the grandstand in light of problems caused by frost and weather conditions this winter, in light of the late announcement?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, the program which has now been in effect for three years has been very well accepted throughout rural Alberta. One of the major reasons it was brought forward was to provide additional employment opportunities in those rural communities during the winter season. So my honorable friend rather forgets the original import and the impetus that went into the program in the first place.

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the final supplementary. We're running very short of time. There are a number of hon. members who have not yet asked their first question.

MR. CLARK:

I may forget the import, the minister forgot the question. Will there be some additional money available?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I think we've been extremely generous with the grants we've made to these communities throughout rural Alberta. Over the past three years, a program that was never even thought about by the former government, and has had major impact in improving the ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Cut it out.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Order please. Order please. Perhaps we might come to this question on another day.

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

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education, but before I pose the question, I'd like to comment that I hope the cowboys are still ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member is not entitled to make comments unless he wishes to put them on the Order Paper first.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, it was not a question I intended. I was just going to state that I hope the cowboys ...

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Order, order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Does the hon. member have a question or does he wish to make a comment on another occasion?

U. of C. - Journalism School

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question and I hope I don't get a lesson in bull throwing when I ask it.

It's a question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education. When he discussed the question of establishing additional faculties with The University of Calgary, was the school of journalism discussed?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, we may well have a letter of intent from The University of Calgary concerning the establishment of a school of journalism. It doesn't come to mind immediately but I could check it if you like.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister advise whether he is prepared to support the establishment of a school of journalism at The University of Calgary?

MR. FOSTER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd be prepared to advise on that point once I've had an opportunity of assessing it and reviewing it in some detail.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller followed by the hon. Member for Camrose.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary to the hon. minister first. Would applications be received from The Edmonton Journal and The Calgary Herald?

Teachers' Pensions

MR. TAYLOR:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the hon. Minister of Education. Has any progress been made towards increasing the pensions of the women teachers who retired prior to 1970? I believe you were going to look into this during the summer.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, it's under very active review at this time. Certainly we have been in correspondence with a large number of these ladies over the course of the last year.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Driedmeat Lake Weir

MR. STROMBERG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was wondering if the Minister of the Environment could inform me, now that the \$1 million Driedmeat Lake weir is a reality, if construction will start in 1975 or 1974?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, it is expected that construction will start this winter.

Oil Sands - Waterfowl Fatalities

MR. YURKO:

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer a question in regard to dead ducks which I was asked yesterday.

AN HON. MEMBER:

... sitting over there now.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the department and Syncrude have been aware of the problem of waterfowl getting into the tailings pond at the Syncrude pilot plant for the last couple of years. The tailings pond is in connection with the old pilot plant and not with the new plant.

Syncrude was prepared to fill in the old pond due to this problem, but their consultants advised them against it until such tests could be conducted to determine methods of keeping the birds away from the tailings pond. Their environmental research associates in Edmonton conducted experimental tests during the fall migratory period and have obtained very useful information. This experiment will be continued, and at the conclusion of the tests the pond will be filled in.

The consultants estimated that approximately 25 to 30 birds have become entrapped in the old tailings pond during a period of ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. minister is actually making an announcement which might be made on another part of the daily routine.

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

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, I have asked my question.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Senior Citizens Subsidies

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question today to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development, and maybe to the hon. the Provincial Treasurer. I don't know who is responsible. It is regarding money.

In light of the present inflationary food prices, is the government planning any increase before the end of the year in the \$10 a month allowance which it gives to those senior citizens in Alberta who receive the federal government subsidy?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the new program which was brought in about a year ago by the government was, as the hon. member points out, very well received by senior citizens and falls into an area which is both policy in regard to overall approaches to the situation of senior citizens within the province, as well as a budgetary matter.

So on that basis, all I can say to the hon. member at the present time is that the issue receives continuing consideration by the government with a view to various factors, including the cost of living.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Little Bow.

Industrial Health Officer

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Manpower and Labour. What were the

reasons for Dr. May, the industrial health officer, resigning, as was aired by CHED radio in a broadcast this morning? Possibly another minister has that responsibility.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member might ask his question directly without reference to a radio broadcast for the accuracy of which he may make himself responsible.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

I am responsible.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the hon. member's question is premature or whether it is based on a wrong premise. My information, as of today, is that Dr. May has not resigned and that there has been some discussion of whether or not he would continue his, I think, lengthening and notable career with the government. But no decision has been taken by him or certainly by the government, and he is continuing discussions with senior officials in the department.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. At present is there a shortage of support and field staff for the office of industrial health officer?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that's a matter of opinion. I would just point out to the hon. member that the estimates of the department from earlier this year, if my memory serves me correctly, did show something like a 23 per cent increase in manpower alone in that division of the department and, of course, with it the necessary additional financial support.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER:

There is a matter arising out of last night's proceedings which I should like to be permitted to refer to. Hon. members may recall that the hon. Member for Little Bow proposed an amendment to Government Motion No. 3.

The intent of the amendment was that the hon. Premier's report be not received and concurred in. The Chair ruled the amendment out of order as being a direct negative of the latter part of said government motion.

An analogy might be a motion that Alberta Day be celebrated on July 15 and an amendment saying that it should not be celebrated on July 15. Such an amendment is a direct negative to the motion. It does not amend the motion. To adopt the amendment would simply defeat the motion, not amend or change it. Thus, the remedy is simply to vote against the motion rather than to move an amendment which, in effect, merely asks the Assembly to vote against the motion.

This very practical principle is to be found in Beauchesne in Citation 202(12) and in Bourinot's second edition at pages 31 and 32.

I mention this now for two reasons, one being to give an explanation of the ruling and the other to express my regret that there was no opportunity given to hon. members to discuss the point of order before the ruling was made.

Under the circumstances the result would have had to be the same, and hon. members will agree that they would not want to hear debate on every point of order that might come up in the Assembly. That would be an enormous waste of the time of the House.

However, it is to be hoped that the Chair will remember that hon. members should have an opportunity to express their views when an unusual point of order arises which is as important as the one that occurred as a result of the very important amendment by the hon. Member for Little Bow. I regret that hon. members did not have that opportunity last night.

QUESTIONS

214. Mr. French asked the government the following question:

The amount of provincial government assistance by way of (a) grants and (b) guarantees during the past two years for each of the following airport developments: Vegreville, Hinton, Lac La Biche, Fort Vermilion, Rainbow Lake, St. Paul, High Prairie, Drumheller, Drayton Valley and Barrhead.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I accept Question 214.

218. Mr. Sorenson asked the government the following question:

- (1) What were the total number of placements through Government Temporary Staff Services from September 1, 1973 to September 30, 1974?
- (2) What were the total number of temporary staff placements effected through private placement firms from September 1, 1973 to September 30, 1974?
- (3) What was the name or names of these firms?
- (4) What was the total commission paid to these firms from September 1, 1974 to September 30, 1974?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, we accept the question on the assumption that "commission" is a synonymous term for fees.

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

1. How many:
 - (a) senior citizens lodges
 - (b) senior citizens apartmentswere built in:
 - (1) Edmonton
 - (2) Calgary
 - (3) the rest of the province
 - (A) during the fiscal year April 1, 1973 to March 31, 1974?
 - (B) during the period April 1, 1974 to September 30, 1974?
2. How many:
 - (a) lodges
 - (b) apartmentsare on the drawing board for construction during the balance of the present fiscal year in:
 - (1) Calgary
 - (2) Edmonton
 - (3) the rest of the province?
3. How many persons were on the waiting list for lodges or apartments in:
 - (1) Calgary
 - (2) Edmonton
 - (3) the rest of the provinceas of June 30, 1974?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

215. Mr. Strom proposed the following motion to this Assembly:

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:
The terms and conditions of the contract negotiated between David E. Mitchell and the Alberta Energy Company for his services as President and Chief Executive Officer, including salary, stock options and any other fringe benefits?

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I move the motion standing in my name on the Order Paper.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, this motion on the Order Paper is a return that I believe the House should not approve, or perhaps the hon. member might even consider withdrawing it.

It has nothing to do with the information which is requested, Mr. Speaker, but rather with the fact that it really goes against the concept and principle of the Alberta Energy Company as it has been explained and established in this Legislature.

Hon. members will remember from the spring session that I think there was general agreement that while the company would be owned 50 per cent by the Government of Alberta,

in most other respects it would operate like any other company in our province. For instance, shares would trade on the stock exchange. There would be a board of directors who would run it and the government would not intrude or become involved in the day-to-day management of the company, but our ownership interest would be represented by members of the board of directors.

