

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: Tuesday, March 1, 1977 2:30 p.m.

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 224**

**An Act Respecting the
Right of the Public to Information
Concerning the Public Business**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 224, An Act [Respecting] the Right of the Public to Information Concerning the Public Business. The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to ensure that information relevant to the making of public decisions is released to the public unless reasons can be given that such information cannot be made public. The bill is patterned after a bill introduced some eight years ago in the House of Commons by the Hon. Ged Baldwin, MP for Peace River. A similar bill was introduced in this Assembly in 1974 by the former MLA for Calgary Mountain View Mr. Ludwig, and also by Mr. Notley last year.

DR. HORNER: You did a lot of research.

MR. CLARK: That's the Horner kind of research.

[Leave granted; Bill 224 read a first time]

Bill 201

**An Act Respecting
Body-Rub Parlours and Nude Parlours**

Bill 202

The Cash Discount Act

Bill 203

**An Act to Amend
The Unfair Trade Practices Act**

Bill 204

**An Act Respecting
Consumer Accounts and Records**

Bill 205

The Telephone Act

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce five bills. The first is An Act Respecting Body-Rub Parlours and Nude Parlours which has been before

the House before. The purpose of this bill is to increase the power of municipalities to regulate and control massage and nude parlors more effectively, to prevent them becoming a nuisance to the public and a danger to the young.

The second bill is The Cash Discount Act which has also been introduced before. This bill provides for not less than a 2 per cent discount for cash customers where national credit cards are accepted and corrects the present situation where cash customers subsidize national credit card users.

The third bill is a new one, The Unfair Trade Practices Act. This bill makes it an offence for a manufacturer to do certain things and closes loopholes that some are using to circumvent inflationary guidelines at the present time. It deals with three items. It makes it an offence to dilute or reduce the quality of a name product and sell it under the original name. Secondly, it makes it an offence to sell or rent the components of a unit separately at a combined price exceeding the price at which the unit components were previously sold as a set. Thirdly, it makes it an offence to sell or rent two or more services separately that previously were sold or rented together at a single price, at two separate prices which, when added together, exceed the original price for the combined services.

The next bill is also new, An Act Respecting Consumer Accounts and Records. The purpose of this bill is to provide a channel through which consumers and creditors may handle errors in billing. It also ensures for the consumer a standard of privacy in regard to any information held by the creditor relating to the consumer, and establishes a course of action which will allow the debtor to have any personal information relating to him removed from the creditor's possession.

Lastly, The Telephone Act. The purpose of this bill is to prevent intrusion on private individuals' free time by unsolicited telephone sales calls anywhere in the province.

[Leave granted; bills 201, 202, 203, 204, and 205 read a first time]

Bill 207

**An Act Establishing the
Right to Public Information and the
Protection of Individual Privacy**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, so members of the Assembly will have ample opportunity to discuss the question of right to information, I'd like to move Bill 207, An Act Establishing the Right to Public Information and the Protection of Individual Privacy. Now, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this act is to outline the principles contained in an act I presented first in 1975 and again in 1976. But in addition to that, it has been expanded to include protection of individual privacy and to distinguish between public and private business.

[Leave granted; Bill 207 read a first time]

Bill 4

The Alberta Loan Act, 1977

Bill 5
The Alberta Municipal Financing
Corporation Amendment Act, 1977

Bill 6
The Statutes Amendment
(Grant Provisions) Act, 1977

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce three bills, the first being The Alberta Loan Act, 1977. The purpose of this bill is to grant to the government the capacity to borrow up to \$200 million. This capacity is granted from time to time, Mr. Speaker, and is used by the government primarily for short-term borrowing and primarily through the sale of treasury bills.

The second bill, Mr. Speaker, is a bill to amend The Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation Act. This being a money bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of this bill, recommends the same to the Assembly. The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to increase the borrowing capacity of the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation from \$1.9 billion to \$2.2 billion to enable that corporation to meet the anticipated borrowing requirements of municipal bodies within the province of Alberta.

The third bill, Mr. Speaker, is The Statutes Amendment (Grant Provisions) Act, 1977. The purpose of this bill is to amend, by deleting from a number of statutes of the province of Alberta, the grant provisions that are now in those statutes and replacing them in most, but not all, cases with a standard grant provision, similar to the grant provision that is within bills that we have been recently introducing.

[Leave granted; bills 4, 5, and 6 read a first time.]

Bill 8
The Alberta Opportunity Fund
Amendment Act, 1977

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Alberta Opportunity Fund Amendment Act, 1977. The purpose of this bill is to provide the Alberta Opportunity Company board the option of establishing an executive committee that would act at the direction of that board between the times when the board was not meeting, on an emergent basis.

[Leave granted; Bill 8 read a first time]

Bill 9
The Provincial General Hospitals
Amendment Act, 1977

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 9, The Provincial General Hospitals Amendment Act, 1977. The amendment reads:

The board of the Foothills Provincial General Hospital may, with the approval of the Commission, provide for the manufacture, purchase or sale of pharmaceuticals or radio-pharmaceuticals for use in any hospital as defined by *The Alberta Hospitals Act*.

[Leave granted; Bill 9 read a first time]

Bill 10
The Alberta Emblems
Amendment Act, 1977

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Alberta Emblems Amendment Act, 1977. Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendments are in response to many requests. First, nearly 100,000 school children cast votes for a provincial bird. The majority felt that *Bubo Virginianus*, the great horned owl, should be added to our provincial emblems. Ornithologists indicate that this bird of wisdom is a fairly common resident throughout Alberta.

Secondly, again by popular demand, the Assembly will be asked to approve . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly the minister could deal with the principle of the bill, and the background in debate.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, the second amendment would approve a microcrystalline variety of quartz, S102, commonly known as petrified wood, as the official stone.

Mr. Speaker, there was never any danger of having your constituency declared the provincial bird, since the meadowlark received less than half the votes of the great horned owl.

MR. SPEAKER: I guess that makes us even.

[Leave granted; Bill 10 read a first time]

Bill 11
The Vital Statistics
Amendment Act, 1977

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Vital Statistics Amendment Act, 1977. The purpose of this bill is to correct a drafting error in The Vital Statistics Amendment Act, 1976, which states 10 days. It will now read 14 days so as to be compatible with The Fatality Inquiries Act.

[Leave granted; Bill 11 read a first time]

Bill 14
The Nursing Homes
Amendment Act, 1977

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Nursing Homes Amendment Act, 1977. Mr. Speaker, this bill has two purposes. The first is to enable the government to establish a more flexible nursing home finance program to recognize varying conditions of nursing home operators. The second is to provide the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care with the capacity to appoint an official administrator for a private nursing home where there exists a danger to the health and safety of patients.

[Leave granted; Bill 14 read a first time]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the following two bills be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders: Bill No. 9, The Provincial General Hospitals Amendment Act, 1977; and

Bill No. 11, The Vital Statistics Amendment Act, 1977.

[Motion carried]

Bill 220

The Blind Persons' Guide Dogs Act

Bill 222

The Adult Publications Act

MR. LITTLE: I beg leave to introduce two bills, the first being No. 220, The Blind Persons' Guide Dogs Act. The purpose of this bill is to allow blind persons who are accompanied by guide dogs access to all public places to which the ordinary citizen is allowed.

The second bill, 222, is The Adult Publications Act. The purpose of this bill is to create outlets to sell or distribute adult or pornographic materials. Minors will be denied access to these premises. The act will also provide penalties for selling or otherwise providing such materials to minors.

[Leave granted; bills 220 and 222 read a first time]

Bill 221

**An Act Respecting
Smoking in Public Places**

Bill 223

The Water Fluoridation Act

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I too have two bills I would like to introduce. I beg leave to introduce a bill, being An Act Respecting Smoking in Public Places. The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to ban smoking, which is a nuisance to the public and a danger to public health, from those areas of hospitals, libraries, and gathering places to which the public has access as a right.

The second bill, Mr. Speaker: I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Water Fluoridation Act. The purpose of this bill is to ensure that the citizens of Calgary and other communities in Alberta enjoy the pleasures of fluoridated water the same as the majority of the citizens of Alberta.

DR. BUCK: Calgary needs it.

MR. FOSTER: How would you know?

[Leave granted; bills 221 and 223 read a first time]

head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce a class from my constituency of Edmonton Belmont. About 30 students from the grade 5 class in the Kildare Elementary School are accompanied this afternoon by their teacher Mr. Belseck. They're in the members gallery, and I should like to ask them to rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. JAMISON: Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege this afternoon to introduce to you, and through you to the

members of this Assembly, 44 grade 5 students from the Katherine Therrien school in the Castle Downs district of Edmonton. They're accompanied by their teachers Mrs. Hagel and Ruth Campbell. They are seated in the public gallery, and I'd ask that they rise and be recognized.

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I wish to file notes for a speech I gave in the city of New York on February 3, 1977, both at a reception and a luncheon to members of the New York financial community. Along with those notes I would like to file a book entitled *Alberta's Finances* that Alberta Treasury had prepared and left with the persons who were our guests at those two functions.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the response to Motion for a Return No. 134.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Gas Well Blowout

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the first question to the Minister of the Environment. The question really flows as a result of a serious situation in the Pincher Creek area in southwestern Alberta with regard to a blow-in a gas well, I think known as Waterton 35. I would like to ask the minister if he's in a position to indicate to the Assembly the present status of the blow-in there, who's on hand, and what's actually happening.

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I could. But my colleague the Deputy Premier could report in better detail with respect to Alberta Disaster Services.

While I'm on my feet, the Department of the Environment was informed immediately after the accident, had monitoring equipment moved to the site, and worked with Alberta Disaster Services in removing Alberta citizens from the disaster area. I understand the company has also had Red Adair in the region to help them freeze in the blowout. I'd now like to refer the question to the hon. Deputy Premier to give additional details.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, that is essentially correct: All the agencies of government that are involved in a situation like this are on hand, including my colleague the Department of the Environment, the ERCB of course, and the RCMP. They have evacuated certain people from the area to the town of Pincher Creek. My latest information is that those people outside a 5-mile radius of the blowout are now being allowed to return home. They are returning with a representative of Shell, and of course with the monitoring devices that are available. The 5-mile radius, though, is being closed off to any but people who are protected and are knowledgeable about the situation.

It is true they are trying to put out the leak, but so far have been unsuccessful. My latest information at 2:40 was that they were trying to freeze the well shut with liquid nitrogen. That has not yet worked because of a shortage of water at the site, and they

are trying to get a different water supply at the moment.

My information is that there is no immediate danger to any life, and that the situation is under control by the various agencies that are involved in that kind of situation.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister responsible for emergency measures, or perhaps the Minister of Agriculture. I raise the question because of concern expressed to my office this morning with regard to loss of livestock in the 5-mile area. I would like to ask the minister responsible what types of contingency plans are available to farmers who, it is my indication, have already lost some livestock.

DR. HORNER: Well, my indication, Mr. Speaker, [i s that] we're not aware of any loss of livestock as yet. Once the situation is under control and the well is closed off, my people along with the Department of Agriculture people will be into the area to assess the situation completely. At that time I'll give a report to the Legislature.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, just one last supplementary question, perhaps either to the Minister of the Environment or the Minister of Labour. I would like to ask the very specific question: has the department had an opportunity to ascertain yet whether the blowout preventers actually functioned on this particular occasion, or in fact is this where the problem developed? It's my understanding that they are inspected by the Department of Labour.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on that particular aspect of the accident I have no information yet. But that type of information is the sort of thing that will be sought in the investigation which is already under way.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. Can the minister indicate if there are personnel in Alberta capable of capping these wild wells, or do we always have to go out of the province?

