

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Wednesday, May 12, 1976 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

**head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 49**

**The Natural Gas  
Pricing Agreement Amendment Act, 1976**

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce three bills. First, Bill 49, The Natural Gas Pricing Agreement Amendment Act, 1976. These amendments are mainly the result of the administration of this act since last November by the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission. There have been some changes to allow for the efficient operation of the act, and for ensuring that producers of natural gas receive the export flowback they are entitled to.

**Bill 58**

**The Natural Gas  
Price Administration Amendment Act, 1976**

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the second piece of legislation is Bill 58, The Natural Gas Price Administration Amendment Act, 1976. This is sister legislation to The Natural Gas Pricing Agreement Act. Members will recall we passed this legislation last year in order that — we did not proclaim it, but we would have it in place in the event we are unable to continue in a pricing agreement with the federal government. We would then be able to proclaim this act. The amendments to it merely reflect the same amendments we are making to The Natural Gas Pricing Agreement Act.

**Bill 55**

**The Mines and  
Minerals Amendment Act, 1976**

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the third act is Bill 55, The Mines and Minerals Amendment Act, 1976. This act is the legislation which incorporates certain principles the government has been working on and discussing with industry over a period of two years to accelerate the rate of exploration drilling and development on Crown leases, or have the acreage turn over by the serving of drilling notices on existing leases.

It also provides for a new term of five years for petroleum and natural gas leases and a new term of 15 years for coal leases. It carries within it the principle of promoting drilling in the deeper unexplored zones beneath existing fields by separating those deeper petroleum and natural gas rights which up to now have been held by production, returning

them to the Crown, and making them available for additional exploration.

The legislation also contains a principle for a new form of exploration agreement. Instead of the five types of exploration agreement which now exist — that is, reservations, drilling reservations, petroleum and natural gas permits, natural gas licences, and Crown reserve natural gas licences — there would be one new type of exploration agreement which would be referred to as a petroleum and natural gas licence.

Mr. Speaker, because of the complexity of this legislation and in order to assist the House in working through it, I propose to distribute a summary to the House which will present the present situation, the changes we propose, and assistance in going through the new legislation and comparing the old act to the new one.

[Leave granted; Bill 49 introduced and read a first time]

[Leave granted; Bill 58 introduced and read a first time]

[Leave granted; Bill 55 introduced and read a first time]

**Bill 52**

**The Manpower Development Act**

DR. HOHOL: I should like to introduce Bill 52, The Manpower Development Act. This act does three things. First, it in part brings together three current statutes: The Apprenticeship Act, The Tradesmen's Qualification Act, and The Welding Act. In doing this, Mr. Speaker, it also brings some new and additional concepts and practices into apprenticeship and tradesmen's qualifications. Welding will be incorporated into one of the designated trades. Thirdly, the statute adds to a provincial statute those responsibilities appropriate to provinces in the important areas of immigration and demography.

[Leave granted; Bill 52 introduced and read a first time]

**head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. FLUKER: Mr. Speaker, I'm privileged this afternoon to introduce to you, and through you to the Assembly, some 22 Grade 5 students from the Mallaig School in my constituency. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Lil Mahe. They are seated in the public gallery. I would ask that they rise and receive recognition from this Assembly.

MR. ASHTON: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce a group of Grade 5 students from Jean Vanier School in Sherwood Park. They are accompanied by teachers and parents and are sitting in the public gallery. I'll ask them to stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, some 60 Grade 5 students from the Rundle School. They are accom-

panied by two of their teachers, Mrs. Gouchee and Mrs. Clough. I would like to ask the students and the teachers to stand and the members of the Assembly to give them the usual welcome.

#### head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to file with the Assembly two copies of an Environment Conservation Authority staff report: *Commercial Supersonic Air Transportation in Alberta*.

#### head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

##### **Business Development and Tourism**

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague, the Hon. Bob Dowling, as Acting Minister of Business Development and Tourism, I wish to make the following statement.

In January, 1976, my colleague announced the first phase of a petrochemical development in Alberta. The announcement stated that Alberta Gas Ethylene Company would be authorized to proceed with the construction of a world-scale ethylene plant having a capacity of 1.2 billion pounds to be built on land east of Red Deer and south of Joffre, and that Dow Chemical of Canada would be authorized to construct a world-scale vinyl chloride monomer plant of approximately 700 million pounds per year capacity to be located at the Dow site just outside Fort Saskatchewan.

Today, on behalf of the Hon. Bob Dowling, I can announce that amendments have been made to the original agreement. Under the revised agreement there will be the same amount of upgrading of ethylene in Alberta. There is, however, a different configuration of derivative facilities. Dow will construct an ethylene dichloride facility to upgrade 50-100 million pounds of ethylene to ethylene dichloride. This is a step in the production of vinyl chloride monomer, and Dow will sell the ethyl dichloride as a product. Also under the revised agreement, Dow is no longer committed to the building of a benzene styrene plant. This is viewed as an advantage as it gives other companies an opportunity to consider making application to construct such a plant in Alberta. Other companies have expressed such an interest.

The government is also pleased to announce the second phase of the petrochemical development in Alberta. The provincial cabinet has approved the Energy Resources Conservation Board recommendation to permit Dow Chemical of Canada Ltd. to construct an ethylene oxide/ethylene glycol plant at the Dow site just outside Fort Saskatchewan. It is considered an important step in the diversification of the Alberta economy. It was noted that the ERCB calculated that the direct and indirect impact of the project in Alberta would aggregate approximately \$1.4 billion over the first 20 years.

In considering the ERCB recommendations, the cabinet has attached a number of conditions to the granting of the permit. One is that construction must start no later than May 1, 1977. Another important

condition calls for maximum practical use of Alberta tradesmen and other construction personnel, Alberta engineering and other professional services, and Alberta materials and services.

#### head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

##### **CKUA Licence**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Education or the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, whichever minister carries the major responsibility for ACCESS and CKUA. Can he indicate the present status of CKUA's licence?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, ACCESS has applied to the Canadian Radio-Television Commission for a renewal of the licence. My understanding is that the application has been postponed until the fall.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister in a position to assure the Assembly that, if an agreement isn't worked out between the Government of Alberta and the federal government, CKUA may go off the air at the end of September?

MR. KOZIAK: Perhaps the hon. Leader of the Opposition could indicate the nature of the agreement he's referring to.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. I'm referring to negotiations right now between the CRTC, ACCESS, and the province of Alberta.

Frankly, my question arises from comments made by officials of CKUA who have expressed grave concern that unless some arrangements are worked out to satisfy CRTC regulations, CKUA may go off the air at the end of September. I think that would be regrettable. That's why I asked the question.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, we share the view that CKUA plays a very important role in the educational system of the province of Alberta.

We don't foresee that problem. An application for renewal of the licence is required from time to time. The application was made in accordance with the present time limits and certain aspects of the application were not to the satisfaction, as I understand it, of CRTC. On that basis, they have put over the application until the fall.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Are officials of ACCESS or is the Minister of Education now carrying the responsibility of satisfying or dealing with the CRTC in this particular area? Where does that responsibility rest right now? Is it with the authority?

MR. KOZIAK: As the hon. Leader of the Opposition recognizes, one of the areas the CRTC is concerned with is the independence of ACCESS. It's that same independence which we honor by permitting that application to be made by ACCESS without interference by the authority, which is composed of the

hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower and me.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Will the Minister of Education or the Minister of Advanced Education be accountable to the Assembly for this particular application and the necessary negotiations?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, the two ministers named in the act are the ministers who are accountable to the Assembly.

The application is of course another matter. That is a matter between ACCESS and CRTC, as I pointed out earlier, because of the fact there is that necessary degree of independence. The interference by the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower or me might be interpreted as interference with that independence.

#### Coal Policy

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Is he in a position today to indicate to the House when he's going to have that long-awaited coal policy available? Will it be within the next week, so we can hear it here?

MR. NOTLEY: In view of the fact that the time's fading fast.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the coal policy is making measured progress through the cabinet committees and has been reviewed at one stage by cabinet. I'm not sure whether the final review and approval by cabinet will meet the time at which the House closes. It would be my desire to be able to present the policy statement in the House. However, if the House closes before the final review and approval are concluded, I have no control over that and will then present the policy as quickly as possible.

#### Bicycle Speed Limit

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Solicitor General. Recently a young constituent of mine was driving a 10-speed bike on Highway 16 and was apprehended for going in excess of the speed limit. He was charged and fined.

Could the minister advise at what speed he could have been travelling on his bicycle?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, my advice is that a bicycle is still a vehicle, even though it doesn't require an operator's licence. I haven't heard of the Bionic Man in Vegreville, but . . .

[laughter]

Mr. Speaker, there was the case of a person going at supersonic speeds in Calgary about two years ago. He was clocked at 80 miles an hour on a 10-speed bicycle. He was fined \$150 for speeding and careless driving.

MR. BATIUK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Could the minister advise how the demerit

system could be made applicable to this young offender who doesn't have a licence?

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly the minister has already gone the allowable distance in the question period in giving the hon. member advice, and perhaps he might seek it otherwise.

#### Arctic Pipeline Proposals

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, that's certainly a hard act to follow.

I'd like to direct my question to the Premier, and it's really a follow-up to a question posed on April 12 by the hon. Member for Bow Valley. Next week the Berger commission on the Mackenzie pipeline will be holding hearings in the city of Edmonton.

Mr. Speaker, has the government reconsidered its position about making a formal submission to the Berger hearings while the commission is in Edmonton?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, no we haven't. I discussed that the other day with my colleague the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, and we confirmed our conclusion that the decision with regard to that matter is a federal decision and that therefore we should be aware that, as a federal government decision, we in the province take the view on a number of occasions that they should not be interfering in our jurisdiction. That's entirely within theirs.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Will it be the intention of the appropriate departments to be present during the commission hearings to formally monitor the proceedings?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, yes. That's an entirely different matter. There would be a watching brief by an official in the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. Premier. In light of this afternoon's announcement, has the Government of Alberta prepared an assessment of the pipeline proceeding, in view of the projects already under way — an assessment on the economy of Alberta?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, yes. In a general way, the assessment would be that, by way of the timing that is apparently being contemplated relative to a natural gas pipeline from the Mackenzie Valley if the federal government decides that such a pipeline should be authorized, the time frame is subsequent to the major build-up of manpower and materials that would be required at least in the first and second stages of petrochemical development in the province.

So it might be, and hopefully will be, a fairly well-phased approach where the oil sands construction activity in the province will begin to taper off at about the time that first- and second-stage petrochemical development comes in. Then it should be meeting its degree of maturity when a Mackenzie Valley pipeline might proceed. That would, of course, be a very fortunate set of circumstances in total for

the province of Alberta, but it certainly is one that seems reasonably possible under the circumstances today.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question for clarification. I take it from the hon. Premier's answer that the government is not concerned about overheating of the economy as a consequence of the pipeline proceeding.

Would the Premier then view the construction of the Mackenzie pipeline as a necessary component of Alberta's continued growth, in view of the comments the Premier made in answer to my previous question?