I believe we have an outstanding group of Albertans who are on this board. They are respected across the province. I have every confidence that they will come up with a satisfactory and good arrangement with Mr. Mitchell.

I don't believe they, as a matter of fact, have as yet worked out such a contract with him. At least I notice that was his response when asked by a member of the media.

But, Mr. Speaker, the motion for a return itself implies the difference between the government and the company. It's "The terms and conditions of the contract negotiated between David E. Mitchell and the Alberta Energy Company ...", not the government.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that interested members could well approach the company, or Mr. Mitchell himself, but not request the government to so quickly break in principle the concept under which this unique company was established. Otherwise we would probably end up treating the company almost as a Crown corporation, and that was not the intention. If we continue on this path, I think the members would agree we could be constantly having requests that, while they probably would be well-meaning, would mean that the government would in fact be becoming more and more involved with the company, at least as to its everyday management decisions.

I note that the leader of the member's party, the leader outside the Legislature, when Mr. Mitchell was appointed by the board of the Alberta Energy Company spoke of the independence Mr. Mitchell should have. He admonished the government to live up to their statements, to in fact not become involved and not to get into the everyday management and suggested that we'd have to be very careful not to. We don't want to become involved in this type of day-to-day matter. We don't intend to, Mr. Speaker.

So I believe in recognition of this concept and of the unique company that we have just now starting in Alberta. Either we should turn down the motion for a return, or request the hon. member not to ask us to break this concept so quickly, and perhaps even withdraw it.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I am certainly surprised at the attitude of the hon. minister. We now know that we must pursue this question and get the answer. He says we do not want to and we do not intend to. The minister is not in a position to say, we do not intend to. The House will determine whether he intends to or not.

We feel that there's something here that the government isn't particularly proud of.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They're hiding.

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes. So the opposition wants to get information. I was just reading some speeches of the hon. members in front there - how they were going to do away with any secrecy. So that's what we're trying to do away with. I know that the minister's views are that he'd like to keep this confidential somehow, keep it quiet, keep it from the public knowledge for the time being. He says "so quickly", as if there's merit in waiting.

Maybe you can stall this thing, but I have an idea that this business of providing highly paid jobs for people has to be out in public. We're not jumping to any conclusions. It's a simple question and the minister says, no we don't want to tell you this. So he gets up and he does a good job of defending or putting up a plea in mitigation of what the House might do because he says: we don't want to tell you; we don't think it's necessary; ask Mitchell.

I suppose perhaps the minister should have said, well, if I get Mr. Mitchell's permission I'll give you the information.

I think we have to fight this kind of nonsense, Mr. Speaker. The minister knows better. It's a legitimate question. If we can hide this kind of information from the public, then we can expect this government to load up some of these companies with their own recommended appointees and have a real pork barrel.

You might say, why should I suspect this government of doing this thing? The question is, I ought to, Mr. Speaker, I ought to suspect them. They've shown that they not only will give preference to those leaning towards them politically, they're proud of it. They do things in this province that a few years ago would have been shocking.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, come on.

MR. LUDWIG:

Where sometimes they would say, well, we perhaps have appointed some political supporter, the exception could be found. But with these people it's the rule. You've got to beat the bush pretty hard in Calgary, Mr. Speaker, to find some good Conservative supporter who hasn't got some kind of position now. Whether he had any qualifications or not, a word to the wise was sufficient, Mr. Speaker. So we're going to fight this kind of thing. The minister doesn't have to tell us anything. His refusal reveals quite a bit,

the fact that he says, well it's a little too quick. The time to ask a question is right now.

I remember the hon. members jumping up and down here and they said, now, we've got to have it now. But the minister says, let's keep this quiet, maybe we'll let you know later, after the election preferably. If the minister is not proud of what he did he should stand up and state, well, we'd like to keep this thing quiet a little longer, but be outspoken and forthright instead of trying to sort of make it look as if there's something wrong in asking a question like this.

The hon. [member] who moved this motion ought not to withdraw it. In fact we should get down and press every point possible to get this answer. The government cannot possibly try this kind of nonsense on the Legislature and then hope to set a precedent, and state, well, in the question and the motion for a return moved with regard to the salary of Mr. Mitchell, the House ruled that we shouldn't give them that information. So there's a precedent. We want to avoid this. I am sure that maybe some of the hon. members on the other side know.

I wonder what right we have got to go around the province seeking information from someone who doesn't even have to talk to us. He doesn't have to give us an answer. We want a reliable answer from the minister. And the minister says, well, whatever reason I have, I don't want to give it to you. That isn't good enough. In fact it is a sort of shirking of the responsibilities of a minister to provide information wherever possible. There's absolutely not a single rule any place that states that this information ought not to be given, except the minister says, I've got enough support behind me that I'm on quite safe ground to say we're not going to give it. When the minister says, we don't want to give it, I know that. I understand that. If he wanted to, he'd give it without any breach of any kind of confidence or anything, because if Mitchell's hiring is confidential, then we have this government in perhaps more embarrassment than it cares to admit.

So, Mr. Speaker, my stand is, and I'm going to continue this stand, let's quit playing games. Let's put our hands on the table and keep this thing clean. Give us the information and we'll quit bugging you for it. We'll keep after this information until we get it, and the easiest place and the most reliable place, I think, is right here in the Legislature. If any kind of public funds is going to be spent in hiring anybody, especially someone who may have had the blessing of the provincial government in the appointment, then let's have it. Otherwise my position is that if the minister doesn't want to give it, he's deliberately hiding information that we want, and he knows best why he's hiding it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I never cease to be surprised at the attitudes of the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, but I shouldn't really be surprised because I've known him for quite a long time.

I know that sometimes he gets a little confused and this shouldn't be mixed up with hypocrisy. But I can remember just a day or two ago I was sort of half listening with half an ear when he was propounding the principles of free enterprise. Now, today, he sounds like a bureaucrat or a socialist who really doesn't believe this Alberta Energy Company ...

MR. CLARK:

You can do better than that, come on ...

MR. FARRAN:

He doesn't believe it should function on free enterprise rules.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order I believe that the minister was taking issue with my demands for information and he has commenced to become very personal. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if that's the best effort the minister can do he should sit down ...

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Order.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member, as he well knows, is not entitled to interrupt another speaker, except perhaps on a possible question of being misinterpreted or a genuine point of order.

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. On the point of order which I did not finish, the hon. minister started making reference to socialism and me being a socialist. I think that's being personal, Mr. Speaker. I have to take a stand here that I don't think you'd allow me to carry on that way, Mr. Speaker, and I think you should stop this nonsense.

MR. FARRAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't talking about what he actually is, because I understand this well enough. I was talking about the so-called principles he was expounding, Mr. Speaker, if he really understands principles. Because I do understand one thing and that is when he's muckraking.

If the hon. member really believes that the Alberta Energy Company should operate as a free enterprise company, then surely it should operate under the same rules as any other free enterprise company, and not have the bicycle ridden for it, so to speak, by the government.

MR. CLARK:

Will you change the legislation?

MR. FARRAN:

If you really believe this, then if you want information from the Alberta Energy Company the proper way is to write a letter to them. I suggest that it should be a polite letter not containing the sort of smears the hon. member has been throwing around in the last few minutes, Mr. Speaker. I presume that the Alberta Energy Company's directors, responsible to the shareholders under our free enterprise system, will send you a polite letter back - send the hon. member a polite letter back, Mr. Speaker.

The point of the hon. Minister for Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs is one of principle. It's not one of the information referred to in the motion. I'm sure that at least some of the members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition understand principles, if not the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

MR. LUDWIG:

Would the hon. minister permit a question, Mr. Speaker? Would the hon. minister advise whether he had been dipping into the sauce before he made those remarks, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame.

[Interjections]

MR. LUDWIG:

I'm waiting for an answer, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. On the contrary, the Chair would ask the hon. minister not to reply in case the matter might escalate.

I would respectfully ask the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View if he might consider explaining his remark in such a way that there would be no implication that the hon. minister is inebriated.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I didn't make any, even the slightest, innuendo that he was. I asked him a question. He was abusive towards me. He was personal, Mr. Speaker ...

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Order please. The hon. member is not entitled to repay alleged abuse in kind. I would ask him if he would kindly advert again to the remark which he made concerning the hon. minister, and whether he might be willing to explain that remark in such a way so that it will be clear that he is not suggesting that the hon. minister was intoxicated when he entered the debate.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question may well have implied it, but if the minister answers me I will explain my position. I've asked him a question ...

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Order please.

DR. WARRACK:

Explain.