MR. NOTLEY: Have we got a Red Adair?

DR. HOHOL: To the best of my knowledge, this is the kind of judgment that a company that has a great deal of money involved in this problem has to make. With Adair's international reputation, it looks like a reasonable kind of judgment. My colleague says it's the other Adair.

Fish and Wildlife Officers

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the other Adair also, the Minister for Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. My question very directly to the minister: what initiatives has the minister taken since the request by the fish and wildlife staff of his department to meet to discuss a number of serious concerns about the administration?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I indicated that I had asked my department officials for a report on

that. To date we have not had any indication from the members of the officers' association or any other. But we are in fact proceeding with the concerns raised at the meeting.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Yesterday in answering a question in the House, the minister indicated he had met with the past president of the association. My question to the minister is: has the minister met with former employees of the department as individuals or in a group to discuss some of the concerns we raised here in the House yesterday?

MR. ADAIR: No, I have not had a request from any former employees of the department to come forth.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to put the question more directly: has the minister in the course of the last two years met with any of the fish and wildlife officers in his department who are now former employees, with regard to these specific concerns?

MR. ADAIR: Not to my knowledge. But I should again stress, Mr. Speaker, because obviously the Leader of the Opposition wasn't listening yesterday when I responded, that I did in fact meet with the past president of the officers' association.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, one last supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister in a position to confirm that a number of fish and wildlife employees have been sent to the counselling and diagnostic unit of the public service office when there have been discipline problems within his department?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if he would repeat the question please.

MR. CLARK: Is the minister in a position to confirm that some fish and wildlife employees have been sent to the counsellor diagnostic and referral unit of the Public Service Commissioner for dealing with discipline problems within the fish and wildlife section of your department?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I'm not really aware of any that would come directly to me in that particular area. I'm sorry, I would have to check and respond.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then specifically to the minister. Will the minister check and report to the House tomorrow on this specific question?

MR. ADAIR: Yes I will, Mr. Speaker.

Fish Stocking

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. I was wondering how the situation is this year regarding the importation of fish eggs and fingerlings for the restocking of our lakes and streams.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, actually this year we are in reasonably good shape. I might indicate that a year ago we mentioned we were having some difficulties with what may happen with the implementation of

the federal change in regulations.

The supplier we have is three particular hatcheries in the state of Washington. They have all been certified by both the U.S. and Canadian governments as disease-free, so we will not have that type of problem this year. We hope it continues.

Rental Housing

MR. GHITTER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Housing and Public Works. Would the minister kindly advise the House whether or not he is endeavoring to announce any new programs or changes to existing programs at this session of the Legislature which could conceivably result in the encouragement of the construction of new rental accommodation in our cities, particularly in Edmonton and Calgary.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, I think that question will be more fully answered during the course of the budget debate.

But I might advise the House in regard to the vacancy rate in Calgary and the number of apartment units presently under construction. In the city of Calgary we have approximately 3,000 apartment units presently under construction. We are conducting a rental survey by telephone on the basis of about 6,000 units. The last we conducted, in February, indicated an increasing vacancy in Calgary and suggested a vacancy rate in the order of 1 per cent. But I will be in a position to cover this topic more fully during the course of the budget debate.

MR. GHITTER: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Getting back to the question, I believe I didn't receive an answer. I wonder if the hon. minister would advise whether any new programs will be announced this session. Or if you are not in a position at this time, will you be announcing it during the budget debate?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, I thought I did answer the question by indicating that any new programs or expansion of existing programs would be dealt with during the course of the budget debate.

MR. GHITTER: Sorry, Mr. Speaker. A further supplementary then. I'm wondering if the hon. Minister has considered a program whereby the provincial government could participate in the federal assistance rental program to encourage rental accommodation, as has proven very successful in the province of British Columbia.

MR. YURKO: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have considered the possibility of piggybacking between the provincial and federal programs. Now, I think the member is referring to the possibility of building high-rise concrete and steel apartments in the central core of cities. Our programs tentatively have been directed for constructing walk-up apartments which can be built below \$25,000 throughout the various centres in the province, including the city of Calgary. The subsidy programs are therefore based on building an apartment costing approximately \$25,000.

If we get into high-rise apartments in the core areas of the two cities, the capital costs are considerably higher. As a result, the subsidies must be con-

siderably higher. Therefore, there is a requirement for piggybacking between two programs, a provincial and federal program, or indeed much higher subsidies by the governments if such are to be built in today's market, because those apartments command very high rental rates, well in excess of \$350 per month.

Now it isn't the policy of the government thus far to subsidize the construction of high-rise concrete and steel apartments in the core of the two cities. Indeed it is the policy to provide as much money as possible to build the greatest number of units for the low and middle income renters and provide the least amount of subsidies because of the limitation of capital usage.

MR. GHITTER: If I may, Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary to the hon. minister. In reference to the address of the hon. minister to the Legislature on May 6, 1976, I'd understood the minister to suggest that he was endeavoring to examine possible formulas whereby rental accommodation of a high-rise nature could be accomplished in our urban core. Do I take it from the remarks of the hon. minister this afternoon that it is no longer the intention of the government to look for formulas which would result in the construction of high-rise apartment accommodation in the central core cities, particularly Edmonton and Calgary?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, we have done just that and have made a policy change in the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation to the core housing incentive program and are permitting commercialization of the bottom floor for structures in the downtown areas, if you wish. Therefore the bottom floor by way of commercialization permits a new formula to be acceptable in terms of making it economically feasible to construct some higher rise apartments in the downtown core. We have had one such proposal under discussion in Calgary for some time.

However, I do want to suggest that the provincial government through the Alberta Housing Corporation is indeed building highrises. They're fundamentally confined to accommodation for senior citizens through the senior citizens' self-contained apartment program. I guess there's one in Lethbridge 15 stories high and several in Calgary. Indeed if you look at the skyline in Edmonton, most of the apartments under construction in the Boyle Street area and right downtown are senior citizens' self-contained high-rise construction in a downtown area.

MR. GOGO: Supplementary to the Minister of Housing and Public Works, Mr. Speaker. The minister quoted the vacancy rate in Calgary at the moment. Could the minister indicate to the House the desirable vacancy rate for both Calgary and Edmonton that he would like to see to satisfy the needs of housing?

MR. SPEAKER: It's rather a matter of opinion, and perhaps it could be elicited in another manner.

Rail Passenger Service

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Deputy Premier and Minister of Transportation, and

follows the announcement of the federal government re the formation of VIA Rail Canada Inc. which I believe accepts some of the recommendations of our own Minister of Transportation to the Hall Commission. Is the federal government now consulting with the Alberta government concerning the impact unified passenger rail service will have in Alberta?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could respond in this way. The hon. member is correct in that as far as we are aware — we haven't yet had an opportunity to assess the full announcement by the federal Minister of Transport relative to passenger service — it would appear that some of the suggestions we put forward at the hearings here and in Calgary have been accepted. Indeed an operation to run passenger trains in this country on both CP and CN lines by one organization may bring a revival, particularly to inter-city traffic. I did have a discussion with the federal minister a week ago Friday which covered this particular point. We will be discussing it with him in the future, relative to how it will affect our province particularly and western Canada generally.

MR. TAYLOR: Supplementary to the hon. minister. Will the announcement and the new program now ensure that continental service through Edmonton and Calgary will be continued?

DR. HORNER: My understanding is that that is so, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately I understand that the first announcement, made some time ago, was in fact a leak from the CTC. We haven't really resolved the difference between the leak and the federal minister's announcement.

MR. TAYLOR: One further supplementary to the hon. minister. Will rural service to centres in Alberta other than Calgary and Edmonton be upgraded and improved under this program?

DR. HORNER: Again, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately we haven't any detail on that. I certainly appreciate the hon. member's concern relative to the Drumheller run, and the other two major runs — in the northeast to Grand Centre and St. Paul, and the other one in the Vermilion area — are of primary concern relative to rail passengers. I would hope that those particular runs would in fact be upgraded. The essence of a passenger service, it would appear to me, is we're going to have to require some new and more modern passenger equipment so we can get people to ride the trains again.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one supplementary question if I may to the hon. Minister of Transportation. If I understood the announcement yesterday, the VIA will start intercity traffic from Quebec City through to Windsor and the points along. I would ask the hon. minister whether he or the government have received any indication yet as to where the Calgary/Edmonton route would fit in terms of priority.

DR. HORNER: I haven't received that direct indication, although the indication was that in fact they accepted our basic premise that there had to be two transcontinental routes across western Canada because of our geography. I think that's the important point relative

to that matter. Then the next matter of course has to do with those connecting routes the hon. Member for Drumheller was referring to.

MR. TAYLOR: One further supplementary to the hon. minister. Has the discussion centred on moving the CPR traffic to the CN station, rather than starting and finishing at the South Side station? This would be an inexpensive operation and would service far more people.

DR. HORNER: That detail hasn't been worked out. But I certainly agree with the hon. member and will make those representations at the appropriate time to the federal minister.

Rent Controls

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In light of the zero vacancy rate in Edmonton according to the CMHC statistics last fall and the very low, possibly 1 per cent or less, vacancy rate in Calgary, will the minister assure the Legislature at this time that rent controls will be extended beyond June 30, 1977?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I can make no such assurance at this time. I think the Speech from the Throne adequately covered the remark that can be made.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In view of the very low vacancy rates in the province of Alberta at this point in time, is the government prepared to divorce the decision on rent controls from the question of Alberta's continued participation in the AIB, and base its decision instead strictly on the vacancy rate in rental accommodation?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I can only say that obviously the vacancy rate is one factor, but I would stress it is only one factor that should be taken into account.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister for clarification. Would it be a fair comment on the government's position that the vacancy rate would be the primary consideration in whether or not rent controls will be continued or modified or done away with?

MR. HARLE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I've said I think it is only one factor to be considered. There are perhaps a number of others. Certainly the vacancy rate is something that in terms of priority would be fairly high, yes.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of the government's intention to introduce changes to The Landlord and Tenant Act this session, can the minister advise the House whether or not the government proposes to introduce security of tenure clauses which would prohibit eviction without just cause?

MR. HARLE: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Institute of Law Research and Reform has made a proposal to government, and part of the proposal was an idea relat-

ing to security of tenure. I believe I said in the last session of this House that because the security of tenure matter raises very serious economic and social consequences, I think it is imperative that all members of the Assembly do some thinking on this matter. I recall suggesting to the hon. member that it might be useful for this Assembly to have his views on this matter.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. In considering the options, which must now clearly be on the table and being given consideration by the government, has the government given any consideration to some form of modified rent control, such as the rentalsman concept introduced in British Columbia several years ago?

MR. HARLE: Well, Mr. Speaker, the institute's report, as I recall, does not recommend the institution of the rentalsman's concept.

MR. NOTLEY: One final supplementary question to the hon. minister. In view of the fact that rent controls have been in effect now for a little over a year, have there been any ongoing studies on the impact of rent controls on rental accommodation, particularly in view of the fact that new construction has always been exempt from the controls in any event? Have any specific studies been directed to determining the impact of the controls on new rental accommodation?

MR. HARLE: Not specifically. My colleague the Minister of Housing and Public Works has alluded to the work being done by his department from the point of view of vacancy, and of course the vacancy statistics relate to accommodation that is in the process of being constructed and will become available.

Labor Legislation

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. Following the public hearings the minister held in Calgary and Edmonton earlier this month on the reform of provincial labor legislation, has the minister discarded any proposals that would sever the supervision and administration of labour standards from the Board of Industrial Relations?

