

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTATitle: **Thursday, June 14, 1979 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 27****The Research Council Amendment Act, 1979**

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 27, The Research Council Amendment Act, 1979.

Essentially, Mr. Speaker, the Bill restructures the board and the council to implement the decision of this government to have a Member of the Legislative Assembly chair the council; redesignates the present director as the president of the council; does some other housekeeping matters in relation to how the council functions; and, I'm sure, is a step forward in having the elected people more knowledgeable about and more aware of the activities of the Research Council of Alberta.

[Leave granted; Bill 27 read a first time]

Bill 212**An Act to Amend****The Alberta Health Care Insurance Act**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 212, An Act to Amend The Alberta Health Care Insurance Act.

Currently, Mr. Speaker, families lose the extended health benefits they are accustomed to when the registered family member passes away. This amendment, Mr. Speaker, would ensure that families continue to receive health benefits.

[Leave granted; Bill 212 read a first time]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege this afternoon to introduce to you a group of 22 students from the Grassland school in the Athabasca constituency. With them are their teacher Anna Johnson; parents Mrs. Federkiewicz, Mrs. Spilea, and Mrs. Evansky; and their driver Jim Zachaewich. They're in the public gallery. I ask them to rise and be welcomed to the House.

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS****Department of Economic Development**

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform

the Legislature that yesterday I had a very cordial and productive meeting with the Hon. Don Phillips, Minister of Economic Development for the province of British Columbia.

We discussed a wide range of economic development initiatives and economic policy matters of common concern to our governments.

We agreed that in a number of areas we could achieve our common policy objectives better in an atmosphere of mutual co-operation, in accordance with the aims expressed by the four western premiers at their meeting earlier this year in Prince George.

Specifically, we identified the need to examine jointly the feasibility of constructing a fertilizer plant or other such petrochemical end uses of natural gas in the area of the Deep Basin gas field, which is common to northwestern Alberta and northeastern British Columbia.

Additionally, we agreed to work together on a common ports policy that would ensure adequate port access and terminal facilities, so that western Canadian producers will be in a position to take full advantage of the marketing opportunities of the 1980s. Given that the federal government controls most port facilities and regulates the transportation systems that service them, it was felt that such a common position would serve to strengthen our dealings with the federal government on this very important matter.

We also agreed to share data studies done by both governments on the geologically common coal and natural gas belt that runs through northeastern British Columbia and northwestern Alberta. We further agreed to proceed with a joint analysis of the infrastructure functions that may be needed to serve that area.

Finally, we agreed to make the topic of common economic development initiatives and mutual policy concerns the principal theme of the western provinces' council of economic development ministers meeting to be held this fall.

On all these matters, we've directed our respective senior officials to take immediate steps to implement our decisions.

Department of Housing and Public Works

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to announce the commencement of the extension of the home adaptation program, which is the fulfilment of a promise made by the hon. Premier on February 19, 1979. The home adaptation program will now provide grants of up to \$1,000 to landlords and tenants, as well as limited-income home-owners in order to adapt their premises to facilitate wheelchair users.

For the information of members, the pages will distribute brochures detailing the program. Copies of this brochure and application forms are available from the grants assistance division of the Department of Housing and Public Works.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Municipal Works — Cold Lake Area**

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Environment. It concerns the funding of regional water and sewage systems in the Cold Lake area.

In reviewing I believe it was Friday's *Hansard*, I find that two different ministers gave rather different accounts of the availability of funding. The hon. Minister of Environment outlined the terms of a new program through which the province pays 90 per cent of the costs beyond the first \$200 per capita and up to a limit of \$2,000 per capita. However, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs stated that the municipalities pick up the first part of the expenditure, and the Department of Environment pays the balance.

Would the Minister of Environment advise the Assembly whether his assessment of this program is accurate, or in fact will the government pick up all the costs over \$200 per capita for water and sewage facilities in the Cold Lake-Grand Centre area?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, our program essentially deals with the costs over a basic amount picked up by the local authority. The statement I made Friday last, which dealt with the minimums that would be required by the local authority, and the maximums, which our program as yet has never taken into consideration — those two positions are basically the same.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a question for clarification. For the water and sewage facilities in the Cold Lake-Grand Centre situation, is it the position of the Minister of Environment that the government of Alberta, through the Department of Environment or other departments, will pick up all the costs above \$200 per capita, and that there will be no maximum of \$2,000 per capita?

MR. COOKSON: I think I made clear, Mr. Speaker, that there is a maximum of \$2,000.

I might say at this point, Mr. Speaker, in this particular system we're looking at for the Cold Lake-Grand Centre area, there are some other ramifications. There is a proposal to channel a supply of water to an Indian reserve which is reasonably close, and would be a part of the total regional concept. There is also a proposal on behalf of the federal government to fund a considerable amount toward the treatment facilities of that concept. That would be taken into consideration in the total cost of the project.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Are those federal funds directed specifically at the Cold Lake-Grand Centre area, or is the minister referring to the broader \$6.6 million available from the federal government for a variety of infrastructure programs across the province?

MR. COOKSON: My understanding, subject to some clarification, is that these are two separate responsibilities of the federal government. The most recent program is in the area of \$6.6 million, which is dealing with the total funding throughout the province. As part of the \$6.6 million, we would be entitled to one-sixth of the acceptable part of the total costs. That is one program. The other program the federal government has agreed to participate in involves something like \$750,000 which, because of the special nature of the federal-based centre, would be a special deal in the total project.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could supplement the answers that have been given. The hon.

Leader of the Opposition began by saying different information was provided to the House by the Minister of Environment and by me. The manner in which the Minister of Environment has just described the program is accurate, I know. If in the question period I left the impression which the hon. Leader of the Opposition is referring to, that there was no maximum to the amount of funding that would be picked up under the existing program, then that was incorrect. If I did leave that impression, I apologize for it.

MR. R. CLARK: I appreciate the minister's straightening of the record, as I understand the record.

Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is the government giving active consideration to some proposal that would pick up that balance over \$4,000 per capita in the Cold Lake-Grand Centre area? Because our information is that present projections for water and sewer services in that area will be well above the maximum of \$4,000 and really will be very crippling to the municipalities if they're to pick up that amount over \$4,000 per capita.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I think I made some comments earlier this week on that question. The facts of the matter are these: with respect to all municipalities in the Cold Lake region, we are assessing the additional extra costs — you might call it that — that they might be compelled to pay through local property tax because of the development which is anticipated to go ahead, if it does go ahead. We have said that where there are some extraordinary additional costs because of the requirement to front-end some of the programs such as water, sewer, or whatever they might be, we would consider assisting with those extra costs by way of special programs. At no time was any commitment made, that I've been aware of, that we would pay 100 per cent of any one specific program. Indeed it's necessary to consider all the costs those communities might incur. It does not include just water and sewer but many other things as well.

With respect to the water and sewer program, the regional plan for the area is now in draft stages. It will not be finalized until perhaps later this year or early in 1980. In addition to that, as hon. members know, there's been no commitment yet — at least no finalization — with respect to Esso Resources going ahead there.

With respect to the project itself and how the area is going to develop, where the residents and the commercial businesses are going to be located, in my view it's premature to say that we have an accurate figure with respect to what water and sewer services might cost. Indeed we are coming close. But until we have a little better information about the extent to which the area might develop and where it might develop, and have come closer and perhaps finalized the regional plan, it's simply not possible for us to go in and make a commitment to extend special programs to pay for water and sewer services that are projected to be over and above what the program the Minister of Environment referred to will cover.

That's where we're at, and I think we're making good progress with respect to being well prepared if and when an announcement is made that Esso Resources intends to proceed.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, just one further question to the minister. In light of the representation that has come to our attention, that the costs at Cold Lake could be as high as \$4,400 per capita, has the minister had representation from that area with regard to the possibility of the cost running as high as \$4,400, realizing that under the existing program that would be calling on the people in that area to pick up \$2,400 per capita unless there is the special funding for which the minister has now alluded there's a possibility?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge I have had no direct representations to my office from the region. But I am aware that officials of my department, as well as officials of the Department of Environment, have had ongoing discussions with those communities relative to the costs of regional water and sewer services.

There are other matters. For example, in the town of Grand Centre there's a question with regard to water tables. It could indeed place an additional burden on the property tax payers which we're looking at as well. It's the entire question of land development for residential and commercial sites that is being handled by the Minister of Housing and Public Works, and indeed many different ministers are involved in a whole area of other public services. So I find it difficult, Mr. Speaker, to zero in only on the water and sewer. We want to know what the entire picture is.

The commitment is there to look at ways of assisting with extraordinary programs that won't put the communities involved in an impossible situation with regard to the tax load. But there certainly is no commitment to come in and pay 100 per cent of the costs of any individual item and see those communities substantially better off than other communities of similar size.