MR. SPEAKER:

I would ask the hon. member to give serious consideration to explaining his remarks in such a way that the implication which I have mentioned twice may not be taken from those remarks.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like the opportunity of reviewing the Hansard remarks of the hon. minister and I will consider my position after this.

[Interjections]

The hon. Deputy Premier can stand here and listen to personal abuse, and then they get touchy when I throw one at them. It's tough, isn't it.

[Interjections]

They were listening to the minister abuse me in a personal manner and I gave him a shot that he had coming. Now I want to read Hansard and see what my position is before I do anything.

MR. COOKSON:

Mr. Speaker ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

You're a real two-bitter.

MR. COOKSON:

... in all fairness the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View has made a charge. You've asked him to explain it or withdraw it. I think that should be carried through.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, lest we get carried away with soya sauce or whatever sauce we are talking about, I would like to ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Explain.

[Interjections]

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

DR. BUCK:

... I'm entitled to make a few comments on this motion.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Haven't we asked the hon. member - I heard you ask him to explain the matter so that it would not in any way leave some kind of shadow over the hon. minister's head. Certainly I gather you detected that in the way he asked his question in fact he did leave some kind of imputation that should now be cleared up ...

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. GETTY:

... and on the point of order and the way the House is going to be run, I think it is only fair that he do that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is another matter connected with this which I have not heretofore mentioned. I was not sure whether I heard the hon. minister refer to the hon. member for Calgary Mountain View as having been muckraking. I said nothing about it because I wasn't sure that I heard it. I wanted to check Hansard to see whether that had in fact been said and it was my intention to refer to it tomorrow. However, this is a separate question which the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View will have to trust the Chair to deal with and I would suggest that we now deal with the question which is before the House.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, when the word "muckraking" was used by the hon. minister it was little more than innuendo. So I used an innuendo of a similar kind. I want the ...

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. It is now quite clear. Hon. members have heard the remark made by the hon. minister. There is no purpose, no need, for the Chair to check Hansard in that regard. There is certainly no need for the Chair or other hon. members to check Hansard as to what the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View has just said. I would respectfully repeat my urging to the hon. member. With great respect and sincerity I would ask him if he would consider making an explanation of his remarks of a kind which might remove the imputation which I have referred to two or three times.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I now rise on a point of privilege, that I listened for about five minutes to the kind of personal abuse that the Speaker does not generally permit in this House. The word "muckraking" is an unparliamentary statement. I took it. The innuendo - I'm on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to finish - about some hon. members drinking is something that has been said in parliament from as far back as you can remember. If the hon. minister is sensitive about this, he should be a little more concerned about the feelings of others. As far as muckraking is concerned, when I make a demand in this House for information and stand here in support of a motion I'm not at all interested in any minister lording it over me and saying that I'm muckraking. That is unparliamentary. Now he did not state that directly. Nor did I state that he did dabble in the sauce. I threw him the kind of innuendo he threw at me and it's fair ball, Mr. Speaker ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Order please. The Chair ...

MR. LUDWIG:

... [Inaudible] ... then the hon. minister ...

MR. SPEAKER:

... the Chair must respectfully decline to follow the hon. member in mixing up the two points. There can be no question that one bit of unparliamentary language may not be a justification for another. I have assured the hon. member that I intend to deal with the other situation. It is not fair to expect the Chair to deal with both situations at once. I would ask the hon. member again, most respectfully and sincerely, if he would kindly consider making an explanation of his remark to remove that innuendo.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I want to make an explanation. I want all the time that I require to make a proper explanation.

The hon. Speaker just stated that one retort of that kind does not merit a reply in kind. But I would say, Mr. Speaker, in the interests of fairness, that the retort is more justifiable than the initial ...

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

MR. LUDWIG:

... and, Mr. Speaker, the remark I made to the hon. minister, whether he had been dipping into the sauce before he made those remarks, was - his remarks were so foolish. I did not mean to imply that he was hitting the bottle. Far be it from me to make such an implication in this House ...

[Interjections]

... I'm trying to explain my position ...

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The Chair would respectfully suggest that the House might accept the full and complete explanation which the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View has made, and perhaps now the hon. minister might wish to make some appropriate remarks with regard to the other expression that was referred to.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear the explanation or the apology. First of all, let me say quite clearly that I have not been dipping in any sauce. I've been in my office all day.

MR. SPEAKER:

May I suggest to the hon. minister that that matter is completely closed. I would suggest that the hon. minister might wish to say something to the House as to the

expression which he was heard by the members to have used, namely the allegation of muckraking against the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, and the Chair would very much welcome an explanation from the hon. minister which might perhaps explain that expression or remove it in some way.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I assume that the hon. member did withdraw and apologize over the remark he made about me and I will now talk about muckraking.

I was not aware that the word "muckraking" was unparliamentary. I am aware of what muckthrowing is, but if the term was objectionable to the hon. member I am only too happy to withdraw it.

[Applause]

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, there are days like this when sometimes a member wonders what he is doing in this place ...

[Interjections]

... and, Mr. Speaker, I am more and more appalled at the treatment that we on this side of the House receive when we are asking for legitimate information, asking for it, we think, legitimately to protect the interests of the people of this province, and we have abuse heaped upon our heads. I really wonder, Mr. Speaker, what the democratic process is trying to serve.

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair]

We are asking this question because we think it's information that the people of this province should have. As the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View says, if the government will not give us that information we must draw the inference that there is something they're trying to hide. The worst thing that can happen to public officials is when they try to hide things, because that's when you really get into problems.

I asked the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce the other day what certain members of the AOC were being paid and he said look it up, it's in some section. All I wanted to know was the number of dollars the people received and the number of meetings they have to go to. When we do ask things like this, Mr. Speaker, this is the legitimate role of the opposition. In the three years I've seen this government in operation, Mr. Speaker, I have never never seen the display of arrogance that the former government displayed in '32 or 35 years of power that these gentlemen on the other side have shown in three years.

Mr. Speaker, when they come out with their battle cry of 75 in '75, they don't need 75 with the totalitarian system they've got over there now. The 49 they're using now who rubber-stamp everything really make me wonder what the dickens I'm doing in this Legislature.

I feel frustrated because any legitimate amendment this side of the House gives is completely ignored. The other night my honorable friend from Calgary Mountain View in his fine, easygoing manner asked the hon. Attorney General several questions and when the Attorney General sat there and did not answer any of them I couldn't believe it. I think if I had been in the hon. Attorney General's position I would have jumped over that chair and given the hon. member the coup de grace because I don't think the minister - what's the term, hon. minister? I think we are being treated just like we don't matter. I'm starting to think that we really don't matter because the members on that side of the House really don't want any input from this side of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

DR. BUCK:

The golden-haired boys have all the answers.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

DR. BUCK:

Then when we have these beautiful forums running around the province after the fact - after the fact in eight out of ten instances - then I really think it's a charade they're pulling on the people of this province when they want public input.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It's ridiculous.

DR. BUCK:

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to say the information we want is legitimate. We want it for a legitimate reason, not only to get the information for our sake and for the sake of the taxpayers but so the government is not brought under any suspicion, because the minute they reject this information, Mr. Speaker, they are under a cloud of suspicion.

My advice to my honorable friends across the way is give us the information that ends the issue. When the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs says, well, ask the man ... They set up the company, they were proud of it when they blazed it across The Edmonton Journal. Why aren't they so proud of it now? Why aren't they so proud of it now to give us the information?

[Interjections]

All we want is information.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That's why you're here, eh?

DR. BUCK:

And, Mr. Speaker, as Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition we're entitled to that information ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

DR. BUCK:

... or the hon. minister is going to have to give us a better explanation than he gave about why he is trying to hide it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. Member ...

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to state that this company, whether it is touted as a private enterprise company or not, is a company that is established by an act of this Legislature and as such is theoretically owned by - at least the shares of the company theoretically are 50 per cent owned by the people of the province which is [by] public funds.

To go and get the information privately is all well and good. It is a good thing for all of the people who have a share. But it would create a large problem for all of them to get the information to [which they] have a right to know some details, the type of which are being asked in this motion for a return. I think it's only a fair question to be raising with regard to concern for the people's investment in the energy company.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I think Motion for a Return No. 215 gives rise to the debate we're in today which I think is a very, very important principle for all members of the Assembly to consider.

Certainly with respect to many things that government is involved in in the nature of a Crown corporation or border agency, where anything for which this government on behalf of this Legislature takes the full and complete management responsibility, there is no question about any motion for a return with respect to those kinds of operations, Mr. Speaker, being proper and valid ones.