MR. CRAWFORD: No, Mr. Speaker. That's one of the matters under consideration. I might add that one of the things I have asked the new chairman of the Board of Industrial Relations to do is make recommendations during the opening months of his term of office, bearing in mind the representations that were made as to the changes, if any, that should be made in the jurisdiction of the board. So we have the advantage both of his views and of the hearings on that point. It's clear from any examination of the jurisdiction that one of the things considered would be the possibility of separating some of the functions of the board from the way they now are.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. With regard to the same hearings, has the minister or the government decided whether it will be the fate of provincial employees to be brought under the provisions of The Alberta Labour Act? If this has been decided, could the minister tell the

House whether the government has decided to supplement a system of final position arbitration in place of the right to strike for employees of the province?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member will have to await events with respect to legislation the government proposes to introduce following the report of the joint task force on public service labor relations that reported last year.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Would it be correct that legislation will be introduced this session with regard to this matter?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think the indication at the time the task force report came in was that legislation in that respect would follow in the normal course.

Public Service Pension Regulations

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. I'd like to ask the minister — the report that came out in The Ombudsman Act where the Provincial Treasurer or the recommendation would be that legislation would be introduced that would permit common-law spouses to be covered for death benefits under The Public Service Pension Act.

MR. LEITCH: I heard the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, but I didn't hear his question.

DR. BUCK: The question is: will any legislation be brought in to cover common-law spouses under the death benefits of The Public Service Pension Act?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the hon. member carefully read the Ombudsman's report. If he did, he will recall that I indicated to the Ombudsman that that question would be taken under consideration. It is now being considered. But that's much different, Mr. Speaker, from saying that legislation to implement the suggestion would be brought in, because certainly no decision in that respect has been made. The matter is just being reviewed, looked at, considered.

MR. NOTLEY: Being looked at in due course.

Ombudsman Office

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a supplementary to the hon. Premier. Has the Premier or the government given any consideration to making the Ombudsman's tenure a permanent position that will not have to be reviewed in five years?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'm rather surprised at the question from the hon. member on that subject. We have select committees of the Legislative Assembly for specific purposes, and I would have thought we would await hearing from that committee. It would be very inappropriate for the government to respond to that question until the committee has reported to the House.

Mortgage Rates

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the Minister of Housing and Public Works. I would like him to advise whether the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation has adjusted its lending rates on home mortgages to reflect the progressive reduction of the interest rate by the Bank of Canada.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, in approximately the last six months the Bank of Canada has adjusted the bank rates downward by .5 per cent on three different occasions. The Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation has generally followed the downward trend in interest rates and adjusted the rates on December 12, January 5, and again on my birthday, February 11.

The rates reflect in almost all cases the .5 per cent reduction, except during the January 5 revision. Some rates were adjusted down only .25 per cent.

DR. PAPROSKI: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House, in addition to the interest rate you have mentioned, the amortization period of the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation.

MR. YURKO: Well, Mr. Speaker, there is some variation in programs, but generally the term is five years and the amortization period is 40 years, though there are variations on the 40 years.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, on another supplementary, I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House how this compares relative to the Central Mortgage and Housing amortization.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation has a variety of programs, and I'm sure there's also some variation in their programs from one to the other. So I'm not certain at this time what the total term of their mortgages are, but I would be prepared to check and advise the hon. member.

Northern Pipeline

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Has the government or any of its agencies received an application for right of way through Alberta for the Mackenzie Valley pipeline?

MR. GETTY: No, Mr. Speaker, not to the best of my knowledge.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary. Would Alberta Gas have the authority to enter into an agreement to carry American gas through the province without the approval of the government of Alberta?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I believe that if the National Energy Board gives approval to a pipeline coming from the north it will have to be under a federal charter, and therefore will create a pipeline company and a charter which will, except for environmental disturbances, presumably be outside the jurisdiction of the province of Alberta.

As for the ability of Alberta Gas Trunk Line to contractually enter into an arrangement to carry some of the natural gas, that would be a legal matter I would have to look into, or advise the hon. member to.

Pollution Prosecutions

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Attorney General and ask whether or not he's in a position to advise the Assembly if the government intends to appeal the recent decisions rendered on charges brought by the department against Great Canadian Oil Sands under The Clean Air Act and the federal Fisheries Act.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, that matter is being reviewed, and as far as I am aware no final decision has been taken. Certainly I have not participated in a final decision-making process yet.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Attorney General. Is the Attorney General in the position to advise the Assembly when, in fact, a decision may be made on this matter?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I understand the decision was made just a few days ago. In the ordinary course of events we would be making a decision on appeal in the course of the next week.

MR. NOTLEY: Further supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney General. Can the minister advise whether or not the department has undertaken any review of environmental statutes and regulations in light of the government's failure to successfully prosecute GCOS?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, while I have been in this office, some two years now, as far as I'm aware the only prosecutions that have been commenced of an environmental nature are the two that have been referred to. In the course of preparing for those two prosecutions some review has been done of environmental legislation, and some weaknesses identified in the law with respect to our capacity to prosecute. Whether or not the weaknesses in fact turned up in this particular prosecution I don't know.

I note from news reports that the Crown counsel handling the case indicated that he would be recommending an appeal, in which case, subject to my review, that would be the decision. But I'm not prepared to say, not having read the judgment in this case or seen the judgment, whether or not the case was dismissed on the basis of some weakness in the provincial laws, or whether it had to do with the type of evidence, et cetera. That's a value judgment that I'm not in a position to make at this time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney General for clarification. Do I take it from the minister's answer that there has already been some preliminary review, and that weaknesses have been found? If that is correct, is it the government's intention perhaps to introduce amendments which would shore up the legislation, so to speak?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not suggesting there are defects in the legislation that make it impossible to prosecute. I am suggesting that I think we have identified some difficulties from a prosecution point of view in enforcing the law, and we are addressing our minds to those weaknesses.

I don't want to leave any suggestion in the House that there may in fact be impediments in the law to prevent us from prosecuting certain kinds of offences. I'm not aware that there are. I'm not suggesting there are.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question to either the Attorney General or perhaps the hon. Minister of the Environment. Could either minister advise the House whether or not the government is undertaking any active review of the procedure of having companies conduct their own environmental monitoring, in light of the recent court ruling in Fort McMurray that such material is self-incriminating and hence inadmissible as evidence?

My question, which perhaps should be directed to the hon. Minister of the Environment, is whether or not any reconsideration is being given at this point in time to the method of monitoring both those acts.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, as some hon. members may be aware, both systems are used at the present time. In a variety of locations monitoring is either done in agreement or built into the licensing requirement of some industries, and in some areas of the province monitoring is carried out directly by the department. The situation the hon. member refers to, of course, deals with a specific case in Fort McMurray. I am like my colleague the Attorney General; until I have the written judgment in front of me and see those specific comments, I wouldn't be prepared to go into further detail.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, just one final supplementary question to the hon. minister. In view of its importance, will the minister give an undertaking, after he's had an opportunity to review the judgment in Fort McMurray, to report back to the House on the possible implications of the present method of monitoring?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, that kind of process and procedure is undergone continually, and I suppose we would be reporting back at such time that new legislation would be introduced.

Medical Treatment for Minors

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney General. Do the Attorney General or the government plan to act on the recommendations made by the Institute of Law Research and Reform? This relates to Report No. 19, which recommends that children over 15 should have the right to medical treatment without parental consent, and that children under that age should be permitted treatment for sex- and drug-related conditions without parental consent.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, that matter is under discussion with my colleague the Minister of Social Services and Community Health and is being

reviewed by members of her department and my own. No position has been taken on that subject relative to legislation at this time.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary on that topic. I wonder if the Attorney General would clarify for the House that in fact children under 18 can receive emergency medical treatment without parental consent.

MR. FOSTER: I think the clarification has just been made, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Has the minister had discussions with the Alberta Medical Association with regard to this matter? If so, what was the outcome of the discussion?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, no. I've had discussions with the Alberta Medical Association on several matters, but as to the specific the hon. member refers to, the answer is no. I'm sure there will be co-ordination and follow-up with my colleague the Minister of Social Services and Community Health, and the Attorney General and I will be looking at this question in the future.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. About a year ago it was indicated in the Assembly that under the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission rules in certain cases with regard to minors, the Alberta Health Care Commission could delete certain treatments from the reports that go back to the parents or the people responsible for the minors. The minister was going to review that practice. Has he done so?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I do not recall at all in any session of the Legislature the specific undertaking the hon. Member for Little Bow raises. But having said that, if the hon. member would like to give me the details of the instance he is describing, I will certainly carry it forward and report back to the Legislature.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I'll do that.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: WRITTEN QUESTIONS

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, might Question 103 stand, please.

[Motion carried]

head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I move that motions for returns 101 and 102 stand and retain their place on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

head: **MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to have the opportunity to move Motion No. 1 in my name on the Order Paper. I would like first of all, Mr. Speaker, to read the motion and then become involved in the actual information itself.

Be it resolved that the Standing Committee of the Legislature on Public Affairs

(a) investigate and report to the Assembly on:

- (i) the events surrounding (a) the tendering and awarding of the contracts to construct the 150-mile synthetic crude oil pipeline to be built for Alberta Oil Sands Pipeline, and (b) the tendering and awarding of the contract to construct the 162-mile natural gas pipeline to be built for Syncrude Canada Limited;
- (ii) the necessity of granting contracts to other than the lowest bidder;
- (iii) the impact on the cost of the services to be provided by, and the return on the public money invested in Alberta Oil Sands Pipeline Limited and Syncrude Canada Limited, resulting from the awarding of those contracts; and
- (iv) the effect on the economic and orderly development of the resources of the province of the establishment of precedents which may tend to continue the practice of letting of contracts in projects in which public money is invested to contractors employing only union labour; and

(b) make recommendations based on its findings;

Be it further resolved that the standing committee publicize its meetings and give opportunity to interested parties and the public to make presentations and present evidence to the committee on the issues;

Be it further resolved that the committee be authorized to compel the attendance of persons and the production of papers and records relevant to the matters under consideration by the committee;

Be it further resolved that the standing committee report and recommend to the Assembly within 15 days, the dates which they wish to set aside for public hearings before the committee, and that upon approval by the Assembly of such report that the Assembly shall stand adjourned on such dates;

And be it further resolved that the standing committee report on its findings to the Legislative Assembly prior to the prorogation of this session.

Mr. Speaker, I raise this matter because I believe it to be one of the most important matters facing the people of the province of Alberta today. I would say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that there are many people in this province watching to see what this Legislative Assembly is prepared to do on this particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, the issue really revolves around two pipelines to be built from Fort McMurray to Edmonton

basically, or Fort McMurray south. First of all, the Alberta Oil Sands Pipeline Limited, which has been set up to carry the synthetic crude oil from Mildred Lake to Redwater; and secondly, the pipeline being constructed for Syncrude Canada Ltd., which is a natural gas pipeline of some 160 miles. Its purpose is to serve the Alberta Energy Company's power plant on the Syncrude site.

Mr. Speaker, it's important that members recognize these two pipelines as the basis for the discussion before us today. The ownership of these two pipelines? Well, as far as Alberta Oil Sands Pipeline Limited is concerned, it's a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Alberta Energy Company, and the Alberta Energy Company is controlled by the government of Alberta through 50.1 per cent ownership of its shares. The people of Alberta through the government of Alberta have \$75.1 million invested in the Alberta Energy Company.

Syncrude Canada Ltd., Mr. Speaker, is made up of Gulf Oil Canada Limited, 16.75 per cent; Canada-Cities Service, Ltd., 22 per cent; Imperial Oil, 31.25 per cent; Petro-Canada, which is an arm of the federal government, 15 per cent; the province of Ontario, 5 per cent; and the province of Alberta, 10 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, in November 1976 the tenders were called for the construction of the pipeline from the Syncrude site south. Syncrude and the Alberta Energy Company extended invitations to tender on the two projects.