MR. SPEAKER: While the question is undoubtedly of great importance, I think the hon. member is outrightly seeking the hon. Premier's opinion. There might be other ways of finding that out.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could rephrase the question and ask the hon. Premier if the government has considered any assessment of the pipeline as a future component of continued growth in the province of Alberta.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, we don't look at the pipeline in that way, because it's still a "maybe" situation. We do not think it is essential to the continued economic strength of the province, because we think a number of alternate situations may develop if the pipeline does not proceed. On the other hand, of course, we are concerned with the overall development of petroleum industrial activity throughout Canada, particularly in the Mackenzie Valley area in the Arctic, because it's served by people who are employed within the province of Alberta and hence of very significant impact. But it could be that any long-term or significant delay in the pipeline would not thwart that economic activity in the conventional oil and gas exploration industry. If it did, possibly it would divert it — as is the case over the past year — towards exploration and development within our own province.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Energy. In view of the announcement today on the petrochemical industry, does the government see a Mackenzie pipeline as eventually being necessary for the continued development of a petrochemical industry in Alberta?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the assessment provided to me by the Energy Resources Conservation Board is that all present and foreseeable needs of the province of Alberta are covered by Alberta's own reserves.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a supplementary question either to the Premier or the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Perhaps a very brief word of explanation dealing with the Mackenzie Valley pipeline — an extension from there, not an extension to the pipeline.

In light of recent discoveries in the central Arctic, has the Premier or the minister had discussions with the federal government regarding the possibility of the pipeline not coming down the Mackenzie Valley route and through Alberta, but down the west side of Hudson Bay, which would completely bypass Alberta?

My question really is: have there been discussions between the Premier or the minister and their federal counterparts, because Alberta's got a lot at stake in that situation?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think one has to look at this matter by evaluating the fact that it is within federal jurisdiction and their decisions. I really am not sure the hon. leader is quite accurate in referring to it by way of route. As I understand the situation, there are two separate projects: either a Mackenzie Valley pipeline project, taking natural gas essentially from the Beaufort Sea area in the Mackenzie Delta, with or without Alaska gas — and two companies are involved in that particular application before the National Energy Board — in which the logical situation would be that it would flow down through and hook up with the Alberta pipeline system, or at least go through Alberta; [or] the other project, which is really quite different and involves the high Arctic and the polar gas project. Just by common-sense geography, if that project were to proceed, having regard to both the supply and the markets, I find it very difficult to contemplate a polar gas project that would in any way involve the pipelines passing through Alberta, except possibly by way of a southern branch line. It looks to me pretty clearly, where the markets are and where the sources are, that the polar project is either going to flow down from the high Arctic over to the immediate east side through Quebec, or to the immediate west side through Manitoba, and not [through] Alberta.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then my supplementary question to the Premier is: does the Government of Alberta see this as an either/or situation? That's why I raised the question. Has the government given some consideration to the Mackenzie Valley project as opposed to a polar project? In the opinion of the Alberta government, is it an either/or situation?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, it's hard to judge that, because again it's entirely a matter of federal jurisdiction. I don't want to give the impression to the Legislature that the Government of Alberta considers these projects an essential ingredient of economic development in the province. We do not consider — we look at it as a federal decision. When it's made, we believe that the business and professional community here will respond.

We will keep a very close touch on the matters. I think one would have to say either/or. It could be that one project might go on, and then the other one might come at a subsequent time because of the shortage of natural gas. Perhaps the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, in terms of discussions between ministers of energy in Canada, could add to my answer.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, only by replying to the hon. Leader of the Opposition in this way. The matters have been discussed informally at federal-provincial energy ministers' meetings. The technical feasibility of bringing out both sources of natural gas through just one system appear immense. Rather, both supplies of natural gas appear to be needed in Canada's future. Therefore, there will probably be both systems at some time.

### Training Schools

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Attorney General. Is the government giving any study or thought to setting up a system of training schools to which juvenile courts could send young people who are in conflict with the law?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I think that question might more properly be directed to my colleague the Solicitor General, since it's his responsibility to provide some of the alternatives to people who find themselves in difficulty with the law. I would also comment that my colleague the Minister of Social Services and Community Health is responsible for other facilities for young people who do not find themselves the product of the juvenile court system, but who are diverted before they get into the system. So I'm sure my colleague the Solicitor General could comment.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, consideration of the need for such facilities is at a very early stage, but it is taking place. The need and, indeed, the size of such facilities would depend largely upon the eventual disposition of the proposed federal legislation pursuant to the federal green paper, *Young Persons in Conflict with the Law*.

MR. TAYLOR: Supplementary to the hon. minister. Has the hon. minister taken a look at the training schools in operation in Ontario at the present time?

MR. FARRAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I've told the House before, I think we've already budgeted for an Outward Bound adventure type of school at Nordegg, and have hired the former superintendent of juvenile delinquency from the province of Ontario, who had set up what are known as the DARE camps in Ontario. He's now active in the preorganization stage at Nordegg. My deputy minister, Rheal LeBlanc, was on the European mission for the purpose of looking at such institutions in Scandinavia and Britain.

### Hospital Operations

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. It's with regard to the Mannville Hospital.

In light of some of the administrative problems at the hospital, is the minister planning any action?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member could be more specific as to what he's referring to.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. I understand there are certain disagreements between the medical staff and the board, and concerns with regard to overborrowing of money.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, again, if the hon. member could be more specific. That's not an unusual operating situation in a lot of hospitals.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Does the minister plan any action with regard to the erecting of the nurses' residence at

Mannville? When it went ahead with building the nurses' residence, did the board have the approval of the Hospital Commission?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I believe the history of that matter was that the board of the Mannville Municipal Hospital had requested the Hospital Services Commission to approve a local requisition for the acquisition of land. Subsequently, as reported to me by my officials, the board went one step further and not only acquired the land, which is still allowed by local requisition, but built a nurses' residence.

I have indicated to the chairman of the board that they did not have authority from the province to actually construct the nurses' residence, and that the residence should be operated on a self-sustaining basis. It should not add to the operating deficit of the hospital.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of the minister's statement that the board did not have authority to erect a nurses' residence, does the minister plan any further action on this matter?

MR. MINIELY: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, I advised the chairman of the Mannville Municipal Hospital board that it was our position that no funding of a deficit arising from the operation of the nursing residence should be paid by the province through the hospital plan. The board, of course, has the option of renting the nurses' residence so it is self-sustaining and no deficit is placed on the operation of the hospital.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct one further supplementary question to the minister. What response has the minister given the groups which have requested the minister to consider the appointment of an administrator at the hospital at Mannville, and to have an investigation into the operation? Where does the minister stand on that question?

AN HON. MEMBER: Most likely the same thing.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, at this point I have received nothing official asking me to indicate our views of that matter. As I've indicated in the Legislature on items of this nature many, many times, that is a local responsibility. That's the way responsibility is delineated. Where there are difficulties in a community with respect to internal operations of the hospital, I consider the municipalities and, in turn, the hospital boards as the groups which ultimately have to resolve personality difficulties or those kinds of questions.

MR. CLARK: A further supplementary to the minister. The minister indicated he had no representation from the board.

I'd like to ask the question: has the minister had representation from individuals in the area served by the hospital board?

MR. MINIELY: Well, again, Mr. Speaker, I've received individual representations on both sides of the matter. As we do in matters of this nature, again I stress

that I have indicated to the people who are locally responsible that they should make these decisions, that they should sort it out locally.

#### **Land Use Forum Report**

MR. JAMISON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. It is with regard to the Land Use Forum report. I was wondering if the minister had any plans for implementing any of the recommendations from this report in the fall session, in particular the recommendation that Edmonton have the majority control over planning of the Edmonton metropolitan region.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, while I'm not... [inaudible] accountable for the Land Use Forum, I certainly am concerned about the recommendations of the report itself. With respect to the specific recommendation as to a metropolitan planning commission, I'm sure the hon. member can wait until the new planning act is presented.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the government still intending to introduce the planning act during the spring session, so it can be held over during the summer for people to review it?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it's my intention to make it available for the summer, certainly. I guess the question is the speed of the House in the next two weeks.

#### **Subdevelopment Application**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my apologies to you, and to members of the Assembly, for being a little late, but I thought it would be politically not prudent to assist 250 students in planting Arbor Day trees.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of the Environment. Is the minister in a position to indicate if any commitment has been made to the lake-cottage owners at Baptiste Lake near Athabasca that no second-stage approval will be given to the Whispering Hills development without full public hearings on the environmental impact of such development on the lake?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, the file on that project is rather thick. I would have to check it and report to the hon. member with respect to that question. I'll do that.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House what the Whispering Hills development is.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, this would seem to be an outright attempt at research in the question period.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, with respect, I'm sure hon. members are not quite sure what the development is. If there was a way of saying it in one sentence... [interjections]

#### **Taxidermists' Licences**

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct this question to the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. I think it's under his jurisdiction, I'm not sure. This is in regard to the taxidermists' licences that have not been issued, yet they have expired. On the applications it's quite clear they are subject to fine.

I wonder if the minister has extended the time, or what the situation is at this time, and the reasons.

AN HON. MEMBER: It's stuffed up.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I am aware we have had some difficulty getting the printed licence forms and that the taxidermists who have responded by application to the department have been issued an interim certificate. At this moment, that interim certificate is acting as the licence until the printed licence is issued.

MR. KUSHNER: A supplementary question to the minister. I was informed quite clearly yesterday that that isn't so. They haven't been issued anything.

#### **Policy on Railroads**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Deputy Premier. Has the provincial Department of Transportation conducted any studies on transcontinental passenger rail service in Alberta?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, we're in the process of putting together material to place before the CTC at the first hearing in Alberta on May 31. We've asked the communities — and, indeed, I think I've asked in the House before — that anybody who has any knowledge in this area come forward and assist in that presentation.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the provincial government concur in the concept of only one passenger rail line in Alberta?

DR. HORNER: No, Mr. Speaker. For the purposes of hon. members, perhaps I might table tomorrow the initial presentation we've made to the CTC in an overall policy way. I apologize for not doing so earlier.

#### **Hospital Operations** (continued)

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. I'd like to ask if any representation has been made to his office or to the Hospital Commission with regard to the situation at the Calgary General Hospital.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, there has been no representation to my office that has come to my attention. I would have to check with the commission whether anything specifically in writing has been received.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In light of the matter being raised in

the Assembly yesterday, has the minister asked the Hospital Commission to check with the Calgary General Hospital?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I can check and report to the House.

MR. CLARK: Perhaps I didn't make the question clear. Has the minister asked the Hospital Commission to check the situation at the Calgary General Hospital as a result of it being raised yesterday?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, we have indicated we've regularly been in contact with the hospital over the past couple of months. I indicated to the chairman and the entire board of the Calgary General that, should any difficulty arise, [they should] contact me immediately and follow through on the basis I've indicated, that my office and I are available to the chairman of the board on a 24-hour basis during this particular period. I have not received any phone calls or any expressions from the board that there is any problem.

If individual citizens write to my office, I would follow up and check the situation. But to respond to something not sent to my office in any official way, Mr. Speaker, I feel is not the proper way to determine what the situation is in fact.

MR. CLARK: The answer is no.

#### **Petrochemical Development**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. Minister of Business Development and Tourism, I would direct this question to the Minister of Government Services also responsible for Culture, in his capacity as acting minister. It concerns the ministerial statement made today. The minister indicated in the statement that other companies have expressed an interest in developing upgrading plants.