I would like to ask hon. members to very carefully consider the principle we on this side are discussing which arises out of Motion for a Return No. 215 and make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that the actual item requested in Motion for a Return No. 215 gives no problem for the government. But we do think the motion gives rise to an important principle which we in this House at this time should consider and should debate. It has implications to many of the things that government may do in partnership with the people of Alberta in the future.

Mr. Speaker, going back to the creation of the Alberta Energy Company, the Alberta Energy Company, as all hon. members will recall, was a unique concept between government and the citizens of Alberta and many I have talked to in the financial communities throughout the world have said a unique concept in the first of its kind, not just in Canada or North America, but perhaps in the world; a concept of 50-50 partnership between the Government of the Province of Alberta and the citizens of the province of Alberta.

From the very beginning, Mr. Speaker, we said this concept and this partnership would not be government controlled. A partnership by its very nature, although it is in a sheer structure, is one, Mr. Speaker, where the government's rights and the citizens' rights are equal in an equal partnership opportunity. But it would not be - and members on the other side have been aware from the beginning that the concept of the Alberta Energy Company was that it would not be government controlled. We all supported that principle, Mr. Speaker, and it was an important principle and a unique and first kind of company in the province of Alberta.

We have also said during the course of questions that the citizens of Alberta would appoint the majority of the board of directors of the Alberta Energy Company. Although the government or the Crown would own 50 per cent of the shares we would have the citizens, when they subsequently purchase shares, appoint the majority of the members of the board of directors.

Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is: in the relationship between this Legislature and the Government of the Province of Alberta and the Alberta Energy Company, the very

concept that we have all agreed on and supported from the beginning should be the concept of this company. I don't think our rights as shareholders, as government, should be any different from those of the rights of an individual Alberta shareholder in the Alberta Energy Company. I think that's an important principle for us to bear in mind.

Mr. Speaker, it's important, in my view, that all hon. members of the Assembly consider this principle on this motion, not just in terms of this company but in terms of what government and this Assembly may do in the future; realize that whatever we do with this motion will have implications, not just for the subject matter of the motion but, in fact, with respect to the entire management and everything that the management and the Board of directors of the Alberta Energy Company does in the future.

In other words it would be easy, Mr. Speaker, to give the information in the subject matter of the motion. But if we, as legislators, commence now to interfere with the management of this company we have violated the entire principle and concept, in my view, of the Alberta Energy Company, and I think not on our side, Mr. Speaker. That is why we are debating the principle. But on the other side they are doing that by the very nature of insisting that, in their view, this motion should proceed.

One hon. member, Mr. Speaker, indicated that the reason we should answer this motion for a return is because there is an Act of the Legislature creating this company. Mr. Speaker, there are many acts of the Legislature which allow the creation or formation of a company, or a variety of companies, which doesn't mean by all governments since the history of Alberta.

AN HON. MEMBER:

By whom?

MR. MINIELY:

The Alberta Gas Trunk Line is a good example.

MR. CLARK:

No.

MR. MINIELY:

We have no right, Mr. Speaker, in my view, to interfere with the internal management of Alberta Gas Trunk Line. We have no right to interfere with the operation of many private insurance companies that are incorporated under The Alberta Insurance Act. It is no different.

[Interjections]

The hon. members on the other side can rationalize it all they want but it is no different. The point is that they want the Legislature to interfere with the management of a private company in the province of Alberta.

MR. LUDWIG:

Just tell us what's going on.

MR. MINIELY:

Well I don't accept that principle, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps they can, but I don't accept that principle. Not when we, as legislators, have said it would be different. And we said it would be different. We said that the government would not control the Alberta Energy Company.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it not only has implications for the Alberta Energy Company but for future partnerships that may arise between the Government of Alberta and the citizens of Alberta. I think it also, in terms of accomplishing this unique concept in the future, will jeopardize the ability for this kind of concept to proceed - the very thing that people on all sides have talked about, the concept of free enterprise, with government, the private sector and private citizens working together.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, in my view, if the legislators of the Alberta Assembly insist on interfering with the internal management ...

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. MINIELY:

... of the Alberta Energy Company we will not ... [Interjections] ... public funds as shareholders, Mr. Speaker, not as managers, not as controllers - public funds as shareholders, public funds as partners with the people of Alberta ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

There are only five shareholders.

MR. MINIELY:

... not in the concept of managers. This is the thing they don't seem to understand on the other side.

If we insist on interfering with the internal management of the Alberta Energy Company, as I have said before, we are violating the basic thing that all members of this

House supported - the basic principle of the company. We are also, in my view, taking the risk that the very top competent people in the province of Alberta who are prepared to come in and manage an exciting company of this nature will not come forward because they do not want interference in the internal management of the company.

Mr. Speaker, for those reasons I feel it is extremely important at this time that legislators on all sides of the House think carefully about the principle that is involved. In my view, Motion No. 215 cannot be supported by the Assembly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, referring to Motion 215, I think there has been an over-reaction and an endeavor on the part of the government member who has spoken to obscure the real facts behind the situation in a volume of words which, mind you, I feel sympathetic to. I feel sympathetic to the remarks of the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs in that there are certain business ethics violated by dragging into the open a person-to-person deal between the directors of the Alberta Energy Company and one of their principals.

However, there is one particular fact I must point out, Mr. Speaker, and that is simply that at this point all of the capital in the Alberta Energy Company has been funded by the Alberta government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. DRAIN:

This is what we are talking about. We are talking about government money. Now there will be a time when a large amount of other money and other shares will be held by Albertans, but never at any time will there be enough shares on the market, having regard for the 50 per cent ownership, to make the Alberta Energy Company other than a creature of this Legislature.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That's right.

MR. DRAIN:

Now this is the direction the government has chosen. The government has to said, with the legislation that set up the Alberta Energy Company, that we will go hand-in-hand with industry but we are going to carry the big stick.

So government in itself will always have a majority. You could say then that you could appeal to the company, but you cannot, in fact, do this because the shares are held by the Government of Alberta - not as a shareholder by any one individual - therefore this recourse [to] information is not available because the government, as such, cannot go there being that it is more of a thing than an entity, in my view. Hence, following the reasoning that this is 100 per cent funded by the public, it is not in fact a public company at this time.

There is some repugnance on the part of the hon. members on the government side, or the implication, in fact, that this is going to be an infringement on the status of the chief executive. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that clearly when a person gets involved in what is not at this time an autonomous company, but a company that is totally funded by the people of the province of Alberta, he should expect some flak.

And if the heat in the kitchen is too warm, we will have to go along with President Truman and open the window.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, in entering this debate, much has been said this afternoon and maybe some members wish they had retracted their statements. The hon. Member for Clover Bar pointed out that maybe the government wished we weren't here. I would say possibly they could vent feelings that way. Nobody likes to be criticized. But I would also say to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs - and maybe I took his remarks wrongly when he said we don't know what the salary would be, it hasn't been set yet.

MR. GETTY:

That's right.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Yet the hon. Provincial Treasurer just finished saying we could get this if we wanted to release it. We could get it right away.

I am a little concerned, Mr. Speaker, because, as the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest has stated, this is neither a Crown corporation nor private enterprise. It was also pointed out we are 50 per cent owners whether we like it or not.

I think it was the hon. minister, Mr. Farran, who pointed out, well, write a letter to the company and find out. If we, as MLAs or the opposition, have to write a letter to

find out what the top executive is getting then I think we have grounds for suspicion. What suspicion have we got? How is his salary going to be determined? If it's on a straight dollar basis, so much. We could say, well, it's \$100,000 or \$75,000, it doesn't make much difference one way or the other. If he's the man the hon. minister thinks he is, he may be entitled to every cent he can get. But what other kind of deal, what percentage of the action: is he getting a set amount? Is he getting a percentage of the action? I think the people have a right to know.

It was pointed out that the government has a controlling interest in the company. The government will have a controlling interest in the company at all times in the future. As the people of Alberta, do we have to go through motions for returns to find out anything we think is wrong with the Alberta Energy Company? Is it the annual reports?

We are not talking at the moment about what the government is going to do or what this company is going to do - its internal workings, the shares they are going to put on the market, what they are going to buy into. But I do think that if we can't find out right from the start - this is the first question that has been asked and the company hasn't even got into action. Yet you won't even disclose the range of salary at which the top executive is going to take over. I suggest that the company is in very serious condition.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, may I close the debate?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I have listened very closely to the arguments that have been given by the members of the government front bench. I would have to say that I haven't heard any arguments yet that has led me to believe that I am asking a question which is wrong in principle.

In my opening remarks I would like to state, Mr. Speaker, that my reason for placing the question on the Order Paper followed as a result of a reply given to me by the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. I would like to draw it to the attention of the House again this afternoon.