Sessional Papers

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Minister of Culture. It flows from one of the standing orders of the Assembly that annual reports would be tabled with the Assembly by the fifteenth day the Assembly has been in session, that day being yesterday. I should point out that the minister isn't the only minister who hasn't tabled a report. But I'd like to ask the minister the reason the annual report and financial statement of the Alberta Art Foundation and the Alberta Historical Resources Foundation annual report have not been tabled in accordance with *Standing Orders*?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I asked about those reports, and they are not ready. I'll look into the matter and report.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Labour. Can the minister indicate the reason for the delay in tabling The Individual's Rights Protection Act annual report under Chapter 2, Section 16 of the 1972 statutes of the province?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I certainly can. Perhaps this would be a good opportunity to indicate that it was my desire to have the members of the commission — as many as might be available — in the gallery when the report is tabled, inasmuch as for some of them this will be the completion of their term. I was

also hoping that the new director of the commission and some of the new commissioners would be there as well. It's still a tentative hope that I'll be able to achieve the tabling of the report, along with the presentation of the commissioners, next Monday.

MR. R. CLARK: Might I simply say to the Minister of Labour that it would be very helpful to have the report prior to the minister's estimates coming up before either the committee or the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Utilities and Telephones. Can the minister explain why The Rural Gas Act annual report was not tabled yesterday?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take that question as notice, please.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, we can now go to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Can he tell the House when we can expect the annual report and financial statement for the Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority and The Petroleum Marketing Act?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I hope to be able to table those documents in the immediate future.

MR. R. CLARK: Can the minister give the House an assurance that we will be able to have them before we study the his estimates?

MR. LEITCH: I'd want to do some further checking, Mr. Speaker, before giving that assurance.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Recreation and Parks. Can the minister explain the delay of The Wilderness Areas Act recommendations?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I checked with my department yesterday, and all the reports I have to table are not ready yet.

MR. R. CLARK: The obvious next question is: when will they be ready, and will they be ready before the minister's estimates? Because according to the legislation and the *Standing Orders* of the House, it's supposed to be in. We are in June, as opposed to generally March or April when we do this.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, as soon as the information is ready I hope to table it. I cannot give assurance today that that information will be ready before my estimates, but I'll check into it.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, can the Premier tell the Assembly what directions are given to ministers, especially new ministers, in the matter of tabling sessional papers required by the statutes of the province and *Standing Orders*, and what effect any direction the Premier would give to these ministers would have on getting the reports here on time?

I recall well the Premier, when he sat on this side of House, having not as long a list of annual reports not tabled, but a list of reports not tabled on time — not three months late.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I might like to debate the length of the list one year we were in opposition.

The direction has been given to the ministers that they follow the legislation and have them here. If there are extraordinary circumstances, that matter should be reported to the House. I advised them that I would anticipate that if they didn't do so the Leader of the Opposition would raise the question that they shouldn't be dealing with their estimates. I think the message has been well presented.

Regional Air Service

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the hon. Minister of Economic Development if he has held any discussions with officials of PWA concerning the application of PWA to muscle in on Gateway's Cold Lake run.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I have not had any discussions with the chairman of the board of directors with regard to that matter, as I consider that to be a management decision, and one in which they've been encouraged to have talks with other operators in the area. I don't think that question has been resolved, nor can it easily be resolved without those kinds of discussions taking place.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has any evaluation been made by the department of the impact on the viability of third-level carriers of PWA's moving in on runs that have been developed by smaller carriers to the point where they are about to make money, as is the case with the Edmonton-Cold Lake run?

DR. HORNER: First of all, that's an assumption the hon. member continues to make in this House without having any knowledge to back it up.

Secondly, the whole question of regional air line service versus third-level service is one that relates to more than the hon. member has reflected upon. Indeed, the recent announcement by my colleague the Provincial Treasurer having to do with the fuel tax on aviation gasoline is an important move forward for the third-level carriers. I might add that that particular removal of tax reflects only on aircraft flown by third-level carriers.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I'm sure the hon. minister will be aware that third-level carriers have very definite views on the impact of PWA's . . .

MR. R. CLARK: Muscling in.

MR. NOTLEY: . . . muscling in.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. Minister of Economic Development: has there been any outline to Pacific Western Airlines with respect to the policy of that air line in applying for runs vis-a-vis the impact that decision or those decisions — admittedly made by the CTC at some point — the decision of the air line to apply will have on the financial viability? Has there been any assessment by the department?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that's one of the considerations, and through the chairman of the board

they have been instructed to take it into consideration when they make application for these runs.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether there have been any discussions with third-level carriers about subsidies beyond the Bill introduced yesterday by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West?

Mr. Speaker, in asking the question I refer to *Hansard* of October 19, 1978, where the then Minister of Transportation indicated that discussions were taking place and that he'd be glad to answer questions in the Legislature on the result of those discussions.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, we've had ongoing discussions with the operators of the third-level carriers in this province relative to ways and means by which we could assist them. The hon. member may consider that the recent legislation is a subsidy; I don't. I think it's a removal of a tax on the smaller operators and as such not a subsidy. That was an important consideration in the discussions we've had with them.

There has been some change in ownership in the other third-level air lines in this province, and I have not yet had an opportunity to discuss some of these matters with the new owners.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Beyond the Bill introduced yesterday, have any policy proposals yet been made by the department with respect to methods of assisting third-level carriers, such as buying seats on aircraft to smaller communities, for example?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, as I've said publicly many times, there is a variety of ways in which one might look at how you could assist the viability of some of these third-level lines. One of those is block buying of seats. Other provinces do it in other ways. The province of Ontario buys the aircraft and leases them to an operator at less than commercial rates. Those matters are of continuing study and discussion with the third-level air lines.

I would stress again, though, that a lot of the third-level licences have been allocated by the federal CTC without any reference to us or input from us, even though in a number of cases they are flying into and out of provincial airports.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has any consideration been given by the province to providing navigational aids at the Hinton-Jasper airport, aids which at the present time Gateway Aviation itself is supplying?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, we've had some discussion relative to that particular matter, but I think we have to come in with an overall policy relative to third-level air lines. That is one of the matters I intend to take up with the new federal Minister of Transport. I hardly see how we can be obligated to increase the spending over and above the great deal we've already spent on some of the provincial airports, without having some input into the policy that's going to regulate the scheduled lines into those airports.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The minister indicated an overall policy. Has the

government developed any set of guidelines in terms of the role of third-level carriers and of Pacific Western Airlines in servicing the smaller communities of this province?

I raise this in light of reports by the vice-president of PWA this morning, that PWA plans to purchase 10 additional jets and is looking at Red Deer and Medicine Hat.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the management would be planning ahead to provide jet service at the appropriate time in this growing province of ours. Now I think my hon. friend can quite easily understand that there's a level of service that can be serviced by non-jet aircraft, and that once a community becomes more mature and populated above a certain level, it is going to demand the jet service. It's not a question of government policy.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Deputy Premier. It relates to an earlier answer the Deputy Premier gave in this exchange, when he implied, if he didn't say, that the government relied on the board and management of PWA to do financial impact studies regarding the impact PWA would have on other lines; i.e., Time in Lethbridge or Gateway going to the Cold Lake-Grand Centre area.

The minister is shaking his head. Then my question is: where does that responsibility lie? Does the minister's department look at that question?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, what I said was that the management of Pacific Western Airlines have been instructed, through the chairman of the board, to take that into consideration as one of the factors relative to their applications.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, the minister has just said "to take that into consideration as one of the factors". To take what into consideration? The impact it's going to have on Time and Gateway?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, that's the general understanding. I think those are the two that the member mentioned.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Are there any further directions to the management of PWA, through the board or any other avenue the government may have, regarding the future of Time and Gateway in Alberta?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, we've said right along that we would do other things to encourage the growth, viability, and stability of the third-level air line industry in this province. We have done that in a variety of ways, the last being the removal of their aviation fuel tax, which is of major benefit to them.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is this the only direction that's been given to the board of PWA as far as Gateway and Time are concerned? Have there been any other instructions or discussions with the board of Gateway and Time — that's with the board of PWA — by this minister or the government?

DR. HORNER: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I have no authority to direct Gateway and Time to appear before me and have discussions with me.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, it's a very nice red herring.

Let me put the question to the minister this way: have there been any directions to PWA, other than what reference you've made here today, regarding the future of Time and Gateway?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I think if the hon. member will look up in *Hansard* the original statements in this Legislature with regard to Pacific Western Airlines, the general policy statement there is that they would act in such a way as to take into consideration the viability of the third-level carriers in this province.

MR. NOTLEY: A question to the hon. minister. Is he able to advise the Assembly whether PWA in fact did an assessment of the impact on the viability of Time's whole operation when they applied for the Lethbridge run? Similarly, did they do an assessment of the impact on Gateway when they applied for the Cold Lake run?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, on the question of Time and Lethbridge the answer is, yes, very decidedly so. Discussions were held in which Pacific Western went so far as to guarantee Time whole for a set period, to change their scheduling to have the least impact on Time, and to work out a joint operating mechanism in Lethbridge which might be helpful to both of them.