And when they extended an invitation to tender, Mr. Speaker — this is considerably different from a public tender — what they did was select a group of pipeline companies and, after they'd looked at their record of performance, asked these pipeline companies, Mr. Speaker, to bid on the project. There was no stipulation that the contractors be unionized. It goes without saying that the senior management people in Syncrude and the senior management people in the Alberta Energy Company knew the companies that they were asking to bid.

The lowest bidder on both contracts, by admission of both the Alberta Energy Company and Syncrude, was the Calgary company Henuset Bros. Ltd., I might say the only completely Alberta-based company that was asked to bid on the job.

The contracts were not immediately granted, though, on the closing date of the tenders. It appears that the unions from the Syncrude site were putting pressure on Syncrude, a number of agencies, through threats of walkout or a strike.

Following the submission of the bids, Henuset Bros. Ltd. were asked to extend the expired date for their own bids on three separate occasions. They were asked to extend the deadline for the acceptance of their bids by senior officials of Syncrude and the Alberta Energy Company.

On December 17 Henuset Bros., recognizing that there was great pressure coming from the unions involved, obtained an interim injunction from Chief Justice Milvain of the Trial Division of the Alberta Supreme Court. It restrained the following unions from any and all acts of intimidation, including threats to strike illegally, threats of or actual withdrawal of services, or walkouts: the International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 955; United Association of Journeymen & Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United

States and Canada, Local 488; International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, Local 362; Labourers' International Union of North America, Local 92; and Alberta and North West Territories (District of MacKenzie) Building and Construction Trades Council.

We're told, Mr. Speaker, by individuals who are prepared to come before this Legislature in the Public Affairs Committee, that a sizable number of members on the government side of the House were contacted well in advance of the decision being made to give the tender to those other than the lowest tenderers. It's been indicated to us by what I would deem to be reliable sources who are prepared to come before the committee that, recognizing this pressure was building, the Premier, the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, the Minister of Labour, the hon. Mr. Faran, Dr. Warrack, Mr. Chambers the member on the board of Syncrude, the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, and the hon. member Mr. Peacock were contacted with regard to this developing situation. On virtually every occasion members expressed their concern that in fact the lowest bidder wouldn't be getting the contract, that here was an Alberta company that had been asked to bid on a selective tender.

Most of the hon. members concerned gave the impression that oh, there's no question, the lowest tender will get the job. Obviously all of them were unwilling to do anything about the matter, because on December 22, 1976 the contract was awarded to bidders other than the lowest. Each of those companies that received the contract were unionized.

The oil sands pipeline: 75 miles to be built by Banister Continental Ltd., 75 miles by Pe Ben Oilfield Services Ltd. and H. C. Price of Canada Ltd. The Alberta Energy Company announcement of these contracts said the successful bids, which totalled \$12.4 million, were \$2.2 million above the lowest tender. As far as the natural gas pipeline is concerned, [the] contract was awarded to Majestic Wiley Contractors Limited. This contract was approximately \$2.8 million above the lowest tender. So when the contracts were awarded, the total contracts were \$22 million; the lowest tender had been something like \$17 million, a difference of \$5 million.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that following the announcement made by the Alberta Energy Company and Syncrude on December 22, the successful contractors met on January 3 with representatives of Syncrude and the Alberta Energy Company supposedly to get the project going, to get the job moving ahead. At that meeting the three successful contractors said: well frankly gentlemen, our bids have run out; we've got more work now; we're not tied to the tenders we submitted some weeks earlier. After quite a flurry at the meeting, several millions of additional dollars were committed to the project, or in fact the three contractors who got the job wouldn't have gone ahead.

Once again we can ask witnesses to come before the Assembly and see if this isn't the case. It isn't a matter of \$5 million the taxpayers of this province are now going to be picking up, it's more in the vicinity of \$10 to \$12 million. Because the contractors said: frankly, we can't make the deadlines; we've got more work; the prices have gone up. So we're not looking at a \$5 million difference now, but between \$10 and \$12 million. That in itself should be enough to spur

on the members of the Assembly to have the Public Affairs Committee investigate the whole matter.

Mr. Speaker, after reviewing the situation it was our decision that an investigation should take place in this area. On January 12 I had a letter delivered to the Energy Resources Conservation Board requesting the ERCB, under Section 5(a) of The Pipeline Act, 1975, which reads:

The Board, when required by the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall, or upon its own motion may, inquire into, examine and investigate any matter relating to (a) the economic, orderly and efficient development in the public interest of pipeline facilities in Alberta.

We went to the ERCB, Mr. Speaker, because it is jointly funded by industry and government. We felt that perhaps here was an agency which could readily understand the implications, not just for the pipeline industry, not just for the petroleum industry either, but for the people of the province, because in fact its funds come partially from the private sector and partially from the government.

I'd like to file with the library a copy of the letter we sent to the ERCB. On January 24, Mr. Speaker, I received a reply from the vice-chairman of the ERCB, Mr. Millard, with regard to my request for the board to involve itself and look at the whole matter. I'll also file a copy of the response.

On this occasion, Mr. Speaker, I don't plan to enter into an argument about the weaknesses in the ERCB's position. However, I would simply like to say that since we've received the letter from the ERCB, their intention that they would not investigate the matter, I think it's safe to say that outside legal services indicate the board has placed the narrowest and most unlikely interpretation on Section 5(a) of The Pipeline Act, 1975.

Mr. Speaker, that's the reason we're here before the Legislative Assembly this afternoon, on the first occasion that we could be. It's become obvious to me, through the reply of the ERCB, that there's not going to be any regulatory agency willing to offend the government by looking into this important issue.

I think it's also important, Mr. Speaker, that members should recognize this isn't only a matter that the official opposition are concerned about. I venture to say there are very few members in this Assembly who haven't had some of their constituents come to them and put some very direct questions as to what's happened in this particular case, some more directly than others. I venture to say there isn't a member who hasn't had that experience.

Let me say that the Calgary, Edmonton, Fort McMurray, and Red Deer chambers of commerce have raised the matter and expressed grave concern about it. The president of the Fort McMurray chamber said: "It was an obvious case where strong government action was called for and they didn't take it." And they didn't take it.

The Canadian Federation of Independent Business has recently expressed its concern about the situation, has called for a royal commission, and is encouraging the federal government and the province of Ontario to become actively involved in getting down to finding out what really happened.

I'm sure most members have seen the editorials in the media attacking the government on this issue. Perhaps some members may not have seen a good

editorial from *The Nanton News*. I'd like to read into the record a few paragraphs from that editorial:

From now on, when Premier Lougheed talks about equal opportunities for all Albertans, it should be taken with a grain of salt by these same Albertans. As far as we are concerned, his credibility suffered severely when he gave in to blackmail threats by the unions doing the construction work on the Syncrude plant in north-eastern Alberta.

A non-union company from Calgary had submitted a tender to construct a pipeline from the plant to Edmonton. This was really no concern of the unions at the plant. The tender was for \$2.2 million less than what union companies had tendered. The unions at Syncrude threatened to go on strike if the non-union firm was awarded the contract. Mr. Lougheed saw fit to give in to the unions and thus by doing so, has notified all Albertans, that if they don't belong to a union, [there was] little chance of getting in on any big construction opportunities planned by the provincial government, particularly in the resource industries of Alberta. This is the field that the Premier has been trying to protect the interests of Albertans against the federal government and other provincial administrations. Who is going to protect us from the policies of Mr. Lougheed?

In this particular instance, he showed lack of intestinal fortitude. He also showed very bad judgment. It is not very long ago that the Alberta government introduced a human rights bill in the legislature, and it eventually became law. It is supposed to stop discrimination, particularly in the hiring and firing of workers of all kinds for any employment. Apparently the Premier feels that it is more of a sin to advertise whether you wish to have male or female help; whether you want a young person or someone [who has some] experience; than it is to demand union over non-union laborers. The human rights legislation, of which he and his Conservative cohorts have been so proud, really doesn't mean much any more. If it doesn't apply to the government and the unions . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. leader. The question of reading in quotations is one which is not entirely clear, but it would seem to me that there should be some limitation; otherwise we're going to have members quoting editorials contrary to each other from both sides of the House, and instead of having a debate among the members we will have a debate among editorial writers. I would suggest to the hon. leader that perhaps he might abbreviate the quotation as much as possible.

MR. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The last sentence then: "If it doesn't apply to the government and the unions, there is no reason why it should apply to anyone else." That's the end of the editorial from *The Nanton News*.

Mr. Speaker, the government has been strangely quiet on this issue since it broke in the middle of December. Reasons for government inaction have basically been of two types. The first suggestion, that has in fact been used by some members of the Assembly, is that basically the government does not control the Alberta Energy Company. This is, if I

could be so frank, an incredibly stupid argument when one considers the government owns 50.1 per cent of the Alberta Energy Company's shares. Refusal to account on that ground is completely and totally inexcusable. [interjections] Potential losses of \$1.5 million a day if the project was shut down.

MR. NOTLEY: Roy's getting a little touchy.

MR. FARRAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think we should correct an obvious error.

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest to the hon. minister that he might correct that error when his turn comes in debate. I am not at the moment of course suggesting it is an error, but I'm using the hon. minister's description. [interjections]

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate how sensitive the hon. minister is. And well he should be, because he was one of the ones who were contacted and did nothing about it.

Now to get back to the matter at hand, the government controls 50.1 per cent of the Alberta Energy Company.

MR. FARRAN: On a point of privilege this time. The hon. leader says I was contacted. I haven't been contacted by any of these people. Where does he get that information from?

MR. CLARK: If the hon. member will just vote for the resolution, we can have the people here and you can find out again. Just vote for the motion.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, dealing with the question now, the second argument the government uses as to why nothing should be done is in the area of — well we would lose \$1.5 million a day if the project was shut down. This is short-sighted, Mr. Speaker. The ultimate cost, the implications of what's taking place on this pipeline, isn't going to be millions of dollars to people in this province; it's going to be billions of dollars in the long run. That's what members have to keep their eyes on. It isn't the \$1.5 million the Alberta Energy Company and the government say will be lost each day there'd be a walkout.

I'm sure the members of the House know, Mr. Speaker, that hardly a month or half a month go by up at the plant where there aren't wobbles now. These wobbles are ongoing in many cases. They're costing the participants in Syncrude a sizable amount of money now. So let's not have the impression that there have been no work stoppages up there, because they have been numerous in the course of the construction of this particular plant.

We're not talking about the \$1.5 million a day the Energy Company said would be lost, or \$2 million a day, if there was a strike for a period of time. We're talking [of] the principle the government chose to follow in this area, which really was of no action; if that continues it's not millions but billions of dollars we're speaking of in the long run.

In my candid judgment, Mr. Speaker, this is a prime example of the government having placed itself in a conflict-of-interest situation through its business/government partnership. In this case the government has decided to place its own corporate interest ahead

of the public interest. Mr. Speaker, I made that point to the members of the House when we brought in the legislation on the Alberta Energy Company.

I further made the point, Mr. Speaker, when we were talking about making that foolish amendment to The Legislative Assembly Act which made it possible for members of this Assembly to have shares in the Alberta Energy Company, because members are once again caught in a conflict-of-interest kind of situation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you buy some?

MR. CLARK: No I didn't, specifically for the reason I explained at that time. [interjections] Because members of the Assembly are now finding themselves in a conflict-of-interest situation, not the first time and far be it from the last.