Is the minister in a position to assure the House that the interest expressed by other companies is going to become a reality so the same amount of upgrading will take place as mentioned in this statement?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice and advise my honorable colleague about it. I'm quite sure he will reply at his earliest opportunity.

#### **Coal Mine Application**

MR. JAMISON: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. It really is a supplementary to the original question by the Leader of the Opposition. It is in regard to the new Luscar coal mine.

Since the ERCB recommended approval of this new coal mine, following the coal policy is there a chance that this new mine will be given approval by your department?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, it is true that the Energy Resources Conservation Board did hear an application from Luscar to develop a project referred to as the Luscar Sterco coal project, and has recommended approval of that project to the Executive Council. I

feel that as soon as a coal policy has been established and made public, particularly with regard to royalty and other conditions, the Executive Council will then be able to deal with the Luscar Sterco recommendation from the Energy Resources Conservation Board, but it is unable to do that pending the policy which is being developed.

#### **Liquor Policy**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Solicitor General. Could the Solicitor General indicate whether there will be any legislation or regulations brought in at this session of the Legislature to amend The Liquor Control Act?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I have been working and am continuing to work towards reforms aimed at moderation and a more civilized approach in the area of liquor. The object is to reduce antisocial behavior.

The difficulty in reaching a consensus covers the whole population, including all the members in this House. People are asking for better outlets, but they're also against more outlets. They're asking for more latitude for fund-raising special events like beer gardens, which the hon. member mentioned yesterday, but they want to cut down on excessive consumption. So that's the dilemma.

The new licensing categories mean more outlets. The more outlets there are, the greater the consumption. That can be shown statistically, so we've got to reconcile exactly what we want. We say better outlets and not more outlets.

If the hon. members of the opposition can come out with some definitive suggestions to help me, I'd be most grateful.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister care to advise the Assembly where the government stands on the definitive suggestions of the Ghitler report?

Mr. Speaker, could I perhaps put that question again to the hon. minister. Perhaps he missed the question.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I didn't get up, because I thought I'd really answered that question when I responded to the question from the hon. Member for Bow Valley.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

#### **Land Ownership**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney General. It is with regard to the monitoring of land purchases at the Land Titles Office. Has the minister an up-to-date report? Is there any indication of an increase in foreign purchases of land?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I've been putting together information in my office for some time, but I haven't got the most recent material.

DR. BUCK: You told us that at the start of the session.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Does the minister intend to file a formal

report in the Assembly, possibly not by the end of this session but at the beginning of the fall session?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I can't say when, but certainly the information we've got will in time be made public.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might direct a supplementary question to the Attorney General. This is the third occasion we've raised the matter in the House. On the first occasion, the minister indicated he had the information in his office; the second time, it was going to be made available to the members.

Will the minister tell the House why he hasn't tabled the information to date?

DR. BUCK: He might be embarrassed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Jim's never embarrassed.

MR. FOSTER: I'm seldom embarrassed, Mr. Speaker. I may encounter a great deal of difficulty, but I would never admit to being embarrassed.

I have a lot to do, Mr. Speaker. There is all sorts of material in my office which I should get to. I was asked by the news media yesterday or the day before about — the Member for Spirit River-Fairview was asking about the matter of GCOS. I've got all sorts of material in my office.

In view of this session and the time I'm spending in this House and in reviewing legislation, I just haven't got to a lot of material. One is the matter raised by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, and the other is this matter of land titles figures.

I've got a great deal of information. I'm pulling it together. I have some up-to-date information to December '75 and some information from the spring of '76.

DR. BUCK: Don't you have any assistants?

MR. FOSTER: I'll try to get it out as quickly as I can. I've already replied by saying this information will indeed be made public. I don't know when. Perhaps in the next few weeks.

MR. CLARK: That's why we raised the lawyers' salaries?

AN HON. MEMBER: Cheap shot.

MR. CLARK: Well, really. Gosh.

DR. BUCK: Cheap shot? Surely he's got help.

MR. CLARK: That's an indication of how important you consider foreign land use.

DR. BUCK: That's right.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS** (Second Reading)

#### **Bill 54** **The Motor Vehicle Administration** **Amendment Act, 1976**

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, speaking on second reading of this bill, as I mentioned on first reading there are no really earth-shaking principles in the bill. Any new bill in a complicated area such as this is bound to require amendments after being tested in the field, amendments on the advice of the courts and the law enforcement agencies.

I also regret that in the original act, which was passed in the fall, some essential provisions for the law enforcement agencies were dropped. I was under the impression that they were in The Highway Traffic Act, the hon. Minister of Transportation was under the impression they were in The Motor Vehicle Administration Act, and they were lost in the shuffle. So they have been reinserted.

The best I can do in addressing myself to principle is quickly to go over the significant amendments in the act, although they're all minor. The first provision of any significance governs the service of notices of suspension. We've had trouble getting convictions for failure to surrender licences because of the difficulty of proving a service. So we've changed the wording to provide that a service is made merely by mailing the notice to the last known address. That's on page 2.

On page 3 the amendments provide that we can proceed against persons holding non-Alberta licences. This was an oversight in the last act. There are of course a large number of people who come to our province who legitimately drive with *bona fide* operators' licences they've obtained in another province, until the date of expiry.

The amendment to Section 36, paragraph 9, makes it an offence to use the registration of a vehicle in the name of non-existent or defunct corporation — a corporation which has gone bankrupt or for some reason or another has been struck off the register.

On page 4 powers are given to the minister to determine the number and design of licence plates. This is obviously necessary. Paragraph 14 "will permit the retention of seized licence plates until the conclusion of a case if a charge is laid". That is when the charge referred to is a case of stolen or false plates.

On page 5 we have altered the mandatory provision that the insurance companies shall issue two pink cards. This had to be altered because we found that recently some of the largest insurance companies have put their operations on to a computer which only kicks out one card. So now the wording is changed to provide for a copy of the pink card on application by the insuree.

We've struck out altogether the offence for failing to maintain a vehicle as an insured motor vehicle. This was obviously unfair. If you went to Arizona for a six-month holiday, you still had to maintain the insurance on your stored vehicle. That is now being cut out of the act.



On page 6 there is again a provision for a peace officer to operate against people holding out-of-province operator's licences, so that they can also be suspended.

In paragraph 27, Section 98, we've added the power for the police to arrest without warrant if a driver fails to remain at the scene of an accident. That was dropped by an oversight. I had thought it was in The Highway Traffic Act and it was not. The police say it was a very necessary provision in the law.

On page 7 Section 103 is amended to affix the minimum fine from \$100 to \$200 in conformity with the other penalties in the act. That particular fine relates to repairing a vehicle that has been involved in an accident before you've got permission from the police or have notified the police through the regular forms and got authority to repair the vehicle. It also refers to a vehicle damaged by a bullet and repairing it without consent.

Section 30(b), headed (8.1), concerns the surrendering of plates after a judge's order of the fine being \$10 a day. That's when there's been a conviction under Section 238 of the Criminal Code, the section referring to failure to take a breathalyzer and subsequent offences for driving while suspended.

Paragraph 5 at the top of page 9 refers to prohibition on driving after a conviction for driving while suspended; 107(1) deals with subsequent offences. It's the offence of carrying a false pink card or driving a vehicle without insurance. This gives the minister the power to suspend the operator's licence or to require that the licence plates be surrendered, and is only used on the advice of the Driver Control Board in the case of serious offences.

Section 35 says: "Where a person is convicted of an offence under section 92 . . .". That is the offence for refusing to blow. The judge may order prohibition from driving.

On page 10, we've had to change the wording to conform with the new provisions in the Criminal Code, which were proclaimed a week last Monday. These changes in the Criminal Code permit a judge to give a conditional discharge for impaired driving if a convicted person agrees to take alcoholism treatment in an approved hospital for alcoholics. Formerly we had an automatic six-month suspension and so on for the first offence, triggered by the word "conviction". Because of this conditional discharge, we've had to change that to "a finding of guilt". As far as we're concerned in the province of Alberta — and I think in all other provinces — there will still be the mandatory suspension, even though the judge may give a conditional discharge to the person agreeing to take the treatment for alcoholism.

The amendment on page 11 makes it an offence to operate a motor vehicle when suspended or disqualified under our Alberta Check Stop procedures, where the police officer has the power to suspend a licence for 24 hours. If somebody defied that suspension and continued to drive, he would be charged with driving a vehicle while his licence was suspended. Otherwise, that somewhat more lenient route than the full charge of impaired driving under the Criminal Code becomes a farce if people ignore it and continue to drive.

Mr. Speaker, those are all the significant amendments in the act. I move second reading.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make a few comments on second reading. While I certainly support the bill and its present changes, I am a little concerned that some restrictions, particularly for those charged for the first time with impaired driving, are perhaps a bit severe. I don't want to be accused of defending drunken or impaired driving or anything of that nature. But I do feel the courts should have some flexibility which they don't have, if I understand the present regulations. Perhaps the minister could comment on this.

I have an example of a chap in British Columbia who was charged, found guilty, and convicted. He paid the \$300 fine. He had a three-month suspension, which he considered fair and just. Then he got a letter advising that that was not the case in Alberta. It was going to be a six-month sentence. This chap, by the way, Mr. Speaker, is a trucker who makes his living driving a truck.

I have a similar instance of a driver who took the breathalyzer test and blew .16. However, at the time of the incident, he had a matrimonial problem. He took to drinking, but he was simply driving his motor vehicle around his own property outside the city of Calgary. Due to another incident, the RCMP came and noticed he had been drinking. He took the test and was convicted. This chap was a professional truck driver, had driven over 2 million accident-free miles without a charge, let alone a previous impaired driving charge. He's going to find it very hard to replace his job as a trucker, for which he gets \$15,000 a year.

What I'd like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, is that since the federal government has, in effect, got out of the field of restricting licences, I think we should take a look at first offenders. I understand that the province of British Columbia has a one-month suspension for first charges. New Brunswick has what they call a hardship licensing system for people of this nature. Quebec, I understand, is discussing this very controversial problem right now.

I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that some people, when charged under The Highways Act — you know, a \$500 fine is probably an irritant to them. If they lose their licence it may become an irritant to their friends because they have to become taxi drivers for them. But, Mr. Speaker, for those who make their living by driving — I know they have an added responsibility to see that they don't drive when they're impaired — I feel the act is too harsh. I think a person should have one chance. I suggest that any person in this Legislature who drinks stands a good chance of being charged with impaired driving. But that's not going to hurt us as far as making a living goes. I think we should consider this for future amendments.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a word on two or three items of principle in the bill. The first is the principle of the design of plates. I'm wondering if the hon. minister has some thought of changing the slogan on the plate from Wild Rose Country to something else. I wasn't particularly excited when the word first came out that we were putting Wild Rose Country on our licence plates. I had always been quite a believer in licence plates for identification purposes and I didn't really see too much sense in cluttering them up with messages. However, every province and almost every state is doing it, so

probably I was wrong and everybody else was right. But the slogan Wild Rose Country seems to have caught on all over Canada, and even some Americans tell me how delighted they are with that particular slogan. So, I'm wondering if the hon. minister is thinking about changing it to something like Fabulous Alberta, Beautiful Alberta, or Keep Alberta Clean. I would like to have his views on it. I might say that I'm quite pleased with the Wild Rose Country slogan.

The next item I'd like to commend the department on is requiring insurance companies to produce two pink cards. I think this is a very excellent . . .