I think the question of Cold Lake is a different matter entirely. First of all, the questions of a terminal in Cold Lake and of getting landing rights there was a provincial responsibility. Inasmuch as we had no input into the licensing authority in Ottawa relative to the Cold Lake run, I think that matter's somewhat different from the one in Lethbridge.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. The officials of Time Air are certainly not happy with the discussions they had with PWA.

But my question with respect to Gateway: then at this time the minister is not able to assure the Assembly that any impact study was done by Pacific Western Airlines on the effect their application, should it be successful, would have on the operations of Gateway into Cold Lake?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, as I tried to point out, the operation into Cold Lake is a very new one. It's dependent upon the substantial resources of the province to make it work and, as such, is an entirely different situation from that in Lethbridge.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary by the hon. member, followed by a further supplementary by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. As a *quid pro quo*, has the minister discussed with the chairman of the board of PWA that particular air line's dropping its objections to Gateway's having a direct flight from Edmonton to Peace River, as opposed to having to make a stop on the way?

DR. HORNER: I'm not aware of that.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Economic Development for clarification, because I'm becoming confused. Could the minister assure the House that when a regional air line makes an application to serve a particular part of Alberta, they make that application to the federal CTC, and not to the province of Alberta?

MR. R. CLARK: Yes, you are confused.

DR. HORNER: That of course is correct, Mr. Speaker. I might just add that a number of applications for running rights in a variety of areas throughout the province have been sitting before the CTC for well over a year.

MR. R. CLARK: I'm sure they'll be dealt with more quickly now.

Crop Insurance Program

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Could the minister give an indication what the response has been to the pilot project for putting hay and pastures under the crop insurance program?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, it's a little too early to give a proper assessment, but it has been well received to date. We'll be in a much better position to make an assessment later in the season.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate whether the federal government is making a contribution to this pilot project in five counties and municipalities in the province?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take that question as notice. I'm not absolutely sure.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate whether in another year the program will be expanded to further counties and municipalities?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the idea of the program as designed for this year was to try it in those areas related to various legume crops. Of course, the evaluation of that acceptance and the degree of coverage would certainly be an indicator as to whether it would go across the province in a similar manner.

MR. MANDEVILLE: One final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate whether all loss payments will be based on computer calculations?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add that part as notice as well and provide the answer for the hon. member.

Alberta's Economic Outlook

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. It's with regard to remarks to the Better

Business Bureau, I believe it was yesterday. As I understand it, the Premier indicated that in Alberta there would be advantages in our economic development staying at a plateau. I wonder if the Premier could clarify that particular comment.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the exact copy of my notes. The reference is to trying to balance growth on a steady basis over a period of time, taking an average five-year period, and during that time to assess whether or not the growth is below the desired rate or whether it's abnormal, pointing out the difficulties from an economic point of view if you have abnormal growth, in the sense that you find yourself in a position of infrastructure costs perhaps being higher than you would want them to be.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. Could the Premier indicate whether the guidelines for the new Department of Economic Development will be to try to stabilize the Alberta economy in the next three or four years rather than have rapid economic growth?

MR. LOUGHEED: No, Mr. Speaker. Important as the department is, a number of other departments are involved in the economic situation in the province. We look to that as a desirable objective, but we also have the reality in the province that limited opportunities are available for us in the diversification of the province's economy. We have to take advantage of those opportunities, sometimes not precisely during the particular time segment that is in the best interests of our development. If we don't take advantage of them at certain periods of time, of course, we have difficulty with that. Perhaps without emphasizing the benefit of hindsight, it's clear that the development of our petrochemical industry in the late '60s would have been a very highly desirable policy for the government of the day.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier for clarification. In his budget remarks the Provincial Treasurer indicated that the economy will surge ahead. I wonder if that was an indicator of what will happen to Alberta's economy, or whether that will be the direction economic development in the province will take.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the reference in the Speech from the Throne deals with a forecast that large projects will have a bearing. As a result of comments being made. I think this should be cleared up. The economy in the province of Alberta is dynamic with or without the large projects. In our judgment, it will continue in a satisfactorily dynamic way through the 1980s. What is interpreted in the budget speech by the Provincial Treasurer is that if these large projects proceed, and there's a high anticipation factor with regard to some of them, we'll see a surging ahead. I don't have the precise words in my mind, but that was the concept in the budget speech.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the Premier, so there's no misunderstanding. From the Premier's remarks yesterday, there is no intent to try to dampen the economy in Alberta, to bring economic development to a plateau and hold it at that level in

some artificial manner or through some type of government direction. That wasn't the intent of the Premier's remarks.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question from the hon. member. No, it was certainly not the intent. It was merely pointing out that there are some advantages to us if it could work out that way, in the same way I responded to earlier questions, I believe from the Leader of the Opposition, that we'd prefer that these major projects didn't peak at the same time, but if they did we were able to cope with it. So we would not artificially dampen it, and certainly in the diversification field we'll have to take advantage of the limited opportunities that are available when they occur.

Education of the Handicapped

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Minister of Education. It arises from a recent report of a group of Calgary parents in the process of launching a private school for handicapped children, children with learning disabilities, to be called the Foothills Academy and to commence operation on September 15, we're advised.

I'd like to ask the minister whether he has had any communication with this group as to the proposed school and, related to that, what the policy of the government is with respect to such community-backed and -supported schools.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the news article to which the hon. member refers, and particularly the report of the intention to operate a private school in Calgary.

The position of the government of Alberta is that we support and have supported such private, non-profit schools intended to deliver special education services, and the department has two classes of grants for such private schools. There has been reference to the need for such a private school to have the concurrence of the local school board for its operation. In terms of the policy of the department, that is not correct. I'm not sure what that might refer to, and I have not received any direct communication from the academy on that matter. I would be interested in hearing from them and in the meantime will attempt to discover for myself what might be involved in that. But it is not the policy of the Department of Education that private schools delivering special education service, if operated on a non-profit basis, have to have the concurrence of any school board to provide that service.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: A supplementary for clarification. Then it may well be possible for this school to obtain provincial support?

MR. KING: Provincial support is available to such schools, Mr. Speaker.

Rural and Native Housing

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Housing and Public Works once again, regarding the rural and native housing program. Since the question period yesterday, has the minister had a chance to check to see what's happened to the

survey started by the department or the Housing Corporation and then stopped in midflight?

MR. CHAMBERS: As I recall, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Olds-Didsbury originally asked me about a cost/benefit analysis contract regarding Grouard, and I checked and assured him that there was not. Then I think yesterday he expanded the question to areas other than Grouard. The officials in the department and in the corporation are diligently searching for any such report. I checked before I came here, and they have yet to find any such report.

However, Mr. Speaker, we aim to please. If the hon. leader has anything in his hip pocket that he can inform me of to help narrow the search, I'd be really pleased to accept that and perhaps expedite the process for him.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, so the minister doesn't have his people looking for the wrong thing, the report was never finished. That's my concern, Mr. Minister. I suggest that you direct your officials to check in the area of unfinished reports rather than finished ones.

I'd like to ask a supplementary question of the minister. Why was the decision made to go ahead with the 26 units of stack-wall construction at Grouard, when it was very easy to see the problems involved after the first two units had been finished? Those problems were pointed out by people in the Grouard area to officials of the minister's department and the Housing Corporation. Why did they go ahead with the other 24?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, the 26 stack-wall houses in Grouard are part of a large program. Obviously you can do a program better as a program than one at a time. So it was designed as a program, including the infrastructure: the roads, water systems, and so forth. The construction went on more or less simultaneously.

I expect the Leader of the Opposition has looked at the houses. I've looked at them. They're quite attractive and habitable, and I believe 24 are now occupied. I think they're well appreciated.

But I would like to point out that obviously it was an experimental project, to a large degree. To my knowledge, stack-wall has not been built on any appreciable scale, at least in Alberta. It offers considerable advantages, if it works, because areas of the province have small timber that perhaps is not suitable for conventional log construction, whereas in a stack-wall type of construction it could be utilized. So there is considerable experimental benefit to be derived from it.

The decision to use stack-wall housing was in large part experimental, and I would like to point out that they are very fine houses indeed.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Has he any more experimental stack-wall housing programs, either under way or in his hip pocket, that he proposes to go ahead with this year?

MR. CHAMBERS: No, Mr. Speaker, not this year.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Can he confirm to the Assembly that this stack-wall housing experimental program in the Grouard area, which

started out to cost about \$40,000 per house, has ended up costing us over \$100,000 per home?