My question first was to the minister: "Can he advise the House if the salary for Mr. Mitchell, the chairman of the Alberta Energy Company, has been determined as yet?" His answer to me was, "I can't, Mr. Speaker, because that is a matter that would be determined between the board of directors of the company and Mr. Mitchell ... " and he suggested that I direct my question to the board of directors.

But I did follow it up, Mr. Speaker, with a supplementary question. The supplementary question was: "Is he suggesting to us", that is the hon. minister, "or stating to the House that there have been no discussions with Mr. Mitchell and the government in regard to a possible salary level for himself, and that it was totally left", and I used the word totally, "to the board of directors?"

The answer, and again I think it's rather important, was this:

Mr. Speaker, I think in talking to Mr. Mitchell there may have been some general discussions as to his responsibilities with the company for which he presently works and the level of salary he presently obtains, and that therefore he would be trying not to damage his family earning capacity. But the matter of his salary is something he is going to work out with the board of directors."

Now, Mr. Speaker, my reason for bringing that to the attention of the House is that it was very clear in my mind that the hon. minister had had some discussion with Mr. Mitchell in regard to salary. I'm not being critical of him. I think that this is only as it should have been.

The government has been very, very keen in having the energy company start in on the right track. They have been very anxious that it proceed on the basis that they themselves wanted it to proceed. I would remind them again that when the initial legislation was brought into this House we proposed a number of amendments to it. These were all turned down because the government wanted to be sure that it was operating or going to operate in the manner which they had determined. Again I say, that's fine if that's the way they want it.

But I come back again to the answer the minister gave to me. there was no doubt left in my mind that there had been discussions as to salary. When I see the reluctance of the government to tell us what it is, I am left to make several assumptions. And if the answer had been given, Mr. Speaker, I say that I wouldn't have been able to make any assumptions. One of the assumptions that I make at this time - maybe it's unfair but I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I have to make it - is that the salary is so high that the government does not want this information to come out at this point in time. It would reflect as being extravagant. I'm not saying it is, I'm just saying what my assumption is.

The minister sits and shakes his head. Nevertheless he can shake it from now until the cows come home and I'm not going to change my assumption because that is the way I

read it. He also suggests that of course if they give us this information it establishes a precedent. Nonsense. It does not establish any precedent. The government can cut it off at any point they want to as far as providing information. They have the muscle to do it and that is their prerogative. They can do it.

They can, of course, turn this one down today if they want, and again they have the muscle to do it. But to suggest that it establishes a precedent and they are caught in it is nonsense. They can shut it off wherever they feel like it. They say that as far as giving us this information they could very, very readily give it to us. But the very fact that they won't, Mr. Speaker, can only lead me to assume that the figure is such that they do not want to have it brought out into the open at this point in time.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Now he suggests that it is a private company, a free enterprise company, and I don't know all of the terms that were used to describe the independence of it. Again I say, Mr. Speaker, nonsense. It is a company that is very, very unique in the way it is set up, and it is not set up like other companies at all in spite of what you say.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Public funds.

MR. STROM:

Now let's take a look, for example, at the preferential treatment that is given to the company. You say it's a company just like any other company, yet it is a company that has been told it will have 80 per cent of the pipeline, it will have 20 per cent of Syncrude, it will have 50 per cent of the power company and it will have an undetermined percentage of Suffield. And yet I am told it is just another company. Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept that at all.

Let's go further. That company has been given a promise of \$250 million from the government that they will be able to invest. Again I say, how many other companies are they giving \$250 million to? I'm not aware of very many. Let's go a little further. That's not the only place where I say it's unique - Mr. Mills who worked for the Premier, I understand, is now the secretary. Who hired him?

AN HON. MEMBER:
No, no.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Oh, no.

MR. STROM:

Yet I am told, Mr. Speaker, it is just another private company and who are we to sit over on this side and start interfering with the operations of a private company.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I realize that at the beginning there was an attempt to throw up a smoke screen to take our minds off what we were trying to get. In no way am I going to be sidetracked because I say that we are perfectly within our right to ask this question and get a very straightforward answer.

Mr. Speaker, what would happen if this company got into financial trouble? I'm not suggesting it will because I think the preferential treatment it is being accorded can assume it would never get into difficulty. But nevertheless, taking a hypothetical case, let us suppose it did get into trouble. Is the government suggesting they are not going to do anything about it, that they are going to sit on the sidelines and say, there goes our energy company, good-bye, too bad. No way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that in the early development of the company it is very important that the people of Alberta have a great deal of information. We want to establish confidence and I say, Mr. Speaker, the only way we can establish confidence is by providing the fullest amount of information to the people who are directly involved in it through the investment capital that is provided to them by this government.

I want to make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that in no way do I interpret this as an interference with the operation. My interpretation is that it is merely providing information which the people of Alberta are entitled to have so they may know how their money is being spent.

I am well aware that the chairman, Mr. Mitchell, has stated that he does not want any interference in its operation from the government. Again I can appreciate that. But I am well aware, Mr. Speaker, that he is operating under an act that sets out the terms under which he has to operate.

I would say to the hon. minister who suggested that the Alberta Energy Company - the Provincial Treasurer who is out of his place right now used it as a parallel. I say that this again cannot necessarily be argued as a parallel. If we want to, again, it is subject to the Legislature inasmuch as it is operating under an act that determined what it could do and where it could carry out its business.

Mr. Speaker, I would certainly hope that the government would reconsider its position in regard to the motion I have proposed. I want to make it clear that in no way can this be interpreted as a desire on my part to interfere. But I want to make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that I intend to use whatever means are available to me to get the information I think the people of Alberta are entitled to have.

Thank you.

[Mr. Speaker declared the motion lost. Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung.]

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

For the motion:

Anderson	Clark	Hinman	Sorenson
Barton	Cooper	Ho Lem	Speaker, R.
Benoit	Dixon	Ludwig	Strom
Buck	Drain	Miller, D.	Wyse
Buckwell	French	Ruste	

Against the motion:

Adair	Dowling	Hunley	Peacock
Appleby	Farran	King	Russell
Backus	Fluker	Koziak	Schmid
Batiuk	Foster	Leitch	Stromberg
Chichak	Getty	McCrae	Topolnisky
Cookson	Ghitter	McCrimmon	Trynchy
Copithorne	Hansen	Miller, J.	Warrack
Crawford	Harle	Miniely	Young
Diachuk	Hohol	Moore	Zander
Dickie	Horner	Paproski	

Totals: Ayes - 19 Noes - 39]

216. Mr. Mandeville proposed the following motion to this Assembly:

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

A list of all business trips outside of Alberta which have been taken by Alberta Export Agency personnel or persons acting on their behalf since May 15, 1973 containing the names of the person(s) involved, the dates, the place, the purpose and the cost of each trip.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is just coming to his seat. Can we wait for him to move this motion?

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Mr. Speaker, I move Motion No. 216 standing in my name on the Order Paper.

DR. HORNER:

The motion is agreeable, Mr. Speaker.

[The motion was carried.]

217. Mr. Ruste proposed the following motion to this Assembly:

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

A list of all export contracts which are or have been in effect as a result of the efforts of the Alberta Export Agency giving the names of the principals, the commodities involved, the dollar value thereof and the relevant dates.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, I move Motion No. 217 standing in my name.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, this motion is agreeable subject to the concurrence of the parties involved in the contract, particularly if that contract doesn't involve government money. I want to point out to the hon. member that there are a number of those in which the agency acted only as a catalyzer putting people together. I'm quite willing to approach them in regard to that and in a general way to provide as much information as possible in regard to their activities. But I would point out that there may be certain contracts in which there are two business concerns involved [and] in which no government money is involved; the agency played a role merely in putting the buyer and seller together. In those cases, we would certainly have to have the consent of the involved parties.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, I concur with that. If those could be listed in a category by themselves.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the House will agree that the motion may be amended in the informal manner indicated by the hon. Deputy Premier and the hon. Member for Wainwright, I'll put the question.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[The motion was carried.]

219. Mr. Barton proposed the following motion to this Assembly:

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

1. The number of wildcat exploration wells drilled in Alberta in the past 12 months.
2. The names of the companies doing the drilling.
3. The amount of money paid through the drilling incentive program.
4. The land sales purchased to date since the initiation of the drilling incentive program.
5. The names of the companies which have purchased land reserves under the drilling incentive credit program.

MR. BARTON:

I move Motion No. 219 standing in my name.

MR. DICKIE:

We have no objection to the motion.

[The motion was carried.]