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, I rather question that we should use the discussion of this bill as a vehicle for the review of departmental policy. Perhaps if the hon. member wished to bring up some items of departmental policy he might do so on another occasion or by means of a resolution on the Order Paper.

MR. TAYLOR: I express my apologies, Mr. Speaker. Since the minister had dealt with them, I thought possibly there should be some reply. However, I accept your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: I apologize to the hon. member. It illustrates how the sins of the Chair come home to roost, if that's not a mixed metaphor.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I don't think it was a sin of the Chair. I think it was my sin, so I'll accept it.

The only matter of principle, then, that I'd like to deal with is this matter of impaired driving. I think that's definitely a principle of the act. I personally don't lean towards leniency in regard to driving while impaired. There have to be some places to provide for exceptional circumstances and exceptional cases. But I think once you reduce the penalty severely for first offenders in drinking, you are encouraging people to drink, because they say the first conviction doesn't amount to much anyway.

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

The reason I say that is, a few years ago the federal legislation provided for a court, if approved by a province, to issue a permit to persons who required their driver's licence during working hours only. The only place the privilege was denied was for pleasure driving in the evenings or on Sundays.

We found that almost every person who was convicted of impaired driving received this special privilege from the courts to drive during restricted hours only. Almost everybody used their cars or trucks for business, maybe not as much as a taxi driver or a truck driver, but a farmer needs his equipment and so on.

I really don't favor reducing the penalty. I think the first offence should be considered as bad as any other because, as an opposition member said a few years ago when this matter was being discussed — I quote as far as I can remember: when life can go back into the little girl who was killed by a first offender for impaired driving, then I'll be agreeable to making that first penalty very light.

That is the difficulty. When we drive while we're impaired, it's only through the grace of God we don't kill somebody or cause severe damage. We just shouldn't be driving while we're impaired, and

impairment starts with the first drink. While many people can take several drinks and still know what they're doing, impairment does start with the first drink. I think there has to be a pretty careful view of this to make sure that we don't undo something that has been done, namely that most people realize they just should not drink and drive, and they shouldn't be taking a chance with other people's lives by drinking and driving.

By the same token, I introduced a bill I think a couple of sessions ago, and I gave the authority to a court rather than the minister, not because I didn't think the minister could handle it, but I think it's an unfair burden to put upon a minister. But I gave the authority to a court that where a person was taking a course of so many hours, and was able to show that he was leaving liquor entirely alone, then some leniency should be extended and he be given the right by the court to continue to earn his living.

There was another section in that, and I had in mind the case of a farmer who must drive several miles, for instance, to feed his cattle. He's charged and convicted for impaired driving for a first offence, and then he can't even look after the work of his farm. He must hire somebody in order to feed his cattle, which creates a very, very severe problem.

I don't think the penalty should be reduced. But in a case like that, where a person realizes that while it's his first offence and it probably will never happen again because he realizes how important it is, I certainly wouldn't be averse to that person serving his six months or three months, or whatever the law happens to be, at a time other than when his urgent work is required. I think he's still being punished, and the punishment is somewhat more equal. As the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight said, if one of us in the Legislature lost our licence through impaired driving, we would miss our vehicle, but we could still do our work — maybe not as well, and it would be inconvenient, but we could still do our work. But the man who is operating a truck or a taxi can't even do his work.

There's still a great responsibility on people like that to make sure they don't drink and drive. But on a first offence where there's definite evidence that it was a mistake, that the man knows the error of his ways and probably will never again take a drink before he gets behind the wheel, I don't think we're going to do too much damage by being a little lenient, by setting the period of the punishment at a time when it will do the least damage to his business, or to those who depend upon him.

I would like to see the minister take a look at that. I know there are difficulties in doing it, because the trend today is to increase the penalties for impaired driving. A lot of evidence comes out that in some of the European countries where the penalty is a jail term for the first offence, almost everybody makes sure they don't drink and drive. It becomes a very, very serious thing. Perhaps that's the way to stop drinking and driving. Whatever we do, we certainly shouldn't endanger the lives of other people on our streets and highways by encouraging drinking while driving.

I was horrified a few years ago when a man completely inebriated in the city of Calgary drove [onto] the sidewalk and killed two or three people. The court threw the case out because they said he

was completely drunk, completely inebriated, and didn't know what he was doing. I don't agree with that at all. If I'm going to drink, surely I know before I start that I'm going to be responsible for my actions. I should take definite action to make sure I don't get behind the wheel and kill an innocent person.

I realize this is a difficult problem. There's no easy solution. All I can ask is that the hon. minister continue to carry out research and study with a view to having a definite deterrent for us all not to drive and drink, but at the same time to be as fair as possible to those who happen to do it, sometimes innocently, and get caught for the first time. I don't think there are any excuses at all for second, third, or fourth offenders. I personally lean to the Criminal Code, where a court can give a jail term for a second offence. If that was carried out and people were charged on the second offence as second offenders, I think it would have a tremendous influence on making people stop to think that before they drink they've got to make sure they give somebody else the keys of their car.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in making one or two remarks I'd like to say that I certainly support a very hard position with regard to drinking and driving, and support the legislation as it now stands. I think our experience in the past, where we allowed judges to have some discretion, [placed] us in a situation where there were inequities in dealing out penalties to different drivers. Even the first offender knows, when he is drinking and he goes out in his car, what the result can be. I think there's no excuse, and there's an old cliché that certainly supports that.

The other area I'd like the minister to comment on: I was wondering if he has considered the matter of the jail sentence in the second or third offence. In 1970, when I was in Finland and looking at the jail systems there, I recall they had automatic one-month and two-month sentences for those caught drinking and driving. They said, and felt from all indications, that was certainly a good deterrent. Some sentences were served just on the weekend, some partly in convenience to the person serving the term, but in one area we visited there was also a labor component that went along with it. Cabinet ministers, ministers of the church, and various other people were doing hard labor on the airport. It certainly shook their dignity just a little bit. Maybe that's an old-fashioned, traditional approach to penalties, but it seemed to be effective. I wonder if the minister has considered harsher sentences in that area.

The other area I wanted the minister to comment on was driver's licences. One of my constituents raised this matter with me some time ago. I understand it isn't mandatory to have your picture on all drivers' licences. I was wondering if the minister has considered any amendments. What type of considerations has the minister had in that area?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: May the hon. minister close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should first make a few remarks about the suggestions of the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight and the hon.

Member for Drumheller, about some compassion for those who have to use their vehicles to work. I am afraid that, as I read it at the present time, public opinion is not in favor of any increased leniency towards impaired driving. In fact, Mr. Justice Kirby, in his recent report on the law courts in Alberta, suggested an even more Draconian punishment. He suggested that cars be impounded. In that case, of course, the wife and the son couldn't drive the suspended driver to work.

The problem is that 90 per cent of the people who work nowadays can make a good argument that they need their vehicles, no matter what they're doing: whether they're feeding horses a quarter section down the road, driving a taxi cab or truck, or they're a salesman, milkman, or bakery distributor. The area of value judgment then begins to be applied to everyone, and the deterrent evaporates. So I think we're much better to have the present system where no discretion is given to the minister under the act, and it's an absolute, automatic, mandatory suspension for six months on the first offence.

Other provinces had the same problems with intermittent licences being given by the judges, and that is the reason the federal government has now removed this power from the Criminal Code — also on the constitutional grounds that licensing is a provincial function, and not a function of the federal authority. Of course a judge can still prohibit with more severe penalties than we have written into our provincial statutes, but he can no longer suspend licences. There's a subtle difference in law. If the judge does happen to apply a bigger penalty than those provided for in our departmental suspensions, it can be tacked on the end of a departmental suspension.

I appreciate the compassion because I have people writing to me every day, pleading for mercy. I suppose it makes it easier for me that I can answer there is no power in the statutes of Alberta to exercise any discretion. It's mandatory.

As the hon. Member for Little Bow suggested, in some countries they have an automatic jail sentence. What I would like to see — and it is practised by some of the judges — is that in addition to the suspension and fine there should be a period of probation. One of the conditions on the probation order should be attendance at AADAC's alcoholism-impaired driver classes. In the famous case of the former Minister of Telephones and Utilities who was picked up by the boys in blue in Edmonton a couple of years ago, he was given a sentence of six months' probation and had to attend these classes. It did him the world of good, I understand.

I've heard rumors that AADAC, which comes under the aegis of the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health, has softened the message in these impaired driver programs a little since the day I graduated, because some of the people were objecting to the films of blood and gore and all the terrible carnage that can be caused by impaired drivers. I think that's a mistake. Even though offenders may hate this extra punishment in the beginning, hate the compulsory attendance at these classes, hate having their noses rubbed in it, so to speak, like you do when you train a puppy, I think it's probably the most constructive part of the sentence. I would like to see that practice extended right across the province.

Judge Rolf in Edmonton initiated this technique. I think it's done an enormous amount of good in Alberta. Such AADAC courses are now attached to most of the courts in Alberta. I hope it's not true that their message has been slightly softened since my day.

The mandatory photo on the license and the trouble we got into with a citizen of the Hutterite faith in southern Alberta who objected to having his picture taken: the act has been amended in accordance with the advice of lawyers to make a licence not valid unless it has the signature of the registrar and a photograph. We believe the loophole has been covered. In any case, the judgment was not later challenged by the Hutterite Brethren, when we made it quite clear there would be no exception in their case. I think it's now covered in the legislation, but one can never be sure in the area of litigation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Motion carried; Bill 54 read a second time]

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, prior to moving into Committee of the Whole, I'd like to move that Bill No. 16, under third reading on the Order Paper, be returned to the Committee of the Whole to consider certain amendments that are being distributed now.

[Motion carried]

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to work on bills on the Order Paper.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Deputy Premier, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker left the Chair]

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**  
(Committee of the Whole)

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee of the Whole Assembly will now come to order.

**Bill 9**  
**The Libraries**  
**Amendment Act, 1976**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say to the member sponsoring the bill that in essence what we're doing here is removing the ceilings. Is that not so? Are we removing the ceilings?

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think it goes without saying that this is fine; but it really doesn't do the people of the province who are interested in libraries — and I guess that's all of us — very much good. What we really need is money. The minister is coming to his

place. I am so pleased to see that, because in our debate on the estimates for the minister's department of culture, libraries come under this section.

To make a long story short, it's fine to remove the ceiling, but what the libraries need, Mr. Chairman, is money. That's really what it's all about. Once again, I plead with the minister and with the members of the government caucus to at least give us some commitment, give some commitment to the people of this province, that next year libraries will receive a high priority. This year we certainly can hide behind the restraint thing. But surely there could have been some re-establishing of priorities to give libraries the rightful place.

MR. NOTLEY: When we discussed the budget of the Minister of Government Services and Culture yesterday, this matter came up. It was pointed out there's a marginal reduction of about 2 per cent. The minister indicated that part of the reason was explainable. In actual fact, there really isn't going to be any kind of significant increase in the budget this year, not even an increase which will keep pace with inflation. So when we look at the 1976-77 budget, the first thing we have to admit is that we are not even standing still. We are being pushed back in library services this year. I think that's extremely unfortunate. Therefore, the point the Member for Clover Bar raised is a very good one. I would ask the member who introduced Bill No. 9, when he concludes debate, to advise us, if he can, what priority the government intends to place on additional funding for libraries in future years.