Now, Mr. Speaker, dealing with this question — and I've heard one of the hon. members say the matter is before the courts. This is the highest court in the province of Alberta. This is where the answers should come forward. This committee would have the opportunity to ask anyone associated with the project to come before the committee and to level with the members of the Assembly and with the people of the province.

We're not talking only about one specific abuse here; we're talking about the future economic direction of this province and the proper relationship which should exist among the various segments of society.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's look for a moment or two at the implications of what's happened. Bechtel, the contractor involved, is in the situation of, if I may use the term, ramrodding this job. They leave Alberta in 1979, but the people of this province live with the problems after they leave. I don't regard Bechtel as a good corporate citizen of this province. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we've been too quick to overlook the long-term implications of this agreement worked out between Bechtel and the Operating Engineers, because Bechtel leaves Alberta in 1979 but the people of this province have to continue long after that.

Mr. Speaker, one of the implications of the decision would be, how long before every contractor in the province will have to be unionized in order to get his contracts? We have to ask ourselves — and members would do very well, each of them, to ask the question — who is really running Alberta?

Under Section 156 of The Alberta Labour Act it would appear the threat of a secondary boycott is clearly illegal. To write them into an agreement which is then held in trust by the Department of Labour is too blatant for words to describe. Section 156 of The Alberta Labour Act says:

No employee shall

- (a) refuse to perform work for his employer for the reason that other work was or will be performed or was not or will not be performed by any person or class of persons who were or are not members of a trade union or a particular trade union, [and]
- (b) refuse to take delivery of goods from a carrier or refuse to assist in the loading of a carrier of goods for shipment except where the carrier and his employees are engaged in a strike or lockout permitted by this Part [of the Act].

Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation, Section 156 of The Alberta Labour Act, could have stopped this whole thing if the government had had the intestinal fortitude to use it. But the government didn't do that. Rather than that, when Bechtel and the Operating Engineers concluded an agreement, where did they lodge the agreement? To use the minister's words, in a place of safekeeping. The place of safekeeping on neutral ground, the Department of Labour — the same department which is charged with the responsibility of seeing that The Alberta Labour Act is lived up to. That's why I ask: who is running the province? Because if that piece of legislation had been lived up to, there would have been no need, no need at all, for the action it was taking.

Bechtel felt no fear in agreeing with the Operating Engineers on this matter. Syncrude and the Alberta Energy Company threw in their lot with the unions and Bechtel, knowing full well that it is the Alberta taxpayer and the consumer who will end up paying the extra millions of dollars. And it's not \$5 million, it's a great deal more now.

The Alberta government says it's not going to become involved in this issue. Mr. Speaker, by making no decision the Alberta government has become involved. The fact that you've chosen to make no decision is, in fact, permitting this to go on. In permitting it to go on, you are establishing it as the precedent from here on. The government has indicated it's quite willing to participate in this conspiracy to — really, in the end it means picking the pockets of the people of the province.

It should also be noted, Mr. Speaker, that the government has been quite willing to see the provisions of the Alberta Crown Agreement violated. That agreement came out of the Winnipeg meeting and is dated February 4, 1975. I refer members to that agreement. One or two members looked a bit shocked; it's the Alberta Crown Agreement. I refer members to Article 2, Section 202 (b) which reads:

In the [case] of carrying out the Syncrude Project the Lessees shall where practical and reasonable . . . use construction firms owned by residents of the Province of Alberta.

Shall "use construction firms owned by residents of the province of Alberta." Isn't it strange in this case that the only firm that really met that criterion happened to be the lowest bidder by \$5 million, which is really likely to turn out to be \$10 million or \$15 million? And they didn't get the contract.

This particular section of the agreement has been completely violated, and with the government's consent in this case. The only conclusion I can reach is: who is really running the province? Is there a combination of Alberta's corporate elite, including the leaders of big business and big unions and big government?

Many members will well recall that prior to the 1975 election the Premier returned from Winnipeg and we heard the words, there is guaranteed labor peace as far as the Syncrude project is concerned. There is guaranteed labor peace.

We look at what has happened on this particular project and say to ourselves, who's next? It isn't going to be very long before some of the other agreements will have to be dealt with. I can hear people in the labor movement now — who were, I am sure, dumbfounded at the success they had on this

case, how easily the government and the companies caved in — coming along next time and saying, well, we are not going to sign on the next venture until all the housing to be built in Fort McMurray is to be done by union work. Why not? They won this round so easily. Is the housing industry next? Is the small construction industry next? That's really what's before us.

We put this motion before the House today because we believe it's time for some answers. Since regulatory agencies refuse to undertake an investigation, it's really up to the Legislature to convene the Standing Committee on Public Affairs in order to call all responsible parties to account for their actions. As well, it will give other interested Albertans an opportunity to express their feelings on this issue to the members of the Assembly. The Public Affairs committee should be ordered to get to the bottom of this particular situation.

We can't turn back the clock on the pipeline being built now; we recognize that. But what we must — and I emphasize this to all hon. members in the House, regardless of where you sit — what we must direct our attention to is: what of the implications for the future? What are the implications for the next tar sands plant? What are the implications for the business community in this province, especially the non-union business community in this province?

I hear people say, well you know, the fault is The Alberta Labour Act. And I have to say that regardless of what we'd had in The Alberta Labour Act, it wouldn't have changed this situation one iota. Because The Alberta Labour Act wasn't lived up to in this case. If Section 156 had been enforced, if we had used that section of The Alberta Labour Act that came in in 1975, on both counts we could have dealt with this situation. Yes, it would have taken some courage and a great deal of determination. But how can a government be in a stronger position than this government is today as far as courage, as far as financial resources are concerned. If a government is ever going to have the intestinal fortitude to do something in this area, this was the glorious opportunity.

The most important contribution that this Public Affairs committee could make to the province would be that it would get down to the root question of the effect on the economic and orderly development of the resources of this province, of the establishment of the precedents which will tend to continue as a result of this one decision. The real question that members have to recognize is that we can't turn the clock back on what I think many members on both sides of the House feel has been a very, very unfortunate episode.

I don't particularly enjoy standing here today and saying, I told you so. But the more we get involved in these kinds of ventures with government/business partnership, the more difficult it is, hon. members, for us to arrive at decisions that are in the best interests of all the people in the province, and not in the best interests of your corporate bed partners.

It appears to many people, not just people in my own party but people who have voted for a large number of members on the other side of the House, that the government hasn't only copped out in this case, it's opted out. It's refused to enforce the legislation we have on the books now. And by not becoming involved, it in fact has made a decision that this is all

right, that this kind of action we have seen by Bechtel, Syncrude, and AEC gets the stamp approval from this government. I don't believe it has the stamp of approval of the people across this province. It's for that reason that I ask the members to give serious consideration to the proposal — the Public Affairs committee.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, I'm anxious to address some remarks to this particular resolution for a number of reasons. One is my own great interest in the energy developments in Alberta and with that, the opportunity for diversified job opportunities for the future of Albertans, particularly young Albertans; but more particularly in the specific development at hand and related to this resolution, the fact that the service of the power plant is involved. And of course, as all members heard, I was mentioned among others in the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition with respect to his proposal on this resolution.

I almost changed my mind when the Leader of the Opposition reduced himself to terminology called "incredibly stupid". I rather think that's not helpful, no matter what argument one is putting, and as a matter of fact tends to erode the effectiveness of any resolution whether it had in the initial instance been effective or not. But in any case I do regret that kind of terminology in this House, though I would not contend that it was necessarily unparliamentary for I recognize that certainly as the speaker's prerogative.

I did notice, Mr. Speaker, that in his usual exaggerated way the hon. Leader of the Opposition did manage to knock almost everyone in sight — certainly the government, certainly unions, certainly Syncrude, certainly the Alberta Energy Company, and certainly Bechtel. At the same time I was pleased to hear his references to turning back the clock, because as a matter of fact, when they were a tired and unhealthy government they had quite a bit of practice at that. Some of us, I think, entered this Legislature to try to offset that kind of thing and get a progressive kind of opportunity at hand for the younger people of Alberta who will be our future.

I would like to get two facts absolutely straight, partly because I've been reading one of these in local papers I get in my area, which adjoins that of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and that [is] his claim at that time, and also of course today, that the decisions involved were government decisions. They were not. They're decisions of the boards respectively of Syncrude and the Alberta Energy Company whose mandate and scope for decision is in fact management of these affairs, and they exercise the best business judgment for their shareholders in light of those matters.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, it's essential to clarify that one point which perhaps the hon. member wishes were different, but in fact is not. That is, that it was not a matter of government decision; it was in fact the decision of those boards which have the responsibility to make exactly those management decisions in terms of the business judgments that are necessary, relative to the shareholder responsibilities they have and as those boards of directors see it.

Secondly, and in part on behalf of my colleague the hon. Solicitor General who was concerned about the

suggestion that there was a holding of a greater than 50 per cent ownership position by the Alberta government — that may have been just a slip of the tongue on the part of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, but it is a matter that ought to be clarified once *Hansard* comes out — I make mention of that on behalf of the hon. Solicitor General who had to leave for a meeting and could not take part in that opportunity at this time.

Above all though, Mr. Speaker, I'm deeply concerned that in the remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition on the resolution he proposes, he does not come to grips with and face the basic question of principle involved. The basic question of principle is whether or not the government ought to make management decisions rather than the boards of directors — in this case of Syncrude and the Alberta Energy Company respectively, but it could expand to a very long list, Alberta Gas Trunk Line, for example, and many, many others one could think of if they put their mind to it. But what is the question? The question is whether those boards of directors who have that management responsibility should in fact manage, or whether the government should be making those decisions instead.

I can recall the positions taken by the Leader of the Opposition at the time many of these discussions came forward. There was very deep concern on behalf of the private sector, as they expressed it, and very deep concern in terms of any big government kind of abuse, as to government in fact doing what they now propose. I find that really quite amazing and a 180 degree shift on the part of the opposition's stand. It's rather clear that the position of the opposition indeed seems to be that government now should make those decisions instead of the management decisions being made by the respective boards who have that responsibility. If that is the position of the opposition of this Legislature, it would be very helpful if they would simply stand up and say so.

That question of principle is the question involved in this resolution. It was not addressed in the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, and that's unfortunate. Because either the present ownership circumstances stand as they are with respect to Syncrude and the Alberta Energy Company — mentioning them because these are the cases in point mentioned in the resolution of the hon. Leader of the Opposition — either they proceed with the job of management in the best business judgment they can take into account and exercise, or the hon. member should make one of two proposals.

He should propose instead that the Alberta Energy Company and the Syncrude operations be nationalized. That position has been suggested in the Legislature before. That could be debated again as it's been debated before. But in any case, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition feels the government should be involved in making those management decisions, he ought to be consistent and say they ought to be nationalized and there be no other ownership involved. I can't help but think of the bumper sticker I saw in Calgary that said, if you like the way the post office operates, nationalize the oil industry.

The other alternative the hon. Leader of the Opposition should propose — if he's proposing, as he is in his resolution, that these management decisions be made by the provincial government — is to suggest as

a policy direction that all Alberta government interests be sold, be gotten rid of if you like, and then there would be no interests. There would also be the problem that it would forego the opportunity for Alberta investors to take part in and share from and profit from the development of the resources which they own in their own province, which is a fundamental cornerstone of resource management policy of this government as we've presented it many times in the Legislature.

Now either the Leader of the Opposition has to take up the policy position that it ought to be complete public ownership by the Alberta government, or there ought to be complete disposal. Only one of the two could possibly be consistent with the resolution as put. That has not been done. Because that has not been done, the resolution as placed is simply not consistent with the previous positions or with the arguments that were made today.