MR. CHAMBERS: Not at all, Mr. Speaker. In fact, in response to the question from the hon. leader the other day, I pointed out that we're still in the process of assembling the costs of the project and in discussions with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. As I recall my answer at that time, I said I hoped to have the final costs soon, probably within a month or so. I wouldn't expect they'd be in the area the hon. leader is alluding to.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the minister says people are living in 24 of the 26 houses and we don't know the costs, could we find out who is going to bear the extra costs? The minister has conceded that there are going to be costs well above the original projection of some \$40,000. Now whether it's \$80,000 or \$100,000, where's that additional \$40,000 going to come from? Can the minister assure the Assembly that the two governments will pick that up, and that the people who initially thought they were getting homes under the rural and native housing program for something in the vicinity of \$40,000 won't be expected to pick up additional costs as a result of this experimental program?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I really think it should be underlined that until such time as we determine the final costs of the project, the hon. leader's question is quite hypothetical. After we determine the final costs, we will be able to assess the extra costs over and above what might be construed to be normal market value. I expect that if they wished to buy the houses the people would be assessed a fair market value. Obviously, experiments do cost money. I think they're well worth while, and there would probably be an experimental aspect to the charges.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary on this topic.

MR. R. CLARK: One last question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister assure the Assembly that the original discussions held with people in the Grouard area, when officials of the Alberta Housing Corporation and of the minister's department talked of a cost in the vicinity of \$40,000 — that was the agreement under which people became involved in this program. Can the minister assure us that he will do all he possibly can to live with that commitment made to people in Grouard some two years ago?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I didn't enunciate clearly. For one thing, of course, the costs of houses vary with the community and with the size of the house people wish to own. There'll be an estimate of what the charge for the houses should be, and until we really determine the final costs I don't think anybody should really be concerned at this point in time.

MR. R. CLARK: Unbelievable.

Irrigation Canal — Recreational Use

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Environment. The

hon. Minister of Recreation and Parks may wish to supplement as well. It relates to a site development study, authorized by the Department of Environment and completed in November 1978, on the Western Irrigation District canal, specifically those portions of the study that deal with the portion of the canal running through the districts of Inglewood and Forest Lawn in the city of Calgary.

In light of the recommendations in this report of the recreational potential of the WID canal for the east side of Calgary, can the minister advise the House what steps are being taken, or whether the government has made a decision as to implementation of these recommendations?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, the Western Irrigation District receives water from the Bow River above Calgary by means of a weir. As the hon. member has said, it's channelled through his constituency and into Chestermere Lake. The study is positive, and does recommend certain works be undertaken by the Department of Environment with regard to beautifying the areas on both sides of the canal. Because the province owns anywhere from 200 to 500 feet on each side, in Environment we have proceeded to negotiate with the city of Calgary for beautifying in the way of paths, kitchen tables, et cetera.

Mr. Speaker, I think last year \$50,000 was budgeted by Environment for beautification, and the Lord willing, and with the good will of members of the opposition, I hope to have a pretty substantial amount in the budget this year for further beautification.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: A supplementary. Could the minister advise the House what amount of money is intended to be spent on this particular project in the next 12 months?

MR. SPEAKER: With respect, perhaps the hon. member could pursue that question when going into the minister's estimates.

We've run past time for the question period, but I believe the hon. Minister of Utilities and Telephones would like to supplement some information, if the House agrees.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Sessional Papers (continued)

MR. SHABEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to respond to an earlier question by the Leader of the Opposition regarding the status of the financial statement for the Gas Alberta Operating Fund. That report has been prepared. It's awaiting audit by the Auditor General of the province, and as soon as it is ready it will be tabled.

MR. SPEAKER: If the Assembly agrees, perhaps the hon. Minister responsible for Culture might also supplement an answer.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to respond to the question the hon. member of the opposition put to me. This was the annual report for the performing

arts. That foundation has not been in existence for a year; that report will be coming out in the fall.

As for the Historical Resources Foundation, their annual report has been submitted to the chairman. Their annual meeting will be in June, so that report will be coming in the fall.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Assembly agree to revert briefly to introduction of special guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**
(*reversion*)

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly, a group of grade 9 students from Crossfield. They're accompanied by their teacher Mr. Marvin Pickering and a parent, Mrs. Cameron. They're seated in the public gallery. I'll ask the students to rise and receive the warm recognition of members of the Assembly.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, a number of students from the Argyll school are here today in the members gallery, and they accomplished something very special. They participated in the national wildlife poster contest. Of over 1,000 posters submitted in Alberta alone, two of the prize winners are from Argyll School. They are Miss Lisa Townsend and Miss Elaine Chu. My colleague the hon. Bud Miller presented them with their awards this afternoon, and I would like to thank him for his very warm remarks during the presentation. Mr. Speaker, may I commend the principal Miss MacArthur and their teacher Mr. Miller for inspiring the students to such fantastic contest participation. The two classes are accompanied by the proud parents of Miss Chu and Miss Townsend, as well as the grandmother of Miss Townsend and other parents. May I ask the students, teachers, and parents to rise and receive the congratulations and welcome of this Assembly.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I indicated that I would be asking for the necessary unanimous leave of the House to deal with two government motions on the Order Paper: Motion 9 with reference to the establishment of the subcommittees for the Committee of Supply, and Motion No. 10 with reference to the adoption of the report of the committee, pursuant to Standing Order No. 46. I should say, Mr. Speaker, before asking you to put the question as to whether or not hon. members are willing to consent to that today, that in the event they do I would further be asking for unanimous consent to revert to Presenting Petitions in order that the hon. chairman of the committee handling private bills would be able to begin the process of moving the private bills through the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree to give the hon. Government House Leader the unanimous leave requested?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

9. Moved by Mr. Crawford:

Be it resolved

1 (a) That two subcommittees of the Committee of Supply be established with the following names:

Subcommittee A

Subcommittee B

(b) That the membership of the respective committees be as follows:

Subcommittee A — Mr. Campbell, Chairman; Mr. Kushner, Vice-Chairman; Dr. C. Anderson, Mr. Borstad, Mr. Bradley, Dr. Buck, Mr. L. Clark, Mr. R. Clark, Mrs. Cripps, Mr. Hyland, Mr. Isley, Mr. Knaak, Mr. Lysons, Mr. Mack, Mr. Magee, Mr. Mandeville, Mr. Musgreave, Mr. Notley, Mrs. Osterman, Mr. Pahl, Mr. Pengelly, Mr. Planche, Dr. Reid, Mr. Sindlinger, Mr. R. Speaker, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Weiss, Mr. Zaozirny.

Subcommittee B — Mrs. Fyfe, Chairman; Mr. Fjordbotten, Vice-Chairman; Mr. D. Anderson, Mr. Appleby, Mr. Batiuk, Dr. Buck, Mr. Campbell, Dr. Carter, Mrs. Chichak, Mr. R. Clark, Mr. Cook, Mrs. Embury, Mr. Fjordbotten, Mr. Gogo, Mr. Hiebert, Mr. Little, Mr. Mandeville, Mr. Notley, Mr. Oman, Dr. Paproski, Mr. Payne, Mr. Purdy, Mr. R. Speaker, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Stromberg, Mr. Topolnisky, Mr. Wolstenholme, Mr. Woo.

2 That the following portions of the estimates of expenditure for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1980, be referred to the subcommittee hereinafter set forth for their reports thereon to the Committee of Supply.

Subcommittee A — Utilities and Telephones, Transportation, Environment.

Subcommittee B — Culture, Occupational Health and Safety, Workers' Compensation, Social Services and Community Health.

[Motion carried]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, with respect to Government Motion No. 10, the chairman informed me this morning that he referred in the report, under the proposed members of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing, to a member whose name is Anderson, and that he wished to specify which of the two members he meant. He means the hon. Member for St. Paul, Dr. C. Anderson. I would therefore ask, with leave, that that change be made, and with that change would move Motion No. 10.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree to the motion being amended as requested in this somewhat informal manner?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[Motion as amended carried]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would therefore ask unanimous leave to revert to Presenting Petitions.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Government House Leader have this further unanimous leave?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **PRESENTING PETITIONS**

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to present to the Assembly the following petitions for private Bills:

1. the petition of Newman Theological College for an amendment to An Act to Incorporate Newman Theological College;
2. the petition of Christian College Association (Alberta) for The Kings College Act;
3. the petition of the city of Edmonton for The Edmonton Convention Centre Authority Act;
4. the petition of Richard A. N. Bonneycastle, George MacKay, John M. Dodds, Donald C. Matthews, and James S. Palmer for The Stockgrowers' Insurance Company of Canada Limited Act;
5. the petition of The Merchants and Traders Assurance Company for The Merchants and Traders Assurance Company Amendment Act, 1979;
6. the petition of William I. Friedman, William Steinberg, Leo Charles Friedman, Felix Adolph Leew, and Otto Schenk for The Prairie Trust Corporation Act;
7. the petition of Robert G. Elliot, Gordon A. Reid, Lyle P. Edwards, Peter Morrey, and Ronald Graham for The Highfield Trust Company Act;
8. the petition of the governors of the University of Alberta for The University of Alberta and St. Stephens College Perpetuities Act;
9. the petition of Canadian Union College for The Canadian Union College Amendment Act, 1979
10. the petition of Les Filles de la Sagesse for The Our Lady of The Rosary Hospital, Castor, Act;
11. the petition of Western Union Insurance Company for The Western Union Insurance Company Amendment Act, 1979.

head: **WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would move that questions 104 and 105 stand and retain their places on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

head: **MOTIONS FOR RETURNS**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would move that Motion for a Return No. 107 stand and retain its place on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

106. Mr. Notley moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

1. A copy of all correspondence between the Department of the Attorney General and the law firm of Messrs. Parlee Irving respecting the employment of that law firm in relation to legal proceedings arising from land claims by Indian people in the province of Alberta.