Obviously, Bill No. 9 is the first step. That's why we're going to support it. By lifting the ceiling, we have the legislative framework to provide additional funding for libraries in the province. But the legislative framework standing by itself is just a bare skeleton. [For it] to be fleshed out, we have to have the funding. That means there is a special obligation, it seems to me, on the part of government caucus members to ensure that when the Provincial Treasurer draws up that budget next year we do a little better than we have this year in terms of funding libraries.

Now I know we can talk all we like about restraint. But the fact of the matter is that \$.5 million is a very, very miniscule amount in comparison to the total \$3 billion budget of the province. The question then is: do we need additional funds for libraries? I know of no one in this House who would not quickly rise and say, yes, we do need additional funds. We can argue about how much those additional funds should be, and where they should be concentrated. But I know of no member in this House who is satisfied with present funding of libraries in the province.

Both the Library Trustees' Association and the Library Association of Alberta have made it abundantly clear — notwithstanding all the arguments that can be advanced about other types of spending, departmental libraries, and so on — that when it comes back to the public libraries in the province of Alberta, we are not providing the kind of funding necessary to continue to improve the library system. Members can say, we have excellent libraries in our major cities. That is true. We do. But the question is: how long will that library service be maintained, let alone improved?

In this rapidly changing world where there's an

explosion of knowledge, additional funds have to be made [available] so that libraries can improve. Library service has to be constantly improving. The fact that we have several excellent libraries in the province does not, in my judgment, answer the point that the people in the library field are making, and that is a very strong plea to the members of this House for additional funding. It's not just a matter of a few people making this plea. It's coming from almost every reputable source in the library community. We have to upgrade our funding from the provincial government.

During second reading we discussed the question of rural libraries. Enough said. During the second reading debate, members from both sides of the House lamented the — in some cases deplorable — state of library services in many points in Alberta because there just isn't enough money available. We are indebted to the people who are providing voluntary service. No question about that. We will always have to have voluntary service in many of the smaller communities.

But to conclude, I would just direct this to the member who introduced the bill: we desperately need additional funding. Bill 9 sets the framework. But in my judgment it is now up to the members of government caucus. The ball, Mr. Member, is in your court to make sure that the funding is provided in 1977-78.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to rise, but I really rise on a point of order. I too would like to give my speech on libraries all over again, but that was the principle of the bill. Are we going to permit again in Committee of the Whole the discussion on principle? Because Committee of the Whole is really to study individual clauses, not to repeat the ideas and the principle of the bill. I bring it to your attention because I think we are going to waste an awful lot of time. If one member is going to do it, the rest of us are going to do it too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, I have to support the view of the hon. Member for Drumheller. I was just about to say the same sort of thing. We've heard these arguments and comments time and time again in this House. I think we're all very sympathetic towards the views being expressed regarding libraries. But I don't think this is the time and place to go through the whole routine again.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I move third reading of Bill 9, The Libraries Amendment Act, 1976.

MR. CHAIRMAN: [Not recorded] hon. member, we are in committee and you are not required to move third reading.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

**Bill 18**  
**The Pension Statutes**  
**Amendment Act, 1976**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, we were part way through this bill the other day, and I drew the attention of the members of the Assembly to some amendments. The hon. Leader of the Opposition asked about the amendment to subsection (8), which is found on page 8 of the bill. We adjourned before I gave an explanation of the amendment to that subsection.

As I indicated in my opening comments on the amendments, they were of a technical nature. The reason for the particular amendment to subsection (8) is this: the phrase "during that service", which we're proposing to be struck out, would limit the board to consideration of picking up prior service as pensionable service to such prior service with the provincial government. That is inconsistent with all the other provisions in the act, where an employee can pick up private service with certain other employers in addition to the provincial government.

The reason it has to be done by amendment is that the word "government" had been taken out in an earlier clause, prior to the bill being printed, which made it necessary to delete this phrase. We simply overlooked deleting it at that time.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 18, The Pension Statutes Amendment Act, 1976, be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 22**  
**The Alberta**  
**Investment Fund Repeal Act**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions, comments, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 22 be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 11**  
**The Alberta Health Care**  
**Insurance Amendment Act, 1976**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions, comments, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the bill, I'm not sure whether the minister completely

convinced the House as to the reason for expanding from five to nine members, and why the minister felt he had to have power to appoint three, and the Lieutenant-Governor three. Why couldn't the Lieutenant Governor in Council appoint six to begin with?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Chairman, I believe the answer to that question is: if the hon. member will look at the total appointees, a chairman and three full-time civil servants are now involved on the commission, as well as the chairman of the Alberta Hospital Services Commission. The three members appointed by the minister accommodate the full-time civil servants other than the chairman. The three members representing the general public and appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council are the citizens who would be appointed. They would not be full-time but part-time, citizens at large who would be appointed to the commission. So the three members appointed by the minister are full-time public servants.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. MINIELY: I move that Bill 11 be reported.

[Motion carried]

#### **Bill 5**

#### **The Alberta School Trustees' Association Amendment Act, 1976**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions, comments, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 5 be reported.

[Motion carried]

#### **Bill 20**

#### **The Municipal Government Amendment Act, 1976**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. JAMISON: Mr. Chairman, I move Bill 20 be reported.

[Motion carried]

#### **Bill 21**

#### **The Hail and Crop Insurance Amendment Act, 1976**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I move Bill 21 be reported.

[Motion carried]

#### **Bill 25**

#### **The Energy Resources Conservation Amendment Act, 1976**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. GETTY: Mr. Chairman, I move Bill 25 be reported.

[Motion carried]

#### **Bill 26**

#### **The Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs Amendment Act, 1976**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. JAMISON: Mr. Chairman, I move Bill 26 be reported.

[Motion carried]

#### **Bill 27**

#### **The Land Surface Conservation and Reclamation Amendment Act, 1976**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, a Xeroxed amendment to Section 2(d) was distributed.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, I move Bill 27 be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

#### **Bill 28**

#### **The Planning Amendment Act, 1976**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, I move Bill 28 be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 31**  
**The Marketing of Agricultural**  
**Products Amendment Act, 1976**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister, Mr. Schmidt, could advise us whether there were any formal discussions or if he had any formal discussions with both Unifarm and the NFU before introducing the changes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I personally had none. But it is my understanding that the amendments you see in Bill 31 were applied for by all producer boards and commissions. It is my understanding that all people concerned have been contacted [about] the contents of the bill.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I just might add that with respect to those producer marketing boards, which mainly included the Alberta Hog Producers' Marketing Board, full and lengthy discussions were held with them with respect to amendments to the bill. They were brought in because of specific concerns which they had expressed to us.

MR. NOTLEY: Just to follow that up, Mr. Chairman, to the minister. The bill in fact represents the proposals of the marketing boards as such, in particular the hog marketing board, and there is no problem as far as they're concerned. They're happy with this bill as it stands, are they?

MR. MOORE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. In fact, the amendments were brought in largely to resolve some existing problems within those boards.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Chairman, I move Bill 31 be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 33**  
**The Civil Service**  
**Association of Alberta Repeal Act**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, to the member. I just wanted one part clarified. I believe he mentioned it in second reading. This will now allow the new organization to seek collective bargaining for — well, let's take the most obvious, immediate example, the VS Services employees at ASH/Deerhome. The successor to the CSA will then be able to bargain for them, or to apply to the Board of Industrial Relations to become the bargaining agent. Would that be correct?

MR. YOUNG: Yes. Mr. Chairman, the bill will clarify powers about which there had been some doubt in

legal circles, and now assures that the Alberta Union of [Provincial] Employees would have the authority to bargain for or to represent employees other than direct government employees. They could operate under The Alberta Labour Act in that respect.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the member. The minister Dr. Hohol received a letter from the instructors at SAIT. I'm sure you're aware of the letter and their concern about how Section 2(d) makes it compulsory for them to belong to the association. They've requested that they have a choice. I was wondering if the member had considered this particular letter.

MR. YOUNG: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the letter was considered. I may say that in matters of this nature it's not unusual to have groups who feel they could better represent themselves in a different manner. I had some direct representations on it, as well. However, this legislation does not alter the existing situation.

As members of the House are well aware, there is a task force at work. When that task force reports, I suspect the burden of some of its remarks may be directed in the general area of the point raised by the correspondence from SAIT.

MR. NOTLEY: As a matter of fact, the Member for Edmonton Jasper Place has mentioned a task force. That was announced with great fanfare shortly before the last election was called, as I recall. Is the member or the appropriate minister in a position to give us some idea where things stand on this matter of sorting out which act applies to people who work in the public service?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, I can't and wouldn't attempt to give a time line as to when the task force may report, other than to refer the question to the minister. But the bill we have before us is a consequence of some of their earlier work and follows their recommendations.

MR. NOTLEY: Is the Provincial Treasurer in a position to clarify that question? I assume it would be the Provincial Treasurer who'd be in a position to do so.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, I didn't catch all the member's words. I gather the question is when we expect the task force report to come in. I'm anticipating it some time in the late summer or fall of this year. Like all such reports, I think we have to appreciate that an anticipated time line may not be kept.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, is the task force meeting at the present time on a systematic, periodic basis, or is it rather leisurely, spasmodic, and infrequent?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that it's meeting on a regular basis and proceeding with its work as quickly as one might expect.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 33 be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 42**  
**The Oil and Gas Conservation**  
**Amendment Act, 1976**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like the minister to outline the necessity for Section 6(e) in the bill. That's the section that gives the Lieutenant Governor in Council the power to

make regulations exempting from the application of this section

- (a) any person or class of persons, or
- (b) any industrial or manufacturing operation or any part thereof or any class of industrial or manufacturing operation.

So if I understand the legislation correctly, we're in the situation of passing the legislation and then giving the minister, I think the term is, a Henry VIII clause which, despite everything the Legislature has approved, allows the minister and the Lieutenant Governor in Council to do as they see fit.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Leader of the Opposition makes a good point. In the case of natural gas and in the case of coal, the present capacity is in the existing industrial development permits as well. It's really a flexibility clause and one which, it is felt, may be in the public interest at a time when it would be necessary for the Executive Council to move in this way. I see no potential need to do that in the near future. However, we feel this makes the legislation consistent with the other industrial development permit legislation and does provide that flexibility.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I don't deny that we may have this kind of section in other pieces of legislation. I recall being on the committee on regulations which I believe the Member for Drayton Valley chaired. Progress on the recommendations of that committee has been amazingly slow. In fact, since the committee made its recommendations we haven't heard anything more of it. It actually dealt with a clause like this. It's my intention to move that that section be taken out of the act now that the House meets twice a year, unless we hear some reason from the minister.

Mr. Minister, could you give us an example of the kind of thing that it has dealt with in the last couple of years, or the last year, where the province has really been hindered by not having this particular section in The Oil and Gas Conservation Act?

MR. GETTY: No, Mr. Chairman, I haven't an example of anything like this which would have been needed in the last year. However, I point out to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that we are moving into an area of industrial development permits that we have, to this extent, not been in before. It's our view that

the flexibility is required for unforeseen circumstances.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Minister, I suppose this is a somewhat rhetorical question, but can you give us some kind of feel as to what some of these unforeseen circumstances are, before we're asked to buy a pig in a poke?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the hon. Leader of the Opposition's position and I can't, or else I would have insisted that that legislation be drafted to cover only those situations.