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I would ask for unanimous leave of the House to revert to routine orders to permit the Chairman of the Special Committee on Standing Orders to present a report.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. Acting Government House Leader have unanimous consent for the purpose mentioned?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES (REVERSION)

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the report of the special select committee which is established by this Assembly to review the standing orders and forms of proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that copies of this report are available immediately for distribution to all members of the Assembly.

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. Moved by Mr. Diachuk:

Be it resolved that our universities and public colleges be encouraged to:

- (a) grant a preference in favor of Canadians rather than non-Canadians in hiring staff, and
- (b) ensure that non-Canadian students have access to all programs of study provided that Canadian students occupy a very high percentage of the spaces available in each program.

Moved by Mr. Taylor that the resolution be amended as follows:

(1) By striking out clause (a) and substituting therefor the following:

"hire Canadian teachers providing they have equal or better qualifications than non-Canadians and";

(2) By striking out all words after "that" in (b) and substituting therefor:

"no qualified Canadian student is denied entrance."

[Adjourned debate: Mr. McCrae.]

MR. McCRAE:

Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to come back to this motion again today. We had a very interesting discussion on it last spring and a lot of members participated. There were a lot of good suggestions, a lot of good comments, and I am sure there will be a number of other speakers today with worth-while contributions.

I just have a few more remarks to make, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I would like - inasmuch as we have been away from the topic for some time - to get it into the Hansard record so I shall read the resolution as it is proposed for amendment. And it is, Mr. Speaker:

- Be it resolved that our universities and public colleges be encouraged to
- (a) "hire Canadian teachers providing they have equal or better qualifications than non-Canadians and;
 - (b) "ensure that no qualified Canadian student is denied entrance."

Mr. Speaker, dealing first with part (a) of the resolution, it does appear to have considerable merit. I don't think anyone will quarrel with the concept or principle of giving preference to hiring Canadians as teachers, as educationists, where they have equivalent academic standing or qualifications.

It is interesting though that from a news report last summer, the CAUT, that is the the Canadian Association of University Teachers which represents 17,000 professors and instructors at 58 Canadian universities, at a conference defeated two motions that would have sought preference for Canadian applicants.

At their conference this past summer they voted down a motion that would have asked the federal Manpower and Immigration Department to prevent non-Canadians from taking jobs for which Canadians are qualified. They reaffirmed the policy that fair hiring practices should be based strictly on scholarly qualifications and not on nationality. They also rejected a proposal by the executive board that a committee be empowered to see that no qualified Canadian is rejected in favour of a foreigner with similar qualifications.

Mr. Speaker, I share their view that qualifications and not nationalities should be - if not entirely the determiner of who should be hired - certainly should be a major factor. I don't really think it is a problem at this point in time. I understood a few years back there were insufficient Canadians qualified for many of the positions and part of the reason was that Canadians preferred to work elsewhere. Many of those who were qualified went to the U.S. or other areas to teach. But apparently that trend has been reversed and a good many of them are returning here. So there are ample Canadians to staff most of our faculty teaching positions.

It is interesting though that the very organization, the Canadian Association of University Teachers, which might be thought to be most readily concerned in this area, itself rejected nationality as a necessary part of the requirement for hiring.

Dealing, Mr. Speaker, with the second part of the motion and that is: "that no qualified Canadian student is denied entrance." Another interesting thing that happened this summer was a news report from eastern Canada that Dr. Bette Stephenson, President of the Canadian Medical Association, in a report she made to the Canadian Medical Association [suggested] that the large number of foreign students in Canadian medical schools makes it difficult for qualified Canadian applicants to become accepted. In particular, Dr. Stephenson referred to The University of Toronto where 25 per cent of the first-year student medical class was apparently Chinese, mostly from Hong Kong.

I bring out these quotes to remind us of the potentiality of the problem. But again, don't think our academic guidelines should be determined solely in terms of nationalistic sentiment. As a complete and whole nation we should, where feasible, permit students of other countries access to our educational system. The system is, of course, financed by Canadian tax dollars and our children might deservedly expect the opportunity of seeking a higher education in the system which our tax dollars has made possible.

Another interesting thing which happened this past summer was a report prepared on the problem of quotas by The University of Alberta Senate Task Force on University Entrance Requirements on the limitations of enrolment at the University of Alberta. This report was prepared in September '74 and has some very interesting things to say. I would like to refer briefly to some of the recommendations. The fifth recommendation was:

The procedures presently in use by the university to determine the imposition of quotas should be re-examined with a view to obtaining more public reaction before actual quotas are established.

The sixth recommendation was:

The University of Alberta should explore the possibility of widening the participation of non-university personnel in the selection procedures for quota faculties.

The seventh recommendation dealing with quotas was:

The University of Alberta should study the possibility of setting up some type of random selection for qualified candidates where student places are limited.

The eighth recommendation was that:

Studies should be conducted to determine whether or not the present university facilities and staff are being used to provide for the maximum number of student places and the result of such studies should be widely publicized.

The ninth recommendation was that:

Certain programs should be re-evaluated as to suitability of the length of the program and also whether or not these programs should be offered by the university or to be available at some other post secondary institution.

Additionally Mr. Speaker, the report dwelt at considerable length on the fact in no time at all it is quite possible that our universities will be completely filled, all the faculties, some of which now are on quotas. Some are not. But with the expanding population it is quite probable that we will have to go to a quota system in all faculties. Additionally, we will have to give consideration to whether or not some faculties should be reduced or put in another educational institution, or some of them should be expanded, depending on the needs of society as we see them from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, The Universities Act establishes for each university a general faculties council composed of the president, the vice-presidents, the deans of each faculty, the director of each school, and it has certain student members and certain members appointed by the public. One of their powers and duties, Mr. Speaker, is to "determine standards and policies respecting the admission of persons to the university as students. Subject in the case of standards and policies respecting first-year students, to the approval of the university co-ordinating council."

Mr. Speaker, it is my conviction that the authority to determine quotas and qualifications for attendance at a university is properly placed with the general faculties council. They are a council of local people. They know the situation in each of the universities. And I think they are far better qualified to address themselves to this question than probably this Legislature is.

I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution is simply that we, the Legislature, give our universities and public colleges encouragement to do the things outlined in (a) and (b) of the resolution. But I think, Mr. Speaker, that as the people on the faculties council are from the community at large they must certainly be aware of the problem. They must certainly be aware that it is a problem first and that certainly Canadians and Albertans should be given some preference.

Specifically dealing with the resolution, I could support Part (1) of the amendment, that is that we hire Canadian teachers where they have equivalent qualifications. I can find no quarrel with that. Part (2), that "no qualified Canadian student is denied entrance" - I think there's no way I could support that. With the obvious knowledge that in all our universities, at least a good many of them, certainly many faculties will be operating to their full limit and many students will have to be turned down, there's just no way in terms of finance that we can commit [ourselves] to assuring them an education. There just isn't the physical and financial capability to do that at this time.

So I think there's no way any of us here could support item [2]. If we did support that we would have to throw the treasury open to the university requirements and satisfy the needs of all Canada. That is the way I read it. If there are limitations on space, first of all a considerable Alberta preference should be acknowledged, secondly a Canadian preference and thirdly we should no doubt make some space available for students from abroad.

Mr. Speaker, that's all I have to say on this resolution. It is I think a very valid one that we should discuss. We should express our concerns. I don't really think we should go too heavy-handed to the universities and attempt to give them guidelines as to how their admissions should be determined. We have set up governing bodies for the universities and colleges and I think, subject only to letting them know we do recognize there can be problems in this area, we should leave it to them, at least until we know there is a very substantial problem, to determine the guidelines for qualification or admission to their universities, both for teachers and for students.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a few comments on the amendment.

The amendment as presented by the hon. Member for Drumheller does restrict the first portion, Clause (a). The amendment states "equal or better qualifications", while the original resolution states "grant [a] preference", leaving the area that the university or public college wished to choose as an area of preference. Therefore it will be up to the institution to make its decision.

With regard to the (b) section of the resolution, the second portion of the resolution, the amendment basically states that no qualified Canadian student be denied entrance, which could very well restrict any enrolment from outside Canada, while the original resolution, as worded, does provide that a high percentage of spaces be available for Canadian students.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

With great respect to the hon. member, according to the record of the debate it would appear that the hon. member would require unanimous leave to speak again on the amendment, because the record appears to show that he spoke on the amendment on April 23.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh ho.

[Interjections]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, with unanimous leave of the House, this could be withdrawn from Hansard. My apologies.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to the amendment. I think the motion is very timely in light of the fact that only recently the Senate of the university issued a report dealing with perhaps a shortage of facilities to accommodate all graduating high school students in this province in the different faculties.