2. A copy of any research reports and/or studies which have been prepared by the law firm of Parlee Irving and/or agents employed by the law firm of Parlee Irving in relation to the matter of Indian land claims in the province of Alberta which have been provided to the Department of the Attorney General.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would urge hon. members of the Assembly to reject Motion for a Return No. 106, which clearly calls for legal opinions which have been received by the government to be made available. It is totally unacceptable to the normal practice of releasing confidential solicitor/client information to the general public and therefore is not acceptable to the government.

[Motion lost]

head: **MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

213. Moved by Mr. Notley:

Be it resolved that the Assembly direct the Minister of Environment to direct the Environment Council of Alberta to conduct public hearings into the environmental effects of the petroleum exploration and production industry.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, as a background to the motion before the Assembly this afternoon, one of the major recommendations of the ECA report on forestry in Alberta is the recommendation contained in the designated motion this afternoon. I might say I'm somewhat at a loss at the rather cavalier manner in which the government has treated the ECA report on forestry. I recall that reference was made to the importance of the forestry hearings several times during the last Legislature, especially when we were debating changing the ECA from the Environment Conservation Authority to the Environment Council of Alberta.

I must confess that even though I was one of the critics of the change and still think the government made the wrong move in changing the structure of the ECA, nevertheless the Environment Council of Alberta did a very good job conducting the forestry hearings throughout the province. These hearings were held in various regions in Alberta. In particular in the Peace River country, the number of people who came out to make representation to the ECA on forestry was really quite impressive. It's because of that, Mr. Speaker, I find it rather puzzling, to put it mildly, that so little attention has been given to the ECA report on forestry. For example, the former Minister of Environment apparently received the report several days before the Legislature was dissolved, yet that report was not made available to the public so that we, as Albertans, would have an opportunity to assess it in the election campaign.

After all, we're talking about one of the really important potential industries for expansion in this province. Forestry is already important, but it has a tremendous potential for expansion. All one has to do is look at the statistics: 150,000 square miles of Alberta is forest. The opportunities for developing a very significant renewable resource industry are just overwhelming.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is certainly puzzling that a

government that campaigned on the theme of "now more than ever" leadership would not take the lead and release the report, so that Albertans could judge its merits during the election campaign. I might say, as well, that people I've talked to who made representation to the ECA — and I think it's probably even fair to say, people who work for the ECA — were rather surprised and puzzled that the government made the announcement with respect to inviting proposals on both the Berland and Fox Creek timber reserves prior to receiving the ECA report. I was rather amused in the Legislature several days ago to hear the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources say he didn't really see any relationship between the ECA report on forestry and the Berland and Fox Creek timber reserves. If the minister says that, I really question whether he in fact even read the report.

Equally puzzling was no mention of the report in the throne speech, no mention of it, to my knowledge, in the budget, and no resolution presented by the government in this session of the Legislature. When one looks at the record of the ECA over the past number of years, at the very least a resolution to hear the report has normally been introduced in the Legislature by the government. I recall the report presented by the ECA on the effects of soil erosion in northwestern Alberta. The hon. Minister of Utilities and Telephones took the initiative, quite properly, to have an opportunity so members of the House could discuss and evaluate that important report by the ECA.

MR. R. CLARK: Except the Red Deer dam report.

MR. NOTLEY: Except the Red Deer dam report, yes. They were a little slow on that one, I must confess.

Mr. Speaker, at least on the soil erosion one we had the initiative taken by the hon. Minister of Utilities and Telephones, but no initiative as yet from the government side of the House to discuss something as important as the forestry industry and the hearings conducted by the ECA.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with the specific recommendation that we should hold hearings on the environmental impact of the petroleum industry in this province, in terms of both exploration and production. In listening to the hon. Minister of Environment the other day, it's pretty obvious to me that the government really isn't going to entertain the prospect of hearings by the ECA.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I wonder what is going to happen to the ECA. As I understand it, at this stage they are completing the report on the Oldman River, but there have been no further assignments. Are we looking at the last few months, the last year or so of the existence of the ECA? In eight years of Tory rule, we've seen a determined effort to downgrade and emasculate the ECA. Are we finally going to see the last stages of the ECA in this, the third term of the present administration?

Mr. Speaker, let's look at the recommendation for debate this afternoon: the question of whether we should have hearings on the environmental effects of petroleum exploration and development. I thought the ECA made a pretty accurate assessment of some of the problems. First of all, the land disturbance of petroleum exploration, seismic work, is very substantial, 580,000 acres. The ECA was using very, very conservative standards to arrive at that 580,000 acres. I note the

other day the hon. Minister of Environment, I believe, said that not all that 580,000 acres contained valuable timber. No one is arguing that point, Mr. Speaker. A good deal of the timber wasn't valuable, but some of it was. I'm going to come to that in a little while.

To put it in context, Mr. Speaker, we have a land disturbance of 580,000 acres as a result of seismic work, compared to 630,000 acres during the same period of time for timber harvest operations. Surely that must put in context the potential problem. If we are using up as much timber — admittedly some of it not valuable, but some of it indeed very valuable — as we are in timber operations, then hon. members in this House, whose job it is to be custodians of the heritage of future Albertans — and surely the forest industry is one of our heritages — have an obligation to stop and ask ourselves the question: should we make changes in policy? And before we make those changes in policy, would it not be appropriate to have hearings by an organization like the ECA? Indeed, I should say to members of this House that the changes the government made several years ago would perhaps make ECA hearings even more appropriate. We could bring together a panel of specialists whose expertise would be extremely useful, not only to the government but to the people of Alberta, in evaluating what kinds of rules should be set for the petroleum industry as it applies to land-use conflicts in forested areas of the province.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to talk about some of the specifics of the problem, as the ECA has enunciated: first of all, this whole question of pipeline rights of way. We're talking about normal pipeline rights of way of 60 feet for pipelines 6 inches in diameter or less. For over 6 inches, we're talking about a 100-foot right of way. As one of the members of the ECA described it to me, to put this in context one should compare the 60 feet we are allowing in our green zones with the 1 foot that is taken in areas of urban dwellings. Why? Because we have very, very expensive land. So in an urban area we say, if you're going to put a 6-inch pipeline through an area, it's 1-foot right of way. But because we haven't placed any value on alternate use of the green zone, we have this huge 60-foot right of way. One of the members of the panel said to me that there is really no justifiable argument, in his view, for why 60 feet is necessary. Perhaps it's more convenient, but it's not absolutely necessary.

Similarly we have this business of seismic development, where cutlines are brushed in so the work can proceed. From an oil company point of view, Mr. Speaker, that's simpler. You just run the cats in, brush out the trail, and then go in with your equipment. I'm not one member of the Legislature to dwell on the good citizenship aspects of some of our large multinational corporations, but in fairness I should say that one of these companies, Gulf Oil, has an excellent record of looking at alternative methods of seismic work. Instead of the old cutline approach, Gulf Oil very frequently employs portable operations. Instead of a normal 25-foot swath through the forest, we have an 8-foot swath. Mr. Speaker, I might also add that in addition to Gulf Oil frequently employing this type of procedure as good corporate citizens, in at least several areas of the North American continent, Michigan and Montana, by law one has to use the portable operation, unless there's just no other alternative.

This is something members of the panel made quite clear in their report: because we really haven't placed

that much importance on the value of other types of land use in our green areas, we have just said, let 'er rip. We need seismic exploration in a green area; they want 25 feet; okay, away they go. If you fly from here to Grande Prairie or along the western region of the province, you see the cutlines here and there and elsewhere with really no rhyme or reason.

Another point that members of the panel make in their report, I think quite vividly, is that we have a very interesting approach to approving seismic programs in this province — 10 calendar days from the time the application is made. Now I know that members — and perhaps the hon. member who used to be in charge of Calgary — could argue that we need this time. After all, there's an approaching energy crisis. And with this federal Tory government, even I'm wondering if maybe we shouldn't push things up, because we're going to have an embargo of oil before too long if Joe Clark continues to fumble and bumble along the way he has. But discounting the problems with their federal cousins that not even the Tories here can deal with, the fact of the matter is that we have 10 calendar days to approve seismic programs.

Hon. members who represent rural ridings and who have dealt with the department of lands when it comes to homestead sales or leases, will quickly realize that 10 calendar days is really amazing. When you're talking about a homestead application, Mr. Speaker, one is almost an old age pensioner by the time the young man can get on the land, because the department of lands is so slow. But in the case of seismic work: 10 calendar days. The ECA says, that's unreasonable. The other side of the case is unreasonable too. Two or three years for homestead applications is unreasonably long. On the other hand, 10 calendar days to apply for seismic permits is unreasonably short.