In fact, there isn't one that we have gone through or one that I foresee. If I could have foreseen one, I would have framed the legislation to cover only that situation. But it is something that must be done only by order in council approving the regulations. As I said, it's strictly a flexibility clause.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you'd tell us where the request for the legislation came from. Did the request come from the Oil and Gas Conservation Board? Is it a request from industry or the department?

MR. GETTY: The request came from the Oil and Gas Conservation Board, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I move that we delete Section 8 of Bill 42. That's the section that says:

The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations exempting from the application of this section

- (a) any person or class of persons, or
- (b) any industrial or manufacturing operation or any part thereof or any class of industrial or manufacturing operation.

I've got copies here for everybody.

MR. NOTLEY: It seems to me that it's very difficult to vote against this amendment when we have no real indication from the minister of why he needs this power. It was not unreasonable for the opposition to ask whether there had been any period in the last two or three years where this authority would have been necessary. As I recall, the minister's answer indicated there wasn't.

The need for flexibility has to be balanced against what the Legislature is surrendering here, and that is a judgment which we have to weigh very carefully. Had there been some evidence in the last two or three years where we've had some major events take place, one might have to admit that kind of flexibility was necessary.

As I listened today in question period I got the impression from both the Premier and the minister that perhaps we were going to have a rather more measured pace of development in the future. That being the case, it seems to me the argument for flexibility, with all respect, Mr. Minister, is not quite as compelling as it would be otherwise. Therefore, I really would ask the government whether it deems this section to be absolutely basic and fundamental to proper application of this bill.

[Motion lost]



[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. GETTY: Mr. Chairman, I move the bill be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 44**  
**The Alberta Energy Company**  
**Amendment Act, 1976**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could just bring us up to date on the mechanisms. I understand the pipeline and the power plant will be set up as separate companies, subsidiaries of the Alberta Energy Company. I wonder if the minister could take this opportunity to advise us just what the structure will be.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Chairman, the corporate structure of the subsidiaries is obviously being handled by the Alberta Energy Company management and board of directors. However, I could provide the hon. member with certain information contained in details that I already provided to the House. The utilities plant will be an entity made up of Calgary Power and the Alberta Energy Company: the Alberta Energy Company as two-thirds; Calgary Power, one-third. They will provide the power to the Syncrude project as specified in the contracts I've tabled in the House. The six participants are responsible for paying the company for the delivery of that power in all circumstances save abandonment. The Government of Alberta, as I pointed out, is guaranteeing the debt in that one circumstance.

I also pointed out the agreement provides that abandonment cannot go ahead without 100 per cent approval of all participants. Therefore, there is a measure of control that way.

The pipeline company is a 100 per cent subsidiary of the Alberta Energy Company. The participants in Syncrude have signed an agreement with the pipeline company to purchase the ability to carry oil from Fort McMurray to Edmonton under a normal cost-of-service arrangement, which will provide that over the period of the pipeline company's contract, they must pay, whether or not the pipeline actually carries any oil. Therefore, it is a guaranteed operation. There is no intention of the government to participate in the guarantee of debt that may be raised in that regard. That guarantee would be inherent in the contract with the six participants.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the minister indicated the power plant was going to be set up on the basis of two-thirds AEC and one-third Calgary Power. Will that be the basis of the board set-up of the subsidiary company? How will that be established?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Chairman, normally that's the case. However, I haven't participated in that part of the Alberta Energy Company's operation. I consider that to be the normal operations of the company.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, just so I understand the avenue of communication here. What we have, then, is a subsidiary company; one-third Calgary Power, [two-thirds] Alberta Energy Company. I would assume that the avenues of communication between the government and that subsidiary company would be the AEC.

I ask because we are guaranteeing the utility company. I'm curious as to how things are coming in terms of the construction. If the construction costs go very high, our guarantee will have to go up accordingly. So how are we keeping a handle on it? It's now once removed from the Alberta Energy Company. Perhaps the minister could advise us on that.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Chairman, the accountability, if you like, of the Energy Company building the pipeline in the most efficient way possible is the profit accountability. It's the whole theory behind the Alberta Energy Company. If the government had wanted, the accountability could have been established — I'm sure the hon. member could argue — by the government owning the pipeline company itself, then hiring people to try to build us a pipeline. In this case, though, the Energy Company is responsible to its shareholders to make a profit. Therefore, they must build a pipeline as efficiently as possible.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I was really referring to the power plant as opposed to the pipeline, but the same principle applies. Is Canadian Bechtel a prime contractor for the power plant as well as the major facility?

MR. GETTY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is. I think I pointed out in the House earlier that the subdivision of the two projects, the power plant from the Syncrude project itself — it is very difficult to actually tell the separation at times. However, it is provided for in the documents that were tabled in the House. But in our judgment, and in the judgment of Syncrude participants, it would not have been feasible to have separate prime contractors.

MR. NOTLEY: [Not recorded] same agreement that the consortium has with Canadian Bechtel also applies to the power plant, so that both the benefits and the problems of that arrangement — to be more specific, the cost-plus aspect — also apply to the power plant. Is there any mechanism, other than the profit motive of the AEC, by which we're going to be able to keep a handle on the construction costs?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Chairman, no. It will be the Alberta Energy Company's own engineers and the participants as well, because of the costs built into a cost-of-service contract. It's certainly to their advantage to keep that cost down as much as possible. But the government itself will not be monitoring the construction of the power plant.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask the minister [about], I suppose, a favorite topic of mine — and obviously the AEC is a favorite topic of the minister, although we don't agree on some points as far as the AEC is concerned.

Mr. Minister, I wonder if you can now give us some sort of idea what kind of developments you see

the Alberta Energy Company becoming involved in in the next year. I'd be especially interested in Steel Alberta and some of the other areas the minister sees the AEC becoming involved in.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Chairman, I would imagine that the members recall the various projects the Alberta Energy Company now has within its responsibility: the Suffield power plant, an interest in Pan-Alberta, the pipeline, and the option on the Syncrude project itself. Putting them aside, I would expect the Alberta Energy Company to participate in petrochemicals within the province. The hon. Leader of the Opposition will probably recall that within the petrochemical letter agreement, which has been filed in the House, there is provision for the Alberta Energy Company to participate in pipelines, ethane extraction, and the potential to participate in the ethylene plant itself. I would also recall for the benefit of the hon. Leader of the Opposition the PetAlta project which he has raised in the House and for which I believe the Energy Resources Conservation Board has now called a hearing sometime in June. That is a benzene project in conjunction with Mitsubishi and one other.

MR. CLARK: Hudson's Bay.

MR. GETTY: Hudson's Bay Oil and Gas, I believe. It's my hope that the Alberta Energy Company doesn't feel in any way constrained not to participate in other energy developments within the province, while staying within the policy guidelines which have been laid before the House and The Alberta Energy Company Act. I would hope they would participate in the coal development in this province. I can see the Alberta Energy Company perhaps participating in other resource developments besides energy. Hon. members may recall that the government has negotiated a 40 per cent interest option in the Simpson Timber development. Now it may be, Mr. Chairman — the decision has not been made — that that option should be provided to the Alberta Energy Company, a period of time in which they might consider taking that option.

I also feel, Mr. Chairman, that the Alberta Energy Company will be participating, through its 50 per cent ownership of 20 per cent of the 50 per cent ownership of Steel Alberta which owns the 20 per cent in Interprovincial Steel and Pipe Corporation, in future expansion of steel operations within the province. But beyond those general comments, I would not be urging the Energy Company to do other than to participate in the most profitable opportunities they can find for their shareholders, keeping in mind that they are restricted within certain policy restrictions of the government and, to some extent, by their act.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Minister, in your comments you talked about the option as far as Syncrude is concerned. I'd be interested in the kinds of discussions there have been between you, Mr. Minister, or your officials, and the Alberta Energy Company with regard to the question of exercising of the option. If my recollection is correct, five years after the Syncrude plant goes on stream we have to make the decision whether or not we move on the option.

My question to the minister is this . . . The minister

shakes his head. He'll be pleased to correct me then, I'm sure. Mr. Minister, when you talk of the options there, are you talking of the options the Alberta government has that centre around the Gulf and the other guarantee tabled in the House not long ago? In fact, what options are you talking about?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Chairman, I thought that was the reason perhaps for the confusion on the five years. The two convertible debentures which the Provincial Treasurer tabled in the House and we've discussed recently provide that those debentures can each be converted to approximately 5 per cent interest in the Syncrude project over a period of five years. However, when the original Syncrude agreement was struck in September 1973, the government negotiated an option for from 5 per cent up to 20 per cent to be offered either to the government, or to an entity designated by the government. That option must be exercised six months after the plant is on commercial production. That is the option I've referred to.

There is provision in the agreements I've tabled in the House that the Alberta Energy Company must give the government 90 days if they are going to say no, in the event we might want to do something else with that option. However, that would be down the road at some time, and it gives a degree of flexibility for the government.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, as to the option the Alberta Energy Company has on Syncrude, we have 5 per cent now but we can go up close to 20 per cent — that's the decision the Energy Company will make if they decide not to pick up that option. They notify the Alberta government 90 days prior to the end of six months after operations start. Is that right?

MR. GETTY: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CLARK: Try again.

MR. GETTY: The 5 per cent the government has through the debentures should be kept completely separate. The Alberta Energy Company is not involved in that whatsoever. That's something the government may exercise, or they may just go on receiving interest and have the debt repaid. That's 5 per cent to each of two companies — it could end up being 10 per cent — 5 per cent Gulf and 5 per cent Canada-Cities Service. The government also has a 10 per cent equity interest.

We may as well get that out of the way too. We took a 10 per cent equity interest in Winnipeg. But from 1973 we had the option to participate from 5 per cent to 20 per cent. The only reason I say from 5 per cent is that below that it would probably be a nuisance to have a 4, 3, 2, 1 per cent kind of option. I think the companies made a fair argument that, if you're going to participate in an option up to 20 per cent, you should take at least 5. So that's the from 5 per cent to 20 per cent. That option is available to the Energy Company.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to go on to this question of some sort of accountability as far as the Energy Company is concerned, especially for the \$75 million that the government put into the Alberta Energy Company.

I refer to the annual meeting held earlier this year. The minister will recall that I asked a question in the House: who really had the proxy votes for Alberta, and what kind of direction was given to Mr. Mitchell? I think the minister indicated that first of all Mr. Mitchell was assigned the proxy, and that no specific direction was given to Mr. Mitchell other than to look after the \$75 million in the best interests of Albertans. So I now raise the question and say frankly that we're not satisfied with that kind of arrangement. I do think the government and certainly the Legislature have some responsibilities as far as accountability for that \$75 million is concerned.

What I'd like to propose is basically that the minister come before the Assembly each year with a resolution, within the first two weeks of the session, indicating who will be representing the \$75 million interest for the people of Alberta, and what kind of voting instructions will go to that particular individual. Then I would have to say that that would naturally have some bearing on when the company holds its meeting. If, in fact, the session of the Legislature commences after the first day of April, the proxy would be exercised by the minister himself at the meeting.