I'd like the hon. Minister of Advanced Education to also speak on this matter. There are serious problems looming ahead. We don't want to restrict students coming from outside. We have some obligation to accommodate them. On the other hand nobody wants to see Alberta students waiting in line, waiting another year or two or more to get into one of our universities.

I think perhaps the second part of the amendment, "No qualified Canadian student is denied entrance" - I think the university has a lot of latitude, a lot of discretion, in this matter but I think the minister ought to tell us, to ease the concerns of a lot of parents who are preparing their high school students to go to university from the disappointment of being told, sorry we have no place for you. In a wealthy province that has an abundance of funds, this kind of situation would be very disappointing.

So we are torn between two desires, Mr. Speaker, in the amendment to not restrict people coming in from beyond the province, beyond the country, but to help take care of the needs of those in this province. I believe that somewhere in between, the university authorities should be expected to make a just and reasonable decision.

I think the hon. minister ought to advise whether any moves or steps are being taken to provide additional accommodation beyond the universities for university credit programs. I am talking about colleges and other facilities that may be available in this province to accommodate the anticipated overflow especially at The University of Alberta. The report that the Senate commissioned about the quota system of student enrolment may not be too well known yet. I haven't a copy myself but I have been advised that this report has now been issued, has been prepared and finished.

I believe the minister ought to ease the minds of all parents who have students graduating from high school, that a place will be found for them in our universities. It's one of the higher budget items, the higher cost items in our budget, referring to education ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

I regret to interrupt the hon. member but apparently his memory also is failing him with regard to having spoken on the amendment on April 23.

[Laughter]

MR. LUDWIG:

It wasn't deliberate. I just hate to be outdone by the government side.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Anybody else?

AN HON. MEMBER:

I'm afraid to get up.

[Interjections]

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sit this one out.

MR. DRAIN:

I'm home free on this one, Mr. Speaker. I'll be able to talk and not very many people will be able to speak back to me and this is a very good situation.

You know, looking at this particular resolution, I would think there is genuine concern in some areas, and rightly so, because there are the sociological implications of introducing a different cultural background in the building of Canada. I think young people are very impressionable at the age when they are attending university. I would think, however, that there is a certain responsibility to the rest of the world and especially to the developing nations.

However, Mr. Speaker, it would appear to me that this could possibly be better met by exporting education to the source; by making available young teachers with the academic expertise to go forth into the world and spread the light of knowledge to a far wider spectrum of people than would conceivably be absorbed in our educational institutions.

However, Mr. Speaker, to take this in the full context, of course it does leave a certain amount of leeway in that it says: "a high percentage". It is not a motion that therefore precludes altogether the employment of people from other countries. I might point out to the hon. members the contribution made by such a person as Albert Einstein. In no way could his contributions to Stanford University have been achieved by anyone other than one who had the vast fund of knowledge and the sum total of genius that this great man had.

Looking at the amendment, Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with the intent and it would appear to me a very desirable direction for the universities of Alberta to go in hiring a greater number of Canadian teachers. But that no qualified Canadian students be denied entrance is of course - this is determined now by the physical abilities of the educational plan to absorb all the students you have. Of course, you could go in the direction of expanding them. There has been a sort of 'de-emphasization' in the matter of the role of academics and academic training, and greater emphasis on the industrial orientation of our young people to meet the concerns of the future and the development of the future.

It is remarkable to me how thinking has changed since the era of the 1960s. The 1960s promised a new world of leisure to everyone in that there was going to be more and more time to play. Suddenly we face the real world of the seventies and we find in fact that the work in this world is not all done. It's only beginning.

The problems in relation to the feeding of the third world, the development of the technology that is going to be necessary to overcome the energy problems of the future, all these things represent tremendous amounts of work - the housing of people, the development of programs in our universities to meet the challenge of the social problems we are confronted with in a greater degree at this time than we have ever been in the history of mankind. It's very understandable that in the short space of 100 years our society has moved from a rural-oriented nature where people communed with nature - they were in contact with the real world - to the sophisticated, disciplined type of society we have today, resulting in social breakdowns, lack of responsibility and the inability of people to adapt to this new environment. These are some of the social problems. We look to the academics to lead the way and bring forth the answers. These answers will not be easy but nevertheless must be sought out.

I did look at some statistics on a group of school children who were examined, and the ratio of those children who did not have hang-ups of some kind or another was in the area of 30 per cent. So the point I wish to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, is that there are in fact more problems to be faced in 1974; that in fact the unreal world of leisure ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The Chair has some difficulty connecting the hon. member's observations concerning sociological conditions with the educational content of the amendment.

MR. DRAIN:

I'm having a little trouble with that myself, Mr. Speaker.

[Laughter]

MR. DRAIN:

However, I hope to cast a light in the area of the hon. members after the manner of Diogenes who went forth and sought out the man with the light who was able to speak truthfully and honestly. However, I do endorse the motion, Mr. Speaker, and accept the amendment with some reservations.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just make two or three comments on the amendment. I would like to begin by commenting on a statement by the hon. Member for Calgary Foothills when he suggested that we ought not to deal too heavy-handedly with the universities. I agree with what he says because I believe the universities ought to have as much autonomy as possible in their courses and in their selection of teachers and students. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, there is one aspect of it I feel needs to be drawn to our attention quite often; that is the fact that when the public purse is called upon, to the tune of approximately \$110 million, to subsidize the universities, they are no longer completely autonomous, and the voice of the public somehow has to have some effect upon the choices made.

It concerns me a great deal when taxpayers complain bitterly about some of the types of teachers and some of the types of courses offered. They feel frustrated because there is nowhere they can go to make their complaints so they will be heard or have some effect. I feel that probably one place it could have some effect is through the members of the Legislature who have voted public funds in this large amount to the universities. Therefore, while not being too heavy-handed, I think they ought to be aware of the desires of the people who at least partially support them in the ongoing of the universities.

With further regard to the matter of hiring Canadian teachers "... providing they have equal or better qualifications ..." as replacing a portion of the resolution, I believe we ought to beware of preferential treatment except in very exceptional situations; preferential treatment even for Canadians as opposed to non-Canadians. The reason I say that is because we are living in a very affluent country and Canada has probably a higher standard of living than any other country in the world. I feel very strongly that we are being called upon to share as often and in every way possible with the peoples of the rest of the world. Unless we are willing to share with other people to a very considerable extent, not only our affluence but all it provides for us, we are looking for trouble in the very near future.

I see here an opportunity to reciprocate, when seeking teachers and students who are non-Canadian to share in our universities, not only so far as our wealth is concerned, not only so far as our education is concerned, but also so far as our culture is concerned. Teachers and students from abroad can share on a one-to-one basis the different cultures of the world, the different emotions and feelings that come from these people. For this reason, I favor very strongly the amendment that has been made so that we not give preference particularly to Canadians but that Canadians have at least equal opportunity according to their qualifications and according to their needs. I should be satisfied that way without making it a case of being preferential.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a very short period of time in which to make two or three remarks on this motion before the House, a motion which I personally find quite reasonable. I have some difficulty with the amendment for reasons which I will deal with shortly. For reasons I will state soon, the amendment is unacceptable but personally I find the motion acceptable if it can be read broadly.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, in my judgment the motion as placed does not cause our universities or public colleges any particular difficulty. I have some correspondence from them which I will read into the record in a moment to indicate that the practice we are encouraging is, in fact, the practice the institutions are conducting at the moment.

I was surprised and delighted to find the interest in this House in this matter. I know when I've gone to groups around the province, the matter of non-academic staff and non-Canadian students has been high on the agenda of topics that people wanted to pursue with me. I must say I was surprised at that and I welcome the opportunity to make a few remarks in the House.

There is, therefore, in my judgment some public interest and concern on this subject. Some would say that the non-Canadian academic staff situation in our universities and colleges is a problem. I wouldn't say that. Some would say that non-Canadian students in our institutions are a problem. Generally I would not agree. Some would say that the government should have a more direct involvement in the resolution of these alleged problems, and again I would not agree.

With respect to the non-Canadian influence in post-secondary education, reference was made by some of the members to a document commonly referred to as the Moir Report, copies of which I think all members of the House have. I think it's important to refer to one or two recommendations in this report. I just choose to read one or two for the interest of the House. One of the observations of the committee was on page 81, item 6 as follows, which was quite important:

The Committee agrees that competence must be the main test in university recruitment and appointment. In measuring competence for work in which there is a high Canadian content the fact that a competent applicant is a Canadian is of course relevant and probably dominant. In other fields where there are available competent Canadians who want to live and work in Canadian universities and who match other applicants in competence, it is not unreasonable to expect that such Canadians be given a preference. Indeed the Committee was often assured that such a preference is in fact common. It recommends the practice.