I'm sure all hon. members who are going to participate have read the ECA report. It points out the problem in the Edson area, where you've got three fish and wildlife personnel in an area of thousands of square miles. In 10 calendar days, there's just no possible way that staff can even begin to make an evaluation of whether or not the permit should be authorized.

Mr. Speaker, one also has to acknowledge that the petroleum industry is not required to regenerate seismic lines. So when one looks at the 630,000 acres compared to the 580,000 acres, in the 630,000 acres we're talking about regeneration; much of the 580,000 acres, in many cases, will not involve regeneration.

Mr. Speaker, I want to move from there to talk for a few minutes about multiple-use concept. Again, in having an opportunity to chat with members of the panel, there was some scepticism about multiple-use. I know that's a very easy phrase for politicians to accept, because multiple-use sounds very good. We can have a little bit of recreation, a little bit of industry, and a little bit of forestry. We can try to shuffle in everything.

But the problem with that sort of policy. Mr. Speaker, is that it really is misleading in many respects, because some uses of land effectively preclude other uses. If you have major industrial development on a certain type of land, you don't really have much opportunity for wildlife and recreation. In the case of certain types of development — and the ECA talks about heavy oil development. Right now we're looking at Lloydminster, but who knows? Perhaps we will have heavy oil development in a green area. The figure is given of 224 acres per section required for heavy oil

development.

What I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, and what I think the ECA report suggests, is that multiple-use doesn't mean you can have a whole series of land uses in every area of the province. It means we are going to have to zone the areas, in fact. Some areas are going to be pure and simple forestry areas. That's that. We can't have seismic development. Other areas are going to be for industrial purposes, and others for recreation.

Mr. Speaker, the point the ECA attempts to make that is we really haven't been very successful to date in resolving those conflicts. That's one of the reasons the major report in this whole set of hearings is bringing together all the branches and departments dealing with land use into one superministry of energy. I would say to members of the House that I'm not entirely sure I agree with that particular proposal. My own inclination is that it's necessary to have someone in cabinet who represents the lands and forest industry, that we probably had a better situation when we had a separate minister of lands and forests. But certainly the need to co-ordinate land-use planning in the forestry areas of the province goes without saying. The argument of the panel, which heard scores of representations by many Albertans, is that at this stage of the game there really isn't the effective co-ordination we need.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to conclude my remarks in introducing this resolution by saying to members that I think at this stage of the game, it's not too much to ask for more stringent conditions on exploration and development as far as the oil industry is concerned. In 1972, I remember the field price of natural gas was 16 cents per MCF. The price has risen a long way since that. The profitability of the oil industry has increased to the point where it is not unreasonable to expect conditions at least comparable to parts of the United States.

But even if one is not in favor of the changes that I think are implicit in the ECA report, at the very least it seems to me there is a strong argument for hearings at this juncture. I notice that for the Berland and Fox Creek reserves we now have three major proposals, two dealing with pulp mills, and a number of smaller proposals. I'm not sure what the government's going to do with those three proposals. On behalf of the Alberta government, the hon. Member for Athabasca is going to be holding hearings of his own a little later on. But in the event that any of those projects proceeds, if we don't have an overall land-use policy they're still going to be caught with the problem of seismic operation, production, and pipelines in their timber reserves.

What the ECA is saying is that you can't work out all the conflicts beforehand. No one suggests that. But with an overall approach to land-use development in the green area, at least you can eliminate some of the potential conflicts before.

In closing my remarks. I think the general thrust of this recommendation is that at a rather critical time in Alberta's history, when we are concerned about the renewable resource industry of our province, recognizing the importance of forestry in the years ahead, surely it is appropriate and sensible to take the time to hold hearings, to review whether we can proceed with the kind of seismic development which has been undertaken, but at the same time to do it in a way that does not wreak havoc on the forestry areas of this province.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to have an opportunity today to rise and make a few comments about the resolution brought forward by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview. Before I do, because this is the first time on my feet, sir, I want to offer my very best wishes to the Lieutenant-Governor, and thank him on behalf of Glenmore for a job well done and a great addition to the prestige of our province; and to you, sir, on your election as Speaker, and to thank you for being my mentor through very difficult parliamentary times when I was on my feet earlier.

The Member for Spirit River-Fairview began by saying that he was puzzled. I too am puzzled. When I read the resolution, I don't see anything that indicates we are going to be discussing forestry in particular. It's a little hard to pin him down, because he has expertise in so many areas that I couldn't really judge what we were going to discuss today, except that some general comments on the oil and gas industry might be appropriate. For his edification, the profit and loss part of it might be particularly useful.

I too have flown over the province many times. One of the remarkable things I think about when flying over this province is the tens of thousands of miles of flow line and wellheads in place. But they're hardly visible from the air. Since 1948, the job that the people in this industry have done has, in my view, been spectacular considering the climate, topography, muskeg, and the trials of this particular industry.

If we were to get involved in regulations covering environment for the province as a whole, Mr. Speaker, in my view the job would be insurmountable. In the first place, the province covers an enormous area. The terrain varies so dramatically from the southeast corner to the northwest corner. There are different techniques for different geology. You couldn't possibly have a standard set of regulations under any environmental act that would cover drilling in Medicine Hat for proven or semi-proven reserves versus wildcatting up in the country of the Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

There are enormous swings in activity. It isn't like running a candy store, Mr. Speaker. From time to time they have a discovery, and rigs converge on a given area. They put an enormous load on the local bureaucracy the province has in place for fish and game, forestry, and all the things that are an essential part of environmental controls.

Finally, the people in the oil business have a wide diversity of disciplines. There are welders, botanists, biologists, geologists, landmen, engineers, and so on. So it's very hard to be precise with the vernacular of each trade, either to write or enforce an overall set of regulations.

I think everybody will agree that it's pretty difficult to explore and produce petroleum products without disturbing the land. Therefore, I think we have to look ideally for co-operation between industry and government so they in turn could return on their investment properly and provide the service they do through finding energy, at the same time balancing that with the demands and expectations of Albertans as a whole.

I think to say this hasn't been done would be a miscarriage of justice, in terms of what the performance has been. In fact, in just the last few years there has been an enormous upgrading in the technology of river crossings, both in sensing equipment and automatic valve shut-off equipment. There has been a very real and determined effort by both government

and industry to reroute pipelines, to try to upgrade pipeline technology through heavily populated areas. Batteries and surface equipment near rivers and steep escarpments have been upgraded, Mr. Speaker, so that the difficulty in getting permits from the environmental agencies is pronounced. People in industry accept that, because they understand the problem of leakages into water courses — which will happen.

It isn't uncommon any more, Mr. Speaker, to go into a lease road and find it's been reseeded. In fact, companies now make their livings by spraying grass seed, fertilizer, and water along the sides of lease roads in areas where people previously never had an opportunity even to be, because they were so distant from civilization.

There has been an effort to reclaim timber, but it isn't all easy. I'm going to deal with that in a few minutes.

It's also common now to have in place all over the province emergency oil spill facilities that can be drawn on almost instantly should an oil spill occur.

The member was talking about the massive destruction caused by cutlines. It's interesting to notice that in fact even the ECA indicates there is not all good and bad in cutlines, that deciduous trees grow quite freely there, and that's forage for our wild animals and a balanced forest growth.

The industry does have some problems, Mr. Speaker. In my view, there's a consistent tendency for the media to exaggerate both the extent and permanency of environmental damage. For some reason or another, to kick people who are trying to do things seems to be a great rallying cry. I guess it's common in all areas, but in the industry we're discussing today it seems to be particularly pronounced. Contrary to the point of view of the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, the industry is fiercely competitive. In fact, after a discovery there is a real scramble for that man to protect his land interests, and that can only be done by hurry-up seismic and by bringing wells down to core point. That has to be done almost at the same time as the land sale is on so secrecy of the whole operation can be protected, thereby offering that man a competitive edge at land sale time. To indicate that this is sort of a routine, humdrum, readily planned thing is again a gross overstatement.

There's also the problem, Mr. Speaker, of oil companies hiring local subcontractors to do a lot of the work, like water hauling, seismic, and supplying equipment. Those people don't have the P.R. profile oil companies do, and they're highly motivated by profit. In my view, while the oil companies try very hard, both through their associations and individually, to promote public relations, it's difficult when you've subcontracted someone whose return on investment is predicated by the number of hours he puts in and the speed at which he does his task. That's an ongoing problem for the industry. In fact, because of the impetus of the Member for Drayton Valley, IPAC is coming next week to discuss with all members the problems involved with these particular things.

Finally, I think the industry is trying very hard. Maybe they're a little late in starting this, but it seems to me they're now working diligently at trying to get access roads across non-arable land to well sites. While flow lines — small lines from the wells to the batteries — have never been subject to serious legislation of any kind and while it's true that a straight line is cheapest, they're attempting now to reroute also to accommodate

arable fields and what other disadvantages might accrue from a straight line approach to flow lines.