I raise the matter because I candidly think that as a Legislature and as a province we haven't fulfilled our obligation as far as accountabilities are concerned. So what I'd like to propose is that following Section 9 in the bill there be added the following section, which would become 31(1). I have a number of copies here for the members. Just to read it:

- (1) In every year that the first session of the Legislative Assembly commences prior to the first day of April, the Minister shall, within 15 days of the commencement of the first session of the Legislative Assembly, move a resolution in the Legislative Assembly proposing a person or persons to be nominated to hold the proxies of the voting rights on all shares in the Company held by the Government of Alberta and proposing directions to be given to such person or persons as to the manner in which the voting rights by proxy shall be exercised.
- (2) The Company shall not hold its annual meeting until
  - (a) such time as the Legislative Assembly has adopted or amended and adopted a resolution moved pursuant to subsection (1), or
  - (b) the first day of May, whichever shall [come first].
- (3) In any year where the first session of the Legislative Assembly commences on or after the first day of April the proxies shall be exercised by the Minister in person.

In proposing this to the members of the Assembly, I simply say that this way it then becomes incumbent upon the minister responsible for the Alberta Energy Company legislation to bring a resolution to the Chamber with direction as to who will be holding the proxy voting rights and what directions will be given to that person or persons, because in fact as a Legislature we've committed \$75 million to the Alberta Energy Company.

Secondly, if the Legislature doesn't sit before April

1, the minister himself will go to the Alberta Energy Company annual meeting and then will be in a position to come back to the Legislature and account therefor.

I raised the question because this year at the annual meeting of the Alberta Energy Company we in fact had the president of the Alberta Energy Company, who was exercising the proxy vote — and some of these people were in the business community too — who indicated after, well really, there wasn't a great deal of sense in going through the ritual of the meeting, because if we'd wanted to change things or propose things, we really had no possibility of doing it anyway because of the make-up of the proxy responsibilities as far as the province of Alberta was concerned.

So I make the point to the members of the Assembly that this would build in some accountability right to the Assembly. Also, members of the Assembly would have some input in the kind of direction that would go with the \$75 million worth of proxy vote to the annual meeting, and where the Legislature doesn't start by April 1, the minister would go and come back to the Assembly and be accountable to the Assembly for his conduct at the meeting.

So I would urge hon. members to give some thought to this kind of amendment. I think it will strengthen The Alberta Energy Company Act and certainly strengthen the accountability of the Assembly.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Chairman, I think it's fair to say that the debate we have in this regard between the opposition and members of the government continues to circle around, I guess, accepting the concept of the Alberta Energy Company as a company within the province, much like any other company. The government is a shareholder. The government doesn't have any greater rights as a shareholder than other shareholders. As a shareholder, the government will assess the management and directors they select, and I suppose in any particular assessment it will either judge them to be sufficient, or it won't. But it will exercise its rights as a shareholder to decide.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition points out: \$75 million. True. However, there are many Albertans. They put up as much, and as shareholders they have the same opportunities as anybody. And you have to accept the concept. I think it's fair to say that over the period of the development of the Alberta Energy Company, the idea in the first part of the hon. leader's amendment was discussed. There was a whole degree of consideration as to whether controls should be very tight or loose, as consideration of the concept went on by the government.

The government felt that this unique company should be forced to operate under the accountability of the profit system. It's the system that this government supports. As a shareholder, the government felt it did not want, as happened with the Alberta Gas Trunk Line, the ownership of the company — although it was originally an extremely good idea in creating the Alberta Gas Trunk Line Company — ownership of the shares to flow to other parts of the country in such a massive way that the Alberta Gas Trunk Line Company is owned in Ontario.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the government decided it would hold 50 per cent of the shares and be a

shareholder like anybody else, and [be] responsible: responsible to the voters, responsible within the framework of our policy statement and the act.

I can appreciate what the hon. Leader of the Opposition is attempting to do here, but I believe that in a way it violates the concept we have talked about, of the government being a shareholder as any others are and accountable as a shareholder.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I agree with many things the minister says. It is a unique company. But I just can't understand that a shareholder, who should be interested in what his \$75 million is doing, wouldn't in some way indicate, other than through the president. The best way to indicate would be through a minister, the minister or a minister, to go and look after how your \$75 million is being handled.

You know, I just can't understand anybody being so casual about \$75 million. I know if I had \$75 million and I was a shareholder, Mr. Chairman, you just bloody well better believe that I would be at that meeting. I apologize for using that term, Mr. Chairman, but it just has to be stated that emphatically.

We just can't put \$75 million into any kind of company and not have somebody go there to see how our investment is being handled. I just think that's completely irresponsible. All we're trying to do is, not to hassle the government, we're just trying to indicate to the government, you have a responsibility as a shareholder to go to see how your money's being invested. That's all we're trying to say.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the minister, in rejecting this particular amendment, indicated that the government wanted to play essentially the same role as any other shareholder. I think we have to remember that no matter how much one may claim that the Alberta Energy Company is a profit-motivated concern — and I'm not arguing that point. I argued that point two or three years ago and lost it, so I'm not arguing it now. But it is an entirely different kind of vehicle from any other operation we have in the province.

We have a company here which has individual shareholders, which has corporate shareholders, but which has as a very important facet 50 per cent of the shares owned by the Government of Alberta, in trust for the people of Alberta.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, it really comes back to the basic issue of how this Legislature is going to demand accountability of the government for the \$75 million of shares which are held in trust for the people of Alberta, all the people of Alberta. The point that is really made in this amendment is that it is not unreasonable that before the annual meeting there be a resolution in the Legislature which would first of all designate who the proxy is going to be and, secondly, allow for a debate in this Assembly; not a debate that is going to control the decisions of the company — that's going to be made at the annual meeting — but where we as the representatives of all people in Alberta have some meaningful input in what the government does with our \$75 million. It seems to me that is not an unreasonable proposition. It is one which is consistent with legislative accountability and not inconsistent with the Energy Company, even set up on the basis that this government chose several years ago.

The point about the proxy is also well taken. If the government simply hands over the proxy to the president of the Alberta Energy Company — by the way, I think we've got an excellent president of the Alberta Energy Company. I think he's a very able person and will do an excellent job. But when the president goes to an annual meeting with the proxy of the Government of Alberta in his back pocket, the whole point is, it's hardly what you call model democracy. I'm not sure even the most ardent defender of our good old corporate system would really suggest this is going to mean much for the shareholders at the meeting. Little Joe Blow shareholder with 20 shares in the Alberta Energy Company — you know, the chances of anything meaningful coming from a resolution proposed if it happens to counter the president, who has the proxy of the Alberta government in his back pocket, without discussion in this Legislature of what that proxy means.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand the purpose of this amendment, it seems to me all we would do here is not even tie the hands of the minister, but simply say that when this House is in session before April 1, there would be the kind of ongoing debate on how that \$75 million — or whatever it is as the Energy Company expands in the years ahead — how our 50 per cent will be voted. It may well be that the government will not accept the recommendations. It may well be there will be no recommendations, other than that we give the proxy to the president to do as he chooses. But at least that is something that should be debated in the House, it seems to me, before the annual meeting.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to speak in support of this amendment. I can agree with the minister with regard to his comments on profit. Nobody disagrees with that. But I think the question of responsibility certainly lies in the make-up of the act as it is and the actions of the minister. In the amendment, we are attempting to bring about responsibility to the Legislature, and involve ourselves in giving some direction in the say and in the shares we hold as government.

I can only re-emphasize the point: if we have 50 per cent of the shares and the president has X per cent of the shares, he determines everything. From the information we received in the Assembly, the president had clear authority to do anything he wanted, make any decisions he wanted. I think there lies some real, deep difficulty in that type of escapism on the part of the minister and government. Sure, when things go along okay, there are no problems. But let's say the president makes a mistake one of these days. Who is going to take the responsibility then? The government is going to say, oh, we gave it to the president. The president made the decision. They're going to try to dodge the political impact that certainly will come out of something like this. I think when you're supposed to take responsibility as a government, take the political flak, you should set up the procedure so you do have something to say in the decision-making process. By dodging that responsibility now, you may believe you're going to get away from some political impact later on. There's no way. You're responsible. Why not make it that way in procedure, instead of removing yourself from that

accountability at this time?

I just can't understand the government's procedure at all, or their position at this time. If it's because they wish to look removed, and not take political flak along the line, when the shares stay as they are at present and it gets closer to an election, you can say, well, that's the company and the president's decision. It wasn't ours. [You can] do all those kinds of things, sure. But I hope out at the grass roots the people understand something different. Certainly I'll assist them in understanding that a little better, Mr. Chairman. If the government persists in going the way they are, to me it's one, lack of accountability; two, just a way to dodge political responsibility and government responsibility.

MR. GHITTER: Mr. Chairman, in entering this debate, I would like to say that I can well understand concerns of members of this Legislature about accountability for \$75 million. But if they think this amendment is going to provide any accountability, they have never been to a shareholders' meeting of a public company.

Maybe it would be instructive if I just suggested what happens at a general meeting of a company, so they might better understand how ludicrous the amendment really is. First of all, the notice goes out to the shareholders. In that notice you have what the business will be. The business will be basically, you'll elect your auditors for the following year; you'll ratify a couple of things maybe; and in five minutes, the meeting is over. If the average length of an annual meeting of a public company in the province of Alberta goes longer than 7.5 minutes, the president doesn't have a proper cheat list in front of him to move the meeting on. And a vote of non-confidence goes to the president because he hasn't moved the meeting quickly enough.

Why you think anything rises and falls upon what happens at an annual meeting is absurd. You might wish to bring a designated resolution to this Legislature to debate what the Energy Company is doing — fair enough. But to encumber the Legislature with having to deal with a ridiculous resolution every year as to who will go to the annual meeting — what do you think we'll do at the annual meeting with all those votes in our pocket? It's traditional that if you have confidence in the directors of the company, you will automatically give them your proxies. That is what is done. If we don't have confidence in the directors, obviously, as a majority shareholder, I would assume we would do something about it. But when the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview stands up and says you have an excellent president, and lauds the president, what are we going to do at the annual meeting, if not give him our proxy anyway? So what is to be gained by a resolution like this?

MR. NOTLEY: We make that decision.

MR. GHITTER: What decision are you going to make? You are going to make the decision how the government is going to vote? You will only make that decision when you are the government. That's how it works in the building here. Maybe you don't realize that.

May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, there are many ways

to get accountability for \$75 million. But if you think what's going to happen with a few proxies, or with the majority of proxies at a meeting, do you expect the hon. minister, frankly, to go to the annual meeting of the Alberta Energy Company and get on his feet and ask questions? What a ludicrous position to put the government of the province of Alberta in. If the minister is unhappy with what they are doing, I'm sure he will take steps as a majority shareholder representing the 51 per cent to see that the directors change. But this is solving nothing, Mr. Chairman. I would suggest we just carry on, get down with the vote, and let's get on with the business of the day.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I was going to say my learned friend but — I still think that's the right term — but I simply have to say this to the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo. It may well be that in the companies he is involved with the average length of meetings is 7.5 minutes. If it goes longer than that, he may feel the president hasn't got the proper checklist. But what this does provide is an opportunity for the members of the Legislature, who are responsible for the \$75 million, to give some direction. The government, the meeting, and the president can conduct themselves accordingly, or not. If they don't, the majority shareholder has the opportunity to take the very action the hon. member talks about. But there's no sense having a designated motion after the meetings are over, after decisions are made. This is once a year, when every member of the Assembly, plus the president of the Energy Company, plus investors in the Energy Company would know there was going to be the discussion right here in the Legislature prior to the annual meeting. Candidly, that may not solve all the problems of accountability, but it's at least a step in that direction. That's what important.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Chairman, perhaps a comment or two. The government is always responsible to the Legislature. That's a fact of our system. Any member can move a resolution in the House any time he wants. We've set aside times — as a matter of fact, there's far more freedom now than when I was in opposition. You can designate anyone you want. There's plenty of opportunity for any member of the House to move a resolution and debate it to his heart's content. If the opposition feels that would in some way help them in this regard, they should do it. I would appreciate the debate.