That I think has been the essence of concern of some members in the House. Further, you could go on and read all the recommendations, Mr. Speaker. I don't propose to do that because the report is important. It has been seriously considered by universities and public colleges.

One recommendation on page 83, item 12 reads as follows:

In the selection of graduate students the Committee recommends that, while academic qualifications must be the major concern, there should also be a fair, reasonable and effective preference for qualified Canadian students. In most disciplines if [the prior] recommendation is followed this should result in the majority of graduate students in well established departments being Canadian. At the same time we recommend that our universities continue to fulfill their obligations in international education. We are interested in encouraging Canadians, not discouraging non-Canadians.

That's very important in my judgment.

Reference was also made to the report of the Ontario Select Commission of Economic and Cultural Nationalism, a copy of which I received last January or February before this debate came up. I incidentally sent it out to the universities and public colleges for

their information and possible reaction. I again underline the fact that this was last January or February, so some of the responses I received prior to this debate ever coming before the House may be somewhat out of date, although I doubt it.

You might be interested, in the few minutes that remain, in the responses I received from some of the universities and colleges around Alberta on this important question. The University of Alberta advised me, for example, that: "Unless the condition is waived by the academic vice-president, all academic positions at The University of Alberta must be advertised widely throughout Canada", which comes up in the Moir Report. "The preference is given to qualified people who are Canadian citizens or who hold landed immigrant status", and thirdly, "if a search does not uncover a qualified Canadian person, our selection committees are empowered to look outside of Canada." That's from the U. of A.

A comment from the office of the President of The University of Calgary, a Board of Governors motion passed in January 1973, that:

Competence must be the main consideration in university recruitment and appointments. Should there be applicants of equal ability and qualifications for a position, the Canadian would be given the preference. Thus, in short, our policy is to advertise widely in Canada and to give preference to Canadians if their qualifications are as good as those of foreign origin.

That was The University of Calgary.

A comment from Red Deer College: competence was the most important job requirement. And they had no particular policy with respect to citizenship.

From Medicine Hat College, Dr. Chace advises me that the hiring practices of Medicine Hat College:

permit absolutely no discrimination related to the citizenship or any other characteristic of the applicant other than his qualification for the defined task. In practice, however, my experience suggests that preference is given to Canadian citizens.

The same may be said of other institutions. However, Mount Royal College made a couple of interesting observations and these were points touched upon specifically by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I believe. Mount Royal, in replying to me, said that preference is given on the following basis: one, the most competent person, and in the case of equals to their staff, and thirdly, in the case of equals to Canadians. But they went on to make this observation which I think is important.

The application of these priorities also creates the best opportunity to protect those areas of special concern to Canadian education. Canadian-educated faculty obviously have advantages in applying for positions in those subject areas crucial to our Canadian heritage: history, political science, literature and social sciences related to Canadian problems.

I think that is significant and important.

Mr. Speaker, the major suggestions in the Ontario committee report were dealt with in an article in a CAUT bulletin to which another member has referred. This is the January edition of this year. If members of the House are interested in this subject, I have a good deal of material on it and would be happy to make it available to them. CAUT comments on the commission in this way:

What the commission does propose is that universities hire more Canadians and Canadian-trained graduates. However, if there is no evidence of substantial improvement in the number of Canadians in the period of the next three years, it proposes a quota system averaged over seven years. It also proposes that 70 per cent of the new appointments should be from among those who obtained their graduate training in Canadian universities.

So the Ontario commission is proposing to take a more firm position than others have. And I agree that CAUT and others have not been anxious to pursue this subject with the sorts of recommendations that the commission made.

With respect to non-Canadian students, I would like to underline something I have said in this House before and have said to parents and students on many occasions when we talk about non-Canadian students. That is the distinction between a foreign student - if you will - who is a landed immigrant in this country and one who is here on a student visa. I take the position firmly, and hopefully correctly, that a student who is here as a landed immigrant is, for all purposes, a Canadian and should be treated as such and should not be regarded as a foreign student in the broad use of that word.

I would like to remind the House that Canada, as a nation, contributes 50 per cent of the costs of post-secondary education in Alberta and, therefore, pays 50 per cent of the costs of educating non-Canadian students who attend our post-secondary institutions. The Alberta taxpayer is called upon to pay the remaining 50 per cent of the cost. Sometimes I have the impression that parents and students are annoyed that they are having to pay the entire bill for non-Canadians coming to Canada. That is not quite correct. Albertans, as such, pay 50 per cent of the cost plus their portion of federal budgeting. It's important

to understand that. Some have argued that we should, in fact, introduce a fee differential in an attempt to screen out or somehow reduce the foreign student or student here on a student visa from participating in our universities and colleges. For the moment my position on that is that we should not, in fact, interject or impose any barriers to the free movement of students within Canada and indeed of those who come here from overseas. If Canada's size is a matter of national policy then we have a responsibility to educate citizens from foreign countries. That's a national policy for Canada and Alberta is called upon to meet part of that responsibility. Providing it's reasonable, and I think it has been to date, we should respond.

I would remind the House, because I think I mentioned it before, that a great many Albertans go outside our borders to receive their university or other post-secondary education. In fact up until a couple of years ago, and I haven't checked lately, there were as many Albertans outside of Alberta taking post-secondary education as there were non-Albertans or non-Canadians inside. It's not really fair to argue that Albertans are being denied access or space simply because of the presence of non-Canadians.

One might argue rather selfishly, Mr. Speaker, that landed immigrants come to this country with their primary and secondary education completed, continue through a period of post-secondary education and then remain citizens of this country Canada, frankly, is making a very good deal - an extremely good investment in my judgment - where we gain educated men and women from other lands who come here and become citizens of this country. We have really had very little to do in terms of paying the cost of their primary and secondary education. That's a rather selfish point of view but I believe it's correct.

My problem with the amendment, Mr. Speaker - and I'll now deal with the substance of the resolution - is that in saying no qualified Canadian student is denied entrance, I read that to mean no qualified Canadian student is denied entrance to the program he is seeking admission to. That is something we simply can't handle. If it was intended to mean that students have an opportunity to gain access and admission to post-secondary education in Alberta, that does not pose any problems for me. Alberta has, as I think we all know, probably the most comprehensive and diversified post-secondary system of any province in Canada. Certainly we contribute significantly more per capita to post-secondary education than any other province in Canada. So I simply can't live with the suggestion that we must accept all qualified applicants, for example, to pharmacy, dentistry, medicine or law. There is more than adequate space for qualified students in post-secondary education in Alberta. We cannot guarantee, however, that each student will be accepted in the specific program of his or her choice. With respect to the earlier inquiry about space in universities, Alberta has, I think, more universities and more university programs for our population than other provinces. Certainly we have several public colleges with university transfer programs. Interestingly enough the participation rate by young people in post-secondary education in this province is among the highest, if not the highest, of any province in Canada. It probably should be, given the commitment this government and the former government have made to post-secondary education in Alberta.

Therefore my suggestion in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, is that for reasons of definition and clarity we should in fact defeat the amendment. If the House is agreeable to passing the motion as it is presented on the Order Paper I, for one, would be happy to agree to it. I don't see any particular difficulty with subparagraph (a) because surely implicit in subparagraph (a) is, as the universities and colleges have indicated, a concern for academic standards and academic excellence. I doubt that any one can argue that in granting a preference to Canadians a university or college will go out and hire a thoroughly unqualified Canadian in preference to an obviously well-qualified non-Canadian.

So, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would urge the House to defeat the amendment and to pass the resolution if that be the choice of the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the House prepared to call it 5:30?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, as to business of the Assembly, this evening at 8 o'clock the House would first move to third reading of Bill No. 67, The Landlord and Tenant Amendment Act, followed by committee study of Bill No. 80, The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act in respect to which there is one additional amendment recommended by the Members' Services Committee.

Then the House would proceed to the government motion, notice of which was given earlier, to receive and concur in the report made by the chairman of the foreign investment committee - that is not a motion to receive and concur in the contents of the report, but rather to agree that that committee may have an extra number of days or weeks in which to finish its report and deliver it to members. Following the disposition of that motion, [we would] proceed to the other motion in respect of which notice was given on the report of the Special Select Committee to Review the Standing Orders, the rules committee of which the Member for Athabasca was chairman and that, I believe, was delivered to members this afternoon.

If there is time for further business, we would then proceed to second reading of Bill No. 62, The Medical Profession Act.

MR. SPEAKER:

It being now in fact 5:30, the House stands adjourned until 8 o'clock this evening.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 5:30 p.m.]