But certainly, Mr. Speaker, above all the important question is: just what is the issue? There's what the issue is and what it is not. The issue is whether the boards of directors in fact manage as their opportunities and responsibilities place in their hands, or whether the government does it instead and there's no point in having a board of directors. That is the issue.

It's clear that the opposition has moved on this in a manner that's certainly inconsistent with their previous positions. The Alberta government, as I see it, as one member representing my constituents, can only take a position against this resolution in order to be consistent with the position that the board of directors who have the responsibility to manage, in fact, manage.

There's also the question, if one wished to pose it, as to which is better. There has been the discussion of whether or not the fundamental point involved [is] whether all these decisions should be made by government or whether they should be made by a board of directors with the responsibility to manage. That has been discussed. The consensus of the government and of the Legislature up to now has been that it is better that they have the capacity and the authority and, as the opposition has put it on prior occasions, not to have the government involved — and I think the term "meddling" might have been used, it often is — in those kinds of decisions.

It's not a question in this resolution, Mr. Speaker, of whether I as an individual member of the Legislature agree, or the Leader of the Opposition or anyone else in this Legislature necessarily agrees or does not agree with the business judgment management decision made by the respective boards of directors. That is not the issue. The issue is whether they should in fact be in a position to make those decisions. What the ownership shares are is also not an issue. It's not a matter of what the labor legislation is. And again, I was rather alarmed to hear the anti-union kind of position the Leader of the Opposition identified himself with. It's not any of the other red, or perhaps pink, herrings that were drawn across during the course of the hon. leader's presentation. It is, in fact, exactly a question of whether or not the government should be managing these matters. And the conclusion that has been reached before is that it's not.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition also mentioned contacts with a number of ministers, including

myself, on the question of whether the government should get involved, which would indeed be contrary to prior kinds of representations we've received from a number of members of the business community, including the Chamber of Commerce, and upon consideration of the question, quickly reached the conclusion that the earlier decision that the boards of directors responsible for managing should manage, and make those management decisions in terms of the best interests of their shareholders and are answerable at their annual meetings for the actions they've taken. For these reasons, briefly, Mr. Speaker, and particularly and singularly more important than anything else, recognizing what the question is, the question of whether these boards of directors make management decisions or whether they don't, I say as a member of the Legislature that they should. In his resolution the Leader of the Opposition says they should not.

I would urge all members to vote this resolution down on the basis that it's better for the people of Alberta, consistent with existing and previous policies as established in discussions in this Legislature, that the respective boards of directors make those management decisions, considering all matters including the labor negotiation considerations, which are legitimate business management judgment matters, and that those in fact continue to be the mandate that they have. Alberta will be better served in the present and in the future if we continue with that policy respecting resource management development in Alberta. We are in a position to do that, in fact, by turning aside this ill-considered resolution.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in rising to address a few comments to this important resolution, first of all I want to set out my views on why it is necessary to have public input into the decision; secondly, to look at the facts of the situation, at least as I've been able to research it; thirdly, to examine some of the implications of the decision; and finally, to look at perhaps a major question that ought to be considered within this resolution — that is, not what has happened to date but rather, Mr. Speaker, what will happen as far as the Fort McMurray oil sands area is concerned, and the Syncrude project in particular, in the future.

Mr. Speaker, turning to the first point I want to touch upon, there's really little doubt in my mind that to date only one side of the story has been heard. For whatever reasons — legal advice, decisions within the building trades, or what have you — the union side of the story has not been told to the people of Alberta. So be it. As far as I'm concerned, one of the reasons I would support this resolution is that I believe it is important that we have an opportunity to fully evaluate this decision.

Now the argument is presented by the Minister of Utilities and Telephones that somehow, if we pass a resolution such as this, we are opting for ownership and control of Syncrude. Well I have no great difficulty with that proposition. But I suggest to the hon. minister that that really is beside the point. Because what is involved here is a lot of public money, well over \$1 billion in one way or another, being sunk into the Syncrude project. And that being the case . . .

MR. CLARK: [Inaudible] the cause of the rural gas co-ops' problem.

MR. NOTLEY: Yes, I think that's probably a fair comment. The minister's not here. I'm sorry to see that, otherwise I would have passed that assertion on.

But the question still remains, Mr. Speaker, that we are talking about a large amount of public money. And to simply say well, it's not our prerogative to investigate this matter because that's a management decision, Mr. Speaker, belies the fact that we as members of this Legislature have an obligation to be watchdogs on how the public money is invested and whether the decisions are good or bad.

Let me also preface my remarks by saying that no one over the last three or four years has been a more consistent critic of the Syncrude project than I have been. I think it is a massive distortion of provincial priorities. I took that point of view to the electorate in March 1975, and the decision was fairly obvious — 69 members surrounding us here, and a very small opposition. Well, Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that, right or wrong, the people of Alberta opted for the Syncrude project. That was part of the Premier's platform. It was one of the things the government took to the people of this province, and I suppose they received an endorsement for the Syncrude project in March of last year.

Mr. Speaker, having reached that conclusion, it seems to me there are certain inevitable things that follow, once we get into major projects. Let me move from my introductory remarks to the history of this particular case as I've been able to understand it.

To my knowledge, the initial talks about no-strike, no-lockout did not come from the government of Alberta, nor for that matter even from the trade unions, but rather from the people developing the project themselves, the Syncrude consortium. If one looks over the so-called Syncrude papers, the basis of Mr. Pratt's book on the oil sands, it's very clear that a peace pact, if you like, Mr. Speaker, is one of the most important considerations. Over and over again during the summer of 1973, discussions took place on that very factor: how can we arrive at a no-strike, no-lockout agreement? I would just pursue this by looking at the Premier's speech in September 1973 — everybody was cheering — and I note, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier makes this comment:

Syncrude will have to work out fair labor agreements in terms of the site and over the course of construction. I'm sure that the labor unions and the labor groups in this province will work to assure that this occurs.

And rather more important, Mr. Speaker, looking at the agreement itself, the agreement that was signed and became the basis of the Syncrude project, the original project that was outlined by the Premier in September 1973, the very first condition in the agreement says:

That such Syncrude contractors as Syncrude may request shall enter into a site agreement or agreements with labor organizations in a form which will have the effect of bringing the various trade components under one set of working conditions and which will achieve labor stability to the completion of the project.

Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that the major reason the consortium was so concerned about a peace pact, if you like, was the regrettable experience of the James Bay project in Quebec where, because

of slowdowns, wildcats, strikes, the cost of that project had multiplied many times over. I can't visualize any group of developers contemplating a project, which at that time was in the neighborhood of \$1 billion, even considering proceeding unless they had some sort of no-strike, no-lockout agreement. One can argue that this sort of thing may be unfair. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, when we're talking about smaller projects, fair enough, it's a different ball game. But we were looking at \$1 billion project in 1973, a project which even as it turned out escalated substantially beyond that original estimate. So the emphasis and the drive, if you like, for a peace pact came from the consortium itself.

Mr. Speaker, in 1974 members of the Legislature passed Bill 52, The Alberta Labour Amendment Act. The purpose of this bill, as it was explained by the now Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, was to facilitate a voluntary on-site agreement. It would not be a legislated agreement; it would be a voluntary on-site agreement. If I recall the debate, the argument was, and I think it's probably reasonable, that in a project as large as this you cannot ensure labor peace by issuing injunctions. You can have all the provincial court judges in the province sitting up there issuing one injunction after another, but that's not going to ensure labor peace. The only way you can enforce, if you like, a no-strike, no-lockout agreement is if there is good will on the part of those representing the workers. That was the reason, as I recall anyway, that the Legislature gave unanimous consent to Bill 52 in 1974.

Subsequently 14 of the 15 unions in the area signed an agreement with Bechtel. One union, the Operating Engineers, had not signed an agreement. But rather important, Mr. Speaker, and I quote from a special year-end report to the shareholders of the Alberta Energy Company:

At the time of the pipeline award, Syncrude had signed no-strike agreements with 14 of the 15 unions [on] the site. The 15th union, the operating engineers, had not signed and was therefore able to legally strike in April.

In other words, there was a possibility of a legal strike.

When the pipeline awards were under consideration, Syncrude advised that its project manager had recently executed a site agreement with the Operating Engineers. This agreement, which was being held in trust until after the pipeline awards were made, committed the Operating Engineers to a no-strike position on . . . condition that both Syncrude's gas line and . . . oil line being constructed for transport of Syncrude oil would be built by contractors recognized by the union.

So to review the events that led up to this particular controversy, Mr. Speaker, the thrust, the drive for a peace pact came from the proponents of the scheme. In 1974 an act was passed by the Legislature which facilitated a negotiated pact. Fourteen of the 15 unions had agreed; one, the Operating Engineers, had not yet signed an agreement but was, at the time the invitation to tender was let, negotiating an agreement with Bechtel.

Mr. Speaker, those simple facts, as I understand them anyway, bring us to where we are today. What are some of the implications? It seems to me the first

question that should be asked is why were the pipelines not included when the legislation, Bill 52, was passed in 1974 to set up an on-site agreement? The utility plant is included, why not the pipelines? When the Premier talked about the Syncrude project in 1973, he indicated that the pipeline was certainly part of the overall project.

I want to make it clear that Bill 52 does not exclude the pipeline from being covered, but it does not specifically include the pipeline. I think we have to ask ourselves why, Mr. Speaker, because that certainly was the beginning of a situation that, as far as the trade union movement viewed it, they had a *quid pro quo*. They were giving up the right to strike; that was their *quid*. The *pro quo* was a unionized shop. Putting it as simply as it could be put, I think that was essentially the situation, and that the contractors — the Bechtel people and the consortium — felt that was the only way they could keep this project on schedule. I suspect they were right.

Sure there have been wildcats. When has there ever been a major project where there haven't been wildcats? But I think it is probably a fair statement that there has been more labor peace on the Syncrude project than on any other project of its size in Canada. Certainly when one compares the time lost at Syncrude with the dreadful story of labor relations at James Bay, there is no comparison at all.

The second question that comes to mind, Mr. Speaker, is that if negotiations were taking place between the Operating Engineers and Canadian Bechtel — and I have a great deal of respect for Mr. Mitchell, the president of the Alberta Energy Company, even though I obviously don't share his philosophical approach to things — it amazes me that when the invitation to tender was let, it was simply allowed to go to companies which, once the agreement was reached, would clearly not satisfy the peace pact that had been worked out before with the Building Trades Council. I simply put to the hon. members of the Legislature that as a business judgment on the part of a very able, very skilful business leader, I find that a rather questionable decision.

The other point I want to reinforce, Mr. Speaker, dealing with this matter, is just to underline what is obvious; that is, labor peace, no matter how we look at it, particularly in a tight labor market, cannot be enforced by injunctions. There must be that willingness to co-operate, that feeling of oneness, that sense of co-operation.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons I think we should have this particular resolution passed is that I would like to look at all facets of this, not just the question of whether Henuset should or should not have got the deal on the basis of their bid. I think a lot of other questions should be raised as well.

In a release early in January, Muriel Venne, a member of the Human Rights Commission but also the director of Native Outreach, makes no comment about Henuset — and I want to make that clear so there's no reflection on the Calgary company in question — but she makes this assertion on behalf of Native Outreach:

However, our experience with non-union contractors has been uneven, to say the least. For example, one non-union contractor stated that Indians were to be paid \$4.00 [an] hour, take it or leave it. If the contract is more expensive than a

non-union contract, it will mean better wages and working conditions for Native people.

She begins her release, as a matter of fact, by praising the provincial government. Of course I find that a little difficult to do, nevertheless Ms. Venne does it, and goes on to say that the decision of the Alberta Energy Company in awarding the contract for the construction of the pipeline to a union contractor is certainly consistent with one of the important principles of this whole project, which was to involve native people in the construction process.