The government is responsible also, as the hon. Member for Little Bow says — at a certain time, he wants to go to the grass roots and talk to them. Go ahead. Come over to Edmonton Whitemud, if you like. We'll have the debate there.

Mr. Chairman, the Government of Alberta assesses the management and the directors in advance. Therefore, we vote our shares that way. That's the way any shareholder does. And when you're the majority shareholder, you have all the rights of a majority shareholder. You can call a special meeting the next day if you like, get rid of the whole crew, and put in another bunch you feel better about. Obviously, Mr. Chairman, in developing this concept, the government has never said there wouldn't be problems. As a matter of fact, I think I said there would be problems before you said it. It's

new. There are always problems when things are new. And the government can't dodge the political impact of it. You're going to have to live with it. If the shares are at \$5 come the next election, boy, there'll be political impact. No question in my mind.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, I believe the members have to accept the fact that as majority shareholders you're always in control, you assess your management and your directors, and you always have available the rights of a majority shareholder.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think there was a very nice try by both the Member for Calgary Buffalo and the minister to deflect the issue — very skilfully done, I admit. Very fluently done. No question about that. However, the basic issue here is not whether the average annual meeting of the corporation is five minutes, six minutes, or 10 minutes. We all know that annual meetings are hardly what you'd call experiments in democracy.

The issue here is really how we, as members of the Legislature, government and opposition, are in fact going to hold the government accountable for the \$75 million in shares which this government holds in trust for the people of Alberta. That is the question.

The Member for Calgary Buffalo says that you can bring in an opposition motion anytime. That's true. No question about that. As the minister well knows, the minister may not even be there for the opposition-designated motion. There have been times, as I very well recall, when opposition-designated motions dealing with specific departments come up and, what do you know, the minister isn't there.

We now have a grand total of an hour for an opposition-designated motion on Thursdays, and that's assuming the question period and the motions for returns get by quickly enough so they don't move us back to that 4:30 adjournment time for public bills.

The fact of the matter is that when the minister stands up and says, oh, we don't need to worry about this because we've already got the mechanics to ensure accountability, really, Mr. Minister, that is stretching it a little far. Maybe this amendment has its defects, but at least contained in the amendment is one, that the minister will designate who will represent the government, who will be the proxy, and propose direction. So at the very least, if this motion were passed, when we had that debate, the minister would be there. We would have a meaningful debate, rather than an exercise in futility which would exist if we had an opposition motion and the minister wasn't even there for debate.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister for clarification. In your response in the Assembly following the shareholders' meeting, I gained the impression that no directions were given to Mr. Mitchell as to what he should do at the meeting. I haven't seen the agenda of the meeting or what kind of issues were at stake, so I'm not aware of that in asking for clarification. But the circumstance is there where you could have given direction and said, we want you to take this position on that particular issue.

Now, as president, he is obligated as your representative to take that position. Is that correct? In the meeting, would he have to explain that to the other shareholders even if he differs in voting on his own behalf, because he holds X number of shares in the

company?

I got the impression that there was no direction. It was just, here are the shares, do what you want to do. Or did you give the impression to Mr. Mitchell, carry on as you've been carrying on because you are following government policy. You have not deviated, so we vote with you at this time. Could the minister clarify that, so I understand the procedure a little better.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Chairman, the government makes an assessment of the management and the directors and places its confidence in them by providing them with a proxy. Every shareholder had that right.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, first of all, I have the right to speak on this because I don't have any vested interest in it. [interjections] Well, I don't seem to have any vested interest. Nobody seems to worry about the \$75 million that I, as a partial shareholder, have in the company because nobody has given the company any direction about my portion of the \$75 million. But I don't have any portion of the other 50 per cent as a direct shareholder.

Mr. Chairman, the point is very, very valid that the Assembly surely should have something. The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo is shaking his head. Now this is a unique company. The minister said that, and the Member for Calgary Buffalo. It's a unique company. It's so unique that we give them \$75 million and say, boys, run the show. That's not good enough for me as a taxpayer of this province. Maybe some people have that much confidence in the government giving direction and in the company running the affairs. But I don't have that much confidence.

As a member of this Legislature representing approximately 25,000 people in my constituency, and representing 20 per cent of the entire population speaking for the opposition, I think there has to be some mechanism so that we have some input. The Legislature. Because I'm sure that the caucus, as much as they're possibly . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Rubber-stamped.

DR. BUCK: . . . directed — I don't want to use rubber-stamped — they're directed and this is what they're going to do. I think they should be given an opportunity to have some input to what goes on in this unique company. To me, the uniqueness is that we say, here's \$75 million boys, go to it. There just has to be some accounting to this Legislature.

I know that the minister — I think I have enough experience in amateur psychology — really knows that what we're saying is right. I think he's almost on the verge of saying, boys, I think maybe you have something here that, you know, may make this accountable for the people of the province through the Legislature. I just can't understand that.

When the Member for Calgary Buffalo says that even public companies — but this is not a public company *per se*. Is it, hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo? Well, the minister said it's unique. It's the first time ever. So it's a unique public company. You'd better believe it, because when we invested \$75 million and the minister says, what do you mean, we should tell you what we're paying the president?

We just picked a fine gentleman with expertise in the oil industry and said, Charlie, here's \$75 million. Set up this company and go. You know, that's really unique. It is very, very unique.

But some of the people out there who trust this government, and who are entrusting this company to invest their money, surely feel that there should be some debate. That's really what we're trying to say here. Let this Legislature have some input, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GHITTER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make just one remark to the hon. member. If he's concerned about the annual meeting, I will offer to buy him one share in the Alberta Energy Company, and he can go to every annual meeting he wants to.

DR. BUCK: I won't accept that.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, the principle seems very simple to me. I see the confusion that takes place in almost every one of these debates. Every member of the government is a member of the Legislature, but every member of the Legislature is not a member of the government. I wish hon. members could get that clear. That's the way it was when some of us on this side were on that side of the House. And that's the way it is now. As a matter of fact, we invested — what was it, over \$200 million in a railway, and we didn't even have a right to go to the meeting of the CNR. Not even the Premier of the province could go to that meeting. I never heard anybody shouting or getting worried about that. I wish we'd be consistent.

The government is responsible for the money it invests. It is responsible to this Legislature. It is responsible to the people. This company is responsible to the government. I don't know how much clearer we want the line of responsibility drawn. If something goes wrong with this company, I know a few members on this side of the House who will be the first ones to say, I told you so. Don't blame me. Don't blame me. Well, if we're going to be a member of the government, we're going to have to take the blame. But we don't want to be a member of the government. We just want to have the say, as if we were elected to the government. We weren't. The people didn't elect those of us on this side of the House as government. They had their chance, but they didn't do it. The government was elected to run the business of the province, and they're running the business of the province. They'll be responsible to the people. They're responsible to the Legislature. As far as I can see, this legislation makes them responsible to the Legislature. But let's forget this idea that because we're a member of the Legislature, we're a member of the government. We aren't.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, then I really think what we should do on the first day of the session is have the Speech from the Throne brought in, followed the second day by the budget, and then we all go home. Really, that's what the hon. Member for Drumheller is saying, that what we're really doing here is wasting the taxpayers' time and the taxpayers' money. Mr. Chairman, I don't buy that argument.

I've had to sit here and suffer through many of the speeches of my good friend the hon. Member for

Drumheller, and vice versa. We've all had to suffer through each other's speeches. [interjections]

Mr. Chairman, there may be some shortcomings in the democratic process that goes on in this Chamber and in the House of Commons. But over the centuries they found there just isn't any better system.

AN HON. MEMBER: Freedom of speech.

DR. BUCK: The freedom of speech, the freedom of expression. Really, we all know that the party that gets the most seats forms the government. But is the rest of this exercise redundant? Is it irrelevant? Is it unnecessary? I think it's necessary. And that's why these things should be brought to the Legislature as a whole, so they can be debated. I would just like to ask the hon. Member for Drumheller if there was a bill brought before this Legislature when the Alberta Resources Railway was built. Was there, Mr. Member?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, there was.

DR. BUCK: Yes, there was. It was debated here. Why was it not just brought in by the cabinet and the bill presented to the Legislature, and we closed the place down? This is a place for public debate, where public business should be carried on. That's really all we're asking here, that we as members of this Legislature on both sides of the House protect the \$75 million that's been invested in this company on behalf of the taxpayers of the province.

DR. PAPROSKI: You have that.

DR. BUCK: How do we have that, hon. member for Kingsway?

DR. PAPROSKI: You're speaking right now.

DR. BUCK: We're speaking now. That's the point. Let's speak and let us give some direction how the moneys we are entrusted to spend are being spent by the Alberta Energy Company. I don't think that's unreasonable, Mr. Chairman. I think that's very, very reasonable, that we protect that \$75 million of the taxpayer's money. I think that's what the Legislature is for, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that we also had a bill brought into this Legislature forming the Alberta Energy Company. It gave the Legislature more authority than the ARR bill.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to get into any discussion over the merits of the ARR. That's not the issue we have today, although we could get into a long discussion on that.

But the issue, and I think it's worth repeating, is very simple. We're all elected members. We are all, if you like, trustees of an obligation to our constituents throughout the province. What is at stake here is that \$75 million has been allotted by this Legislature to the Alberta Energy Company. Whether we're on the government side or on the opposition side, it's not for us to accept on blind faith that this money is being handled properly, without our continued right to examine, to scrutinize, to debate. That's what the

whole system is about.

Now we all recognize, Mr. Chairman, that the party that wins the most seats forms the government. But that does not alter the basic responsibilities we all have, as members of the Legislature, in the process of the work of this Legislative Assembly to ensure that this public money is invested only after we have had an opportunity to fully exercise our obligations and responsibilities.

Mr. Chairman, I see that the time has reached 5:30. I beg leave to adjourn debate.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

I might just notify the House that tomorrow evening we will go to the final estimates of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs and then go on to the bills in committee, with the exception of Bill 35, on which we will be in committee on Friday morning, if everything goes as scheduled.

[Motion carried]

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask the Acting Government House Leader if he could check with his colleague — I guess it would be his colleague to his right — with regard to the legislation introduced this afternoon on the leases. Could we have that held until Monday or as late as we possibly can? We've sent out copies of it, and it's been a long

time in coming.

And when will we have the information the hon. minister was going to make available to us today, the comparisons?

MR. GETTY: Tomorrow.

[Dr. McCrimmon left the Chair]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

DR. MCCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration the following bills: 9, 22, 11, 5, 20, 21, 25, 26, 28, 31, 33, and 42.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration bills 18 and 27 and begs to report same with some amendments.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration Bill 44, begs to report progress on same, and asks leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the reports and the request for leave to sit again, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at half past 2.

[The House rose at 5:30 p.m.]