I don't think it would be fair to compare with homesteading the 10-day clause for seismic. I can see nothing really very competitive about homesteading that requires a 10-day window, unless I've missed something there.

From the government side, there are some problems also. The environment thing is fairly new, Mr. Speaker, and there has been an enormous overlay of environmental rules. I know of an engineer hired by the Eastern Irrigation District to go down and repair a gate on a valve. He was accompanied by half a dozen people from the Department of Environment who stood around and watched. So we're all learning, and it's all taking a little time. I think the environmental thing is necessary and useful, but at the same time it's caused an enormous overlay of paperwork, rules, and duplications of maps and applications and one thing or another. It's a real toothache for people who are doers.

In addition to that, the government still suffers from lateral communication within departments as well as, in my view, a serious communication gap between industry and government. I think that's being helped a lot by the attitudes of the present ministers, and I'm sure that thing will be eased as time goes on.

This resolution the Member for Spirit River-Fairview brought forward seems to come from page 130 of the ECA report, which relates primarily to forestry. Unfortunately, that's an area I don't know much about at all, except to say that if you're trying to harvest timber on seismic cuts commercially, you have to understand that there is no concentration of timber at any one place, which makes the economics doubtful. On top of that, a lot of that timber is damaged by cats and couldn't be salvaged in any event. And finally grade and size are problems that don't make it necessarily commercial.

Then they also say we could probably do a lot by cutting down on the size of the drilling site. The people who have been drilling wells for a good long time probably know as much about drilling site size as do the people in the ECA. They will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that by making the drill site smaller you also run a very high risk of fire, and that there needs to be a black area between the diesel engines and whatever else has ignition equipment on it and the pile of deadwood and indeed the forest that's alive. To say summarily that that's a panacea for this problem would be overstating it again.

On the whole, I think the industry has been very responsible and that we can go a long way in this government toward the co-operation that's more necessary than more rules and regulations. In my view, further committee study "just because" would be expensive, time-consuming, and counter-productive. So I would urge all members to summarily reject this resolution as it's put forward today.

Thank you.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak against Motion No. 213. Like the previous speaker, I have to express some confusion on what this is all about. I can make some observations and comments, but I have to refer to the report the hon. member who introduced the motion referred to, The Environmental Effects of Forestry Operations in Alberta. I would like to read recommendation No. 24 from that report:

The Minister of Environment should direct the

Environment Council of Alberta to conduct public hearings into the environmental effects of the petroleum exploration and production industry...

Obviously, as has been pointed out, that is Motion 213 that's before us this afternoon.

Again, I can't understand what a report that deals with forestry operations has to do with the petroleum industry in Alberta by itself. Nevertheless, the report goes on to criticize the petroleum exploration and development industry in one way or another. It has five main criticisms. First of all, it criticized the industry for not realizing the negative impact it has on Alberta's green belt. It notes the industry acts in haste, and as a result there's poor planning and decisions resulting from that. It chastises the industry for justifying that haste in saying it cannot wait for more lengthy evaluations. It goes on to say the petroleum industry is a little arrogant, in that if we do something wrong, we'll just go ahead and pay for it. It also points out that the reclamation projects that do exist on the part of the industry are of a corrective rather than preventive nature.

It does have one good comment. It says that on a tour of the Swan Hills area, the council was impressed by voluntary erosion control measures the oil industry had taken. Nevertheless some of the other points it has made in regard to the industry warrant observation or comment. The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview pointed these out today in support of his motion. However, we can look at it from the other point of view and note that these arguments could be used against the motion just as much for it.

He referred to the comparison made between the forestry industry and the petroleum industry in land disturbance and noted it was of comparable magnitude. However, it's been pointed out by the previous speaker that that's not a fair comparison, because much of the land through which the seismic lines run is non-economical scrub.

It also goes on to point out that there's a proliferation of seismic lines throughout the province and refers to a particular area, noting that seismic lines are allowed every quarter mile. That's not actually true; seismic lines are not run every quarter mile. They are only in very exceptional circumstances, when an impressive anomaly is located. Under those conditions, a ranger might allow seismic lines to be run closer than they otherwise normally would be. Some examples of that are in the Zama-Rainbow Lake area.

Another concern expressed in this report is in regard to the access the public gains from these seismic lines. But there are conflicting opinions with regard to that problem. Some people, for example the department of forestry, wish to have seismic lines left open, so they can have access to the land. On the other hand, other departments are concerned about the access the public has to those seismic lines, because they disrupt wildlife in that area. In that case, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that the problem isn't with the seismic lines, but with the public that uses them, and their disregard for the natural element contiguous to those lines.

I believe the member who introduced the motion stated that a new technology which would minimize the deleterious impact seismic lines have on our green areas is available, and he referred to portable seismic operations. In all fairness, I think it should be noted that these are pioneer-type developments. They haven't been perfected to this point, nor are they as reliable as

existing methods.

It's highly doubtful that the petroleum industry as a whole is unaware or irresponsible with regard to real or potential negative impact on green areas. Several agencies monitor petroleum-oriented activities to such a degree that little negative activity would be tolerated. It's also doubtful that hasty planning decisions and expensive mistakes compromise the rule of practice for the industry. Certainly, as in any other industry, mistakes have to be expected. Responsibility, however, would have to be admitted and corrections carried out, where possible.

The report neglects to include the positive effects of the petroleum industry. More often than not exploration efforts in the province lead to opening up an area. This opening up characteristically initiates development by other industries, the forestry industry being one of them.

So I'm a little confused about the motion before us today. I don't understand how this recommendation in regard to the petroleum industry emanated from a report which had directed its attention to forestry operations in the province. One might presume, if the logic were to be carried forward, that if a similar study were carried out for the petroleum industry, further studies would be recommended for other industries: the agricultural industry, or what have you. I don't believe we would wish to direct our efforts to that end. Therefore, I am speaking against the motion presented to us.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I hadn't planned to take part in the debate this afternoon, but in light of the comments made by the last two members I think it's important to say a word or two.

First of all, so that no hon. members are mystified as to how this recommendation came into being, the Member for Calgary Glenmore has been in this House long enough to know very well that the government he's a member of first emasculated the Environment Conservation Authority of Alberta, then set up the Environment Council of Alberta. The member's own government then appointed three or four people, along with the man they brought in from British Columbia, Mr. Crerar, to look at the environmental effects of forestry operation in Alberta. Let there be no misunderstanding how this came into being. This was set up by your own government members.

Secondly, the council — which candidly I don't think is appropriate; I think the former Environment Conservation Authority was a far more independent vehicle — is a vehicle the government set up. The Minister of Environment at that time, the hon. Mr. Russell, brought it into line. Earlier he'd said the old organization couldn't manage its affairs. We all remember that. Then the government set up this organization; the government hand-picked the members to go on the panel. They had hearings across the province, looking at the forestry industry and others. I made representation to the hearings held in Calgary at the Jubilee Auditorium, not with regard to the petroleum industry but to what I considered to be the idiotic approach by some people in the forestry branch to some operations north of Cochrane. But that's beside the point.

This government's own Environment Council, hand-picked by this government, had hearings across the province. And one of their major recommendations

is that there should be further hearings on the impact of the petroleum industry on forested areas of the province. My understanding is that the basis for that recommendation was twofold: from what members of the government's hand-picked panel saw when they were out in the forested area in the province — and if they weren't expert enough that's no one's fault but the government's — and secondly, from representations made to this council by Albertans. So there should be no mystery, hon. members, as to how the recommendation came about. You may quarrel with the qualifications of the people your government appointed, but it's your government's report. I must say, it's more candid than I had expected when the Environment Council was established.

I didn't plan to spend very much time defending the Environment Council, because I want to say one or two other things. But for the benefit of the Member for Calgary Glenmore and the Member for Calgary Buffalo, that's how it came about.

Let me also say to hon. members that I resent with considerable intensity the comments the Member for Calgary Glenmore made about local contractors and the implication that their public relations is pretty lousy. I happen to represent a riding where five gas plants are in the riding or the surrounding area. And a lot of local contractors are involved in that area.

MR. PLANCHE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I don't remember ever saying that anybody's P.R. was lousy.

MR. R. CLARK: If he didn't say it, the member certainly implied that. But, Mr. Speaker, the point I want to make is that whether it's the forestry industry, the resource industry, the government, or political parties, on occasions all our P.R. is lousy. On other occasions it's rather good. But I want to make that point to the Member for Calgary Glenmore, that not all the problems of the resource industry are the problems of local contractors.

I do want to make three points, though. The first is this: I am prepared to support the proposition for the hearings put to us today. I think enough evidence came forward in the course of the Environment Council's travelling across the province, representations made to it by Albertans, that that appears to be a reasonable proposition. But I think the hearings should move quickly, and once the government gets the recommendations it should move quickly on them.