I have been, as I mentioned before, the most constant critic of Syncrude. But I do have to say in fairness to the company that I believe they have made an effort to involve native people, and so has Bechtel. I don't think there's any question about that, and it would be less than honest to imply otherwise.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude my remarks on this subject by suggesting that my concern, if I have any with this particular resolution, is that it doesn't really go far enough. We're being asked to hold meetings of the Public Affairs committee to examine one particular contract. We should be looking at all aspects of that contract. But I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that we should be having a meeting of the Public Affairs committee to discuss where we go in the oil sands, that we should debate in this House a position paper on what the government proposes to do with oil sands policy.

My heavens, I look over the record here: way back on May 18, 1972, Mr. Dickie, the former minister saying, we're contemplating a position paper on oil sands. That's May 18. Then we go over to April 9, 1973, we're talking about an "oil sands development policy". We go over to December 5, 1973. This is Mr. Loughheed, the Premier, talking about an oil sands paper:

...our view at the moment is that during the first half of 1974, we hope to be in a position to present to the Legislature if it's in session — or if not, to the public and hence distribute to [its] members — a paper with regard to policy and policy guidelines for Alberta oil ... sands development.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they didn't quite make that deadline.

We then go over to April 18, 1974, again the hon. Premier saying, "Mr. Speaker, our hope would be to try to have it in hand during the course of the present summer". Well, we didn't quite make that deadline either. Then, we go on to December 5, 1975, and the Premier says:

...over the past year we've considered the second oil sands plant as a very high priority. Because of the difficulties [of] the first plant, we felt it was extremely important to have the second plant in operation to show the viability of oil sands production in Alberta as a long-term resource for the province.

And no position paper to be tabled.

Well, Mr. Speaker, quite frankly what we should be doing if we're going to have public hearings is discussing what plans the government has in developing the oil sands. With great respect to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources when he rises and says, well, we're talking about possible expansion, it seems to me that when you're looking at a \$2.5 million plan, at some point you have to make an

engineering decision about whether or not you're going to expand that thing.

At the present time there just happens to be widespread opinion in the oil sands area that the government is going to support massive expansion of the Syncrude project, from 125,000 barrels a day to 200,000 barrels a day. It's my information that a hydrogen furnace has already been on order, if not by Syncrude at least by Bechtel. Mr. Speaker, the point I want to make is that we should be debating this question in the Legislature before we get into another Syncrude project.

If I have any quarrel with the resolution put forward by the hon. Leader of the Opposition — I certainly quarrel with most of his assumptions — but if I have any quarrel with the intent of the resolution, it is that we should be going beyond the scope of the Henset question and evaluating the entire future development of the oil sands at this point in time. Mr. Speaker, that in my judgment is a necessary decision if we are going to have — we can go back to an oft-quoted phrase — open government.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I want to make my position very clear in regard to the resolution. I look upon the resolution as an attempt to make people in the hustings think the opposition is doing something grandiose in protecting the rights of the common people. I want to deal with that for a few moments. I suppose those who vote against this will have the members of the official opposition holding up the paper in their hustings and saying, so and so voted against a Public Affairs committee meeting. I suppose they have the right to do that.

I would like to point out that a number of things have to be considered. I'm going to analyze the resolution quickly, to see just where we stand in regard to the various items. That first item is to investigate and report on

- (1) the events surrounding [a] the tendering and awarding of the contracts to construct the 150-mile synthetic crude oil pipeline to be built for Alberta Oil Sands Pipeline, and [b] the tendering and awarding of the contract to construct the 162-mile natural gas pipeline to be built for Syncrude Canada Limited;
 - (2) the necessity of granting contracts to other than the lowest bidder;
 - (3) the impact on the cost of the services to be provided by, and the return on the public money invested in Alberta Oil Sands Pipeline Limited and Syncrude Canada Limited, resulting from the awarding of these contracts; and
 - (4) the effect on the economic and orderly development of the resources of the province of the establishment of precedents which may tend to continue the practice of letting of contracts in projects in which public money is invested to contractors employing only union labor; and
- (b) make recommendations based on [the] findings.

The resolution could be read, and people might say it sounds like a reasonably well-prepared resolution.

The first part is in connection with the gist of the matter, the awarding of these two contracts and the conditions surrounding them. Now, is it necessary to call people, have a Public Affairs committee, to get the events surrounding the tendering of these two contracts, either one. The only people who know the details of that are the people who are involved in the Alberta Energy Company or Bechtel. They're the ones who thrashed it out before they ever let the contract. They went over all the details of it.

So when I was following this up, I felt the proper thing to do would be to call the Alberta Energy Company and ask them how come they let the contract to other than the lowest tender. The answer was that there is an operating agreement — which was outlined already in this debate, and I'm not going into details on it — with the engineers that was being held pending the letting of these contracts. That agreement was that union labor would be involved.

So were the awarders of the contract going to be in the position of breaking faith with the agreement they had already entered into? Or if they did, what would the result be? Well, the result would undoubtedly have been a very long and costly strike. I don't think anybody will argue against that. It would have been a breach of the contract, a breach of the understanding, a breach of the basis upon which the contracts were being let. So I'm sure the people who were awarding the contract gave very careful thought and said, well, will we let it to other than the lower bidder and lose a reasonable amount of money? It'll cost us an additional amount of money. Or shall we break the contract and maybe cost 20 or 100 times as much as well as putting the entire province and hundreds of innocent people out of work?

Well, if I had sat on the board I would have thought that out and I would have voted the way Alberta Energy or Bechtel voted. Because you have to consider the public interest, the hundreds of people whose jobs are involved, the agreement we entered into that was outlined by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, the no-strike, no lockout clause.

When I was in Highways, there were times — not many, but there were times — when I could not recommend that the contract be let to the lowest bidder. I think anyone who's ever had very much to do with this type of thing reaches a point where he can't let the contract to the lowest bidder. That means that a higher amount of public money is paid. The provision in our government legislation is that it then be done by order in council so everybody knows about it. This was done publicly. It wasn't hidden, it was done publicly.

In my view the reason was that instead of costing us an additional 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 — I don't know what the figure is in the mind of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, because he used several figures during his speech. Every time he went a little higher; as he got enthused, the costs went up. I'm sure glad he's not running the Alberta Energy Company.

In any event, whatever that cost is — say it was \$5 million — we have to weigh that against a loss of maybe \$50 or \$100 million in this province. As the hon. members of the official opposition say, they would rather cost the people of Alberta and hundreds of innocent people their wages in order to save \$5 million, when the alternative is to cost the people of the province \$50 or \$100 billion. I don't think I'm

exaggerating that figure one iota.

I've been in strikes. I come from a labor-dominated area. My folks were strong labor people, and I know what it means to go through strikes. I know how the bread on the table diminishes when you're in a strike. But I've never seen a strike where the workers benefit, never. They always lose out. So I would do anything to avoid a strike.

So I think the facts are there. They have not been hid; they've been made public. There was no hesitation at all when I telephoned the Alberta Energy Company and asked them for the facts. They gave them to me immediately. They didn't even ask me what side of the House I was sitting on, or if I was a member of the House, or union or non-union. They gave the facts, and I appreciate that very much indeed.

So the facts under item (1) are known. Why do we want to go to the expense of all the blowing of trumpets and waving of flags to get that information when it's already available? Well, it might help politically if people are so far down that they have to grab at any straw in order to get a couple more votes. But I even doubt that.

The time this was let, the MP for my area and I were in Rockyford in December at the opening of their complex. Scores of people came to us both and said, why didn't the government take a stand? Why didn't they have a confrontation with the union? Are the unions running the country? I said, let's get all the facts before we start jumping to conclusions. Let's get all the facts. In the second place, I made it very clear it wasn't the government that was letting the contract. That seemed to be an eye opener to many. It wasn't the government that was letting the contract.

But had it been the government, undoubtedly it would have been done the same way, at least if I were in the government and all the facts were known. And it would have been made public through an order in council. That would have been the only difference. This way it was made public immediately. Now, who's trying to kid who when we're talking about hiding facts? Nothing was hidden, and I want to emphasize that point.

The second one, "the necessity of granting contracts to other than the lowest bidder". Obviously our whole system of tendering is to let the contract to the lowest bidder, all other things being equal. But the exception makes the rule. I've already said how the previous government and, I believe, the present government have let contracts to other than the lowest bidder. In many cases it's sensible to do so, and the cost in the long run is going to be less to the people of the province. We don't need to study that before a Public Affairs committee. Surely that's self-evident.

The third one:

the impact on the cost of the services to be provided by, and the return on the public money invested in the Alberta Oil Sands Pipeline Limited and Syncrude Canada Limited, resulting from the awarding of [these] contracts.

Well, I was concerned about that item. But I'm not concerned now, because I asked the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources the other day in the House who was going to pay these additional costs. He said, Syncrude. The companies will be paying the additional costs; it's not going to be charged to the

taxpayer.

So the end result is exactly the same as it would be in any other business. The cost is added to the product being sold, much of it being paid for by people not even in this country. So when we're trying to kid the taxpayers of Alberta that they're going to be stuck with a tremendous load of costs, we're not telling them the whole truth. I emphasize that: we're not telling them the whole truth. It looks to me like number (3) is an attempt to fight the last election all over again.

I took a very definite stand supporting Syncrude, and supporting the entry of the Alberta government into Syncrude. I'm a free enterpriser too, but I don't think a government is going to destroy free enterprise by becoming a partner with free enterprise. They didn't nationalize; they simply became a partner with free enterprise. I just look at the number of people on the other side of the House and at my own seat here. I supported that, and I made it very clear that if I was elected I would continue to support the Syncrude project, because in my view it was in the interests of the people of Alberta and in the interests of the people of Canada. I still think so. Well, if it's an attempt now to try to go back and fight the last election all over again through the back door, that's what number (3) appears to me to be doing. The cost will of course be added to the product. Do we need a Public Affairs [committee] to decide that? That's just ordinary, elementary business.

The other item that comes into this — I'll deal with the next part first:

the effect on the economic and orderly development of the resources of the province of the establishment of precedents which may tend to continue the practice of letting of contracts in projects in which public money is invested to contractors employing only union labor

Well, I don't know whether I want to take a definite stand against union labor. I've said in this House many times that I don't think a person's right to work should be premised on the fact that he belongs to a union. I don't think that is sound; yet that's the philosophy right across this country. The party I was a member of, when in government, made it so that I couldn't teach school unless I became a member of a union. The hon. members in the official opposition supported that legislation. You can't practise medicine in this province without being a member of the union. You can't practise law without being a member of the union. These are things that have been accepted in our country.

Also, the unions have done a tremendous amount of good in this country. When the hon. Leader of the Opposition talks against unions so glibly through the side of his mouth, I wonder why he marched with the civil service a few years ago in front of this Legislature when they wanted to be unionized. He was out there marching with them. He and Notley were fighting with each other to see who could be at the head because the TV cameras were at the front.

Well, I don't believe in the unionization of our public service and I never did. I believe the civil servants of a government, whether it's provincial or municipal or federal — the example should be set so that those workers get fair play. Any government that doesn't treat its employees fairly soon finds out that the electors will not support it. But I've never had

anybody in my constituency ask me to support unionization of the public service.

I don't want to do away with unions. There may be a time when there will be a confrontation by the government with unions. It may well be. But I want to say, as I said to many of my constituents, this was not the time. This was not the time, if ever there has to be a time, because this would have meant that hundreds of innocent people would have suffered, that the cost to the people of this province would have been tremendous, \$50 million or \$100 million, whereas the cost because the contracts were honored will be paid by the people of Canada, including the people of Alberta, and much of it will be paid by people from another country.

Now when it comes to us setting precedents, I don't know who thought up the program of entering into a no-strike, no-lockout clause and getting the unions and the companies to adopt it. Even the Legislature adopted it, as the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview said a few minutes ago, and adopted it unanimously, including the members who are now criticizing it. I don't know who thought it up. I have a notion it was the hon. Minister of Energy, but I'm not sure. But whoever it was should be honored, because that's one of the greatest breakthroughs in this country. In a huge project costing millions of dollars, management and labor agree that it was not in the interest of themselves or of the province or of the country to have strikes and lockouts. I wish every company in this country could enter into a similar arrangement; no strikes and no lockouts. Strikes and lockouts across Canada are costing the people of Canada millions of dollars every year.

We've been fortunate in this province over the years to have a minimum. Even the ones we've had have cost a lot of money as well as the grief that takes place and the agony that takes place and the hunger that takes place. As I said before, I have gone through that. I'm not talking from reading books. I was raised in a coal mining area.

One set of working conditions was established. I think that was a tremendous precedent. So if we're looking for economic and orderly development, one of the best ways of having it is to have no strikes and no lockouts. I think Bechtel and the Alberta Energy Company and the labor unions involved are to be congratulated and commended for what we have seen take place in the Syncrude project. That should be an example to industry and labor all across this tremendous country.

As the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview said, when we see what happened in James Bay through strikes and lockouts, we surely should be thankful that we had enough vision in the government leaders of this province to work out a program like this that has saved us such a tremendous loss as well as all the agony.

Mr. Speaker, there's one other point I'd like to mention. The whole thing seems to be putting the responsibility for this on the government of Alberta. I can't follow that. I refreshed my memory by getting The Alberta Energy Company Act. Section 15 of the act says "the Company is not an agent of the Crown in right of Alberta." Now are we asking the government to run the affairs of Syncrude or the Alberta Energy Company? What about the shareholders? The government of Alberta is one shareholder, even

though it holds 50 per cent or more of the shares. What about the other shareholders? Well, I happen to be one of them. And I have confidence that the management of this company will run it wisely and well, without the government sticking its nose into their business.

What I've heard from the members of the official opposition over the last few years is, let's keep government out. Because we've become a partner, does that mean we want to take over and run the whole thing? Of course it doesn't. It means exactly what it says here: "the company is not an agent of the Crown in right of Alberta". When we try to place the responsibility on the government, we are just forgetting that we passed legislation, and we're asking the government to break the law that this Legislature passed. Section 17 also says, "where there is any conflict between the provisions of this Act" and other acts, such as The Companies Act, "the provisions of this Act prevail."

Consequently there's no doubt in my mind at all that the government should be put in the position they're being put in with regard to this position today of trying to fool the people and make the people think the government made this decision. It isn't so. Every ratepayer will have the opportunity, at the annual meeting of the Alberta Energy Company, to raise this point and to speak out. There will be no thwarting or stopping free speech, including the government of Alberta. If the management of the Alberta Energy Company is found at fault, they'd have to take the consequences just as in any other company at the annual meeting.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not plan to support this resolution. As I have done already, I will go to the people who sent me here, without any help from the Social Credit Party, and tell them why I voted against this resolution. It's not because I don't believe public information, making public information public, and getting all the information available. It's because of the following reasons: number one, the government did not make the decision; number two, we don't want the government starting to run the Alberta Energy Company; and number three, the reasons for the letting of the contract to a union is sound and will save the people of this province, I say again, possibly \$50 to \$100 million.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, a few months ago you will recall having read on the front page of the *Edmonton Journal* that the Alberta Chamber of Commerce made a presentation to the cabinet and concluded apparently with a strong denunciation of the extent to which this government was allegedly involved in the activities of private enterprise and the plea that we should not any further involve ourselves than was necessary. In contrast to that you have the declaration of the Fort McMurray Chamber of Commerce, whose plea is that we are not sufficiently involved in the activities of private enterprise and should make ourselves more involved.

At the time we purchased Pacific Western Airlines there were considerable misgivings, particularly in Calgary, that we would not be able to entrust the management of that corporation to competent managers and leave them free to do what was best for the business, that no time could go by before the government would feel compelled to interject itself in the

operations of Pacific Western Airlines. And this, according to the people who were very concerned, was something that would be terrible if it would happen, something they did not want to see happen. Some of those people who didn't see how we could keep ourselves from being involved in Pacific Western Airlines are the same people who now insist we must involve ourselves in the operations of two other private companies in the province. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have just used the wrong phrase. They're not private companies. They are public companies, one of them incorporated under the laws of Alberta, and one of them incorporated under the laws of Canada.

The essential proposition of the resolution here this afternoon is that the government of Alberta, having invested its money in public companies, whether in a minority or majority position, should enjoy and should feel free to use prerogatives or remedies which are unique to it as a government. The proposition is further that the unique powers or prerogatives of the government should be used as a first resort, not as a last resort. Never mind the fact that there are well established in the laws of this province and in the laws of the federal government remedies at annual meetings of the company, remedies through the courts and through the quasi-judicial boards of both jurisdictions. Never mind the fact that these are available to anybody who considers himself aggrieved. Let us in the first instance step over all the other remedies that are available via independent third parties, and let us bring the question to the court of which we ourselves are members, where we can predetermine the outcome of the issue. And let us do it because on one particular question of management we decide, if we may, that we don't like what management has done.

There are a number of questions related to the proposition that I think are important. Should the government invest its money and, if it invests it, should it be in equity or in debt? Should it be in issues that have greater risk or less risk? With respect to both the Alberta Energy Company and Syncrude Canada Ltd., those issues have been debated in this Legislature, they have been decided in this Legislature, and they have further been decided by the people of Alberta in the last provincial election. As the hon. Member for Drumheller has said, more eloquently than I could, if the purpose of this resolution is to refight issues that have previously been decided in this Legislature, I think it is an unnecessary use of the time of the House.

The second question which I think is important is whether or not, having made an investment, we should feel free to act unilaterally, using sovereign powers that are not available to any other party to the agreement, to protect ourselves in any way from an action which, by the very description of the mover of this resolution, is not illegal, not irregular, and not unusual.

DR. BUCK: But expensive.

MR. KING: That issue was debated and decided in this House on a previous occasion. Mr. Speaker, we are talking about the question of whether or not the Legislative Assembly of Alberta should call before itself the officers and the books of public companies to have a discussion or an examination of an issue

which is admittedly not illegal, immoral, irregular, nor unusual, when there are other established remedies available to anybody who considers themselves aggrieved and when they have chosen not to avail themselves of those other remedies. The hon. member who moved this resolution did not suggest to anyone to whom he has spoken that they should go the courts, and to the best of my knowledge they are not doing that.

The discussion has centred mainly on the first operative clause. For the Fort McMurray Chamber of Commerce, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business — for whom I might say I have the greatest respect — and the business community in Calgary, I would like to read one of the less frequently quoted operative clauses of this resolution:

Be it further resolved that the committee be authorized to compel the attendance of persons and the production of papers and records relevant to the matters under consideration by the committee.

Now, let's consider in other operative clauses of the resolution which are those matters or records relevant to matters as considered by the mover of the resolution. The tendering and the awarding of the contracts to construct two pipelines for two different companies by four different contractors — the officers and the papers of all of them could be called before the Assembly. "The impact on the cost of the services to be provided by, and the return on the public money invested" in the awarding of these contracts.

Mr. Speaker, today we are concerned about two companies in which the provincial government has an interest, and we are concerned about the relationship of four other public companies, in which we have no interest, to the activities of Syncrude and AEC. Nothing more clearly illustrated the powerful precedent which could be set by passage of this resolution than the speech by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, who said he was certainly going to support it and his only regret was that it didn't go further; that it didn't inquire into all aspects of the operation of the Syncrude project, including the work of other contractors on the Syncrude site.

The question I think every member of the business community should ask himself, with respect to this resolution, is whether it paves the way for a public inquiry into the operations of Alberta Gas Trunk Line Company Limited, of which we have a 20 per cent interest; or IPSCO, of which we have a 20 per cent interest; or any of the companies to which the Alberta Opportunity Company has loaned money. Now it's certainly true, with respect to these companies, that we don't have an equity investment. But we have made an investment. We expect a return on that investment.

Protection of the return on investment is one of the main criteria used by the mover of the resolution. If indeed we're going to hold public inquiries into everything in which we make an investment, on the basis of our concern about whether that investment is going to yield a return, then I would suggest there are body shops in Airdrie or possibly in Spirit River, there are farm corporations in Brooks or in Drumheller, for which it would not be unreasonable to be concerned that in the not too distant future the personnel and the books and records are going to be called into question by this House and called before this House.

Then we're going to be so busy determining whether we've made a good investment in some company that we're not going to be concerned, properly concerned, about those things which are solely our responsibility.

What about the companies whose debentures we have bought through the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation or through some of the pension funds of the provincial government, which pensions we have guaranteed? If we're concerned about our investment, is that the criteria by which we are going to call TransCanada PipeLines? What about the companies to which we have leased resources?

Mr. Speaker, by his own admission the mover is not primarily concerned about the facts of this situation which, as he said, are now history. He is concerned about the implications of this action upon government. My response to him is that if this is his concern, he should get at it by a means which is consistent with the end. If his concern is over the labor policy of this government, or the absence of such policy, let's have a debate on the labor policy of the government. If he is concerned that there is a weakness in The Alberta Labour Act, let's have a debate on an amendment to The Alberta Labour Act. The resolution is a method they have chosen of getting at an issue without stating their own position on the issue.

The fact that it would incidentally drag public corporations before this Legislature, the fact that it would incidentally give us the power to open up the books of a public corporation, the fact that it would incidentally give us the power to put to the test the management of public corporations is of no concern to them. The future of public corporations — in this case the Alberta Energy Company or Syncrude, in some other case any other public company which operates in this province — is incidental to the desire that they should have a debate in this Legislature on issues not at all related to the management of those companies. Mr. Speaker, I think that is probably one of the major reasons they are on that side of the House and in such small numbers, rather than on this side of the House.

We are developing new relationships in this province between the government and private industry. It is happening on a daily basis. It is happening more frequently. And all these facts make it most important that in all cases we should be concerned about the precedent we are establishing for the nature of the relationship that is going to exist between public companies and the government.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the proposal of the hon. member opposite is full of unhealthy implications for the future right of the provincial government to use sovereign power in any way it sees fit, for any reason it thinks is sufficient, to impinge on the operations of private activity in this province. And that, Mr. Speaker, I think is regrettable.

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

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Buck
Speaker, R.

Clark

Notley

Against the motion:

Adair	Hohol	Paproski
Appleby	Horner	Peacock
Ashton	Horsman	Planche
Backus	Hunley	Russell
Batiuk	Hyland	Schmid
Bogle	Hyndman	Schmidt
Bradley	Jamison	Shaben
Butler	Johnston	Stewart
Chambers	King	Stromberg
Chichak	Koziak	Taylor
Crawford	Kroeger	Tesolin
Diachuk	Leitch	Thompson
Doan	Little	Topolnisky
Dowling	Lougheed	Trynchy
Farran	Lysons	Walker
Fluker	McCrae	Warrack
Getty	McCrimmon	Wolstenholme

Gogo	Miller	Young
Hansen	Moore	Yurko
Harle	Musgreave	
Totals	Ayes - 4	Noes - 59

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move the Assembly adjourn until tomorrow at half past 2.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Government House Leader, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

[The House adjourned at 5:32 p.m.]