The second point I want to make is that when we talk about the forestry industry, or Alberta Forest Service, remember the forest industry and the forest service are lumped in the Department of Energy and Natural Resources. And I'm being very charitable, Mr. Speaker, if I say it's the poor cousin in that department. The lands branch is also in the same department.

So we have a situation, Mr. Speaker, of people in the Department of Energy and Natural Resources responsible for the oil and gas industry in the province — and that's a very, very major income of this province. What, some 52 per cent of the province's income last year? Then tacked onto that same department are the forestry service and lands people. From the standpoint of departments, I think it's a mistake to lump those three together. I think it's very difficult for the forestry industry and for the lands branch not only to be able to get equal attention of the minister, but to have equal

impact around the cabinet table and in this Assembly, when in the Department of Energy and Natural Resources, I'm sure 95 per cent of the minister's time must be spent with the very important area of negotiations with the federal government and overall petroleum exploration and development problems. And that's the way it should be.

Frankly, I do not agree with the council's recommendation that we should have a superministry. I would prefer that we have one of the cabinet ministers with a very clear responsibility for forestry, lands, and fish and wildlife. And this is a very bald admission: I think the former government didn't give that department the kind of priority it should have had. I also think this government is even worse when it comes to the kind of priority needed in the areas of forestry, lands, and fish and wildlife.

Let me just make two more points to hon. members. We talk a great deal in this Assembly about heritage. We have a heritage of dollars: we'll have \$8.6 billion the end of this fiscal year. But an equally important part of the heritage of this province is the Eastern Slopes.

MR. NOTLEY: Agreed.

MR. R. CLARK: For several members in this Assembly — the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration, the Member for Drayton Valley, and several members back in yonder corner — the Eastern Slopes play a very important part in their constituency. If they were to ask their constituents which is more important, in their judgment, the \$8 billion in the heritage fund or the Eastern Slopes, I suspect a large number of people would say the Eastern Slopes are mighty important, hon. members, and don't forget that.

In addition to what the members across the way said earlier, the reason I got involved in the debate is that the Eastern Slopes are an important part of the area west of Sundre in my own constituency. I took part in the old Environment Conservation Authority hearings in the early 1970s. At that time I urged the Environment Conservation Authority to zone the Eastern Slopes carefully, and to put that zoning in legislation.

I would also draw hon. members' attention to the idea my colleague Dr. Buck raised in this Assembly last year: that of co-ordinated resource management. I honestly don't believe we would have had some of the situations the Environment Council refers to in its report, if it hadn't been for the fact that we have an awful time co-ordinating among the various government agencies and departments.

Let me give an example. Just within the last short while, a rural electrification group in my own constituency tried to get approval from the forestry service to put in a rural electrification line for a mile and a half. The forestry people in Sundre couldn't make a decision, nor could the forestry people in Rocky. It came to Edmonton and sat here for a month. So I made a telephone call, and it was approved.

But what we've really done is centralized by drift. For that whole Eastern Slopes area, we've centralized more and more and more of the decision-making right here in Edmonton. I think one of the best recommendations in this report is where they call for a large amount of local citizen input, not only in the forestry operations but in the ultimate uses of the forested areas in the Eastern Slopes.

I believe there's a lot to be said for co-ordinated resource management. I take this opportunity to say to the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Environment, who are here, and several other ministers who aren't here today: I think it's highly important we look at that concept of co-ordinated resource management on a local basis. For goodness' sake, if you're going to have people in Rocky Mountain House, Drayton Valley, Sundre, or Canmore, let them make some decisions there. Don't have them have to send a telex or a telephone call or whatever it is to Edmonton.

If we would do the broad, general zoning by legislation, then give some policy initiatives to those people. Let them make decisions locally. Have some local people involved, not civil servants or MLAs, but some people who've lived in the area for some time. Let them be involved in helping make the decisions as far as ultimate land use is concerned. Politically, the government wouldn't have nearly as much problem in Edmonton. We'd have decisions made a darned sight better locally, and they'd be made much more quickly.

I think the call for a great deal more local input was one of the very good aspects of the Environment Council's report. Where it talks about advisory committees, let me say this: there's no sense setting up advisory committees if all we're going to be able to do is give some advice, then have it come to Edmonton and sit around here for a period of time before decisions can be made. If you're going to set up the advisory committees — and I'd urge the government to do that — then make them effective. Give them some terms of reference. Let them make decisions locally. To me, that is one of the best recommendations of the report.

I got involved in this debate primarily because of the wondering and the wandering around by the Member for Calgary Glenmore at not being able to understand how the recommendation came forward. He was a member of the government.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I'm obviously not going to get very far into the meat of my remarks, because I feel I have to rebut some of what has been said so far this afternoon.

The Member for Spirit River-Fairview brought in a motion which is almost exactly the wording of Recommendation 24 of the ECA report. I presume, therefore, that he would like to take all the recommendations of that report. One of them is of course the superministry, which the hon. Leader of the Opposition, like me, feels is not a good recommendation. So we are obviously all going to be picking and choosing which recommendations we want to pay attention to.

He also used the term "let 'er rip", as if we had absolutely no controls over the petroleum industry at the moment. These are examples. He spoke about regeneration in seismic cuts. You know, we're talking in this province about an 80-year cycle for growing timber. If a seismic cut is put through a stand of almost mature timber, that's fair enough. It can be regenerated along with that stand when it's cut. But if you put it through a 40-year-old stand, there is no point in regenerating coniferous timber upon that seismic line, because when they are cutting that timber 40 years from now, the regenerated area on the seismic line will not be of any commercial value whatsoever. It will either have to be left for another 40 years or knocked down in the process.

As far as the remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition are concerned, the very quality of the report he commented upon is an indication of the honesty of the government in choosing the people who made the report: Dr. Dancik, Mr. Crossley, and the others.

I think I have a couple of minutes, so I will start. My remarks are going to be limited to the forested area of the province. I was quite interested to see that the first two speakers following the introduction of this motion were from the city of Calgary. I seem to remember having visited that city. It's almost treeless by nature. I guess I'm going to have to take defence of the 70 per cent of the province that is within the green area, in particular the majority of that area which is forested. It's a very significant area in the province, and also supports an industry I have already made remarks about in this Chamber. It's a very important industry based on a perpetually renewable resource, and for that sole reason has a very important part in the economy of the province.

I somewhat object to the remarks that the hon. Minister for Energy and Natural Resources pays no attention to it. I'm sure he's going to be paying a lot of attention to it in the decision on the Berland River timber berth.

We've only recently had this report of the Environment Council, I think mainly because of the unfortunate illness of Dr. Dancik. It did delay it. But the economy of Grande Cache could not wait, in case that report was further delayed. If we're going to have some important input to the economy of Grande Cache and the forested area on the Berland River, we couldn't wait for that report before we put out for proposals, which after all are extremely complex and require a lot of work by the industry concerned. We had to give that industry time to make worth-while proposals in order to have a satisfactory proposal put forward.

At the moment, Mr. Speaker, I would like to adjourn the debate. I'll be back to this subject in the future.

Thank you.

MR. NOTLEY: On a point of order. Since the hon. Member for Edson has just got into his speech, we could have unanimous consent to continue the debate until he has an opportunity to finish his remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly wish to give the unanimous leave requested to depart from the *Standing Orders* and to extend beyond 4:30 for a sufficient time for the hon. Member for Edson to finish his speech?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Would all those in favor of the request please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Those opposed please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: There isn't unanimous consent.

head: **PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS
OTHER THAN
GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS
(Second Reading)**

CLERK: Bill 205, The Crown Corporation and Government Agency Disclosure Act.

MR. HORSMAN: I move that this Bill and the Bill which follows on the Order Paper, in the name of Mr. Anderson, stand and retain their place on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly wish to adopt the motion by the hon. Deputy Government House Leader.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: So ordered.

**Bill 202
The Code of Ethics and Conduct Act**

[Adjourned debate May 31: Mrs. Chichak]

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, on May 31, 1979, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview moved second reading of Bill No. 202, The Code of Ethics and Conduct Act. That afternoon a number of members spoke on the principle of the proposed legislation, and this afternoon I would like to briefly recap a few of the points made by the hon. members before I continue with my remarks.

Perhaps I should commence not with the mover of the motion for second reading, but with the speaker just prior to myself, the hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane. Though *Hansard* has recorded the fairly lengthy remarks of the hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane, for readers who may not have obtained a copy of *Hansard* for May 31, I would like to refer to two points that were made. I think the two major points referred to by the Member for Banff-Cochrane were his reflections on many years of involvement in various areas of public service at both the provincial and federal levels or the jurisdictions under each of those governments and legislation pertaining thereto, and the code of ethical conduct he found himself having to live by and accept and honor which, in his present role in this Assembly and as minister of the Crown, he continues to observe. I think those remarks were very worth while and would be beneficial for members to read.

The other point the hon. member stressed was his concern over the inability to enshrine in specific legislation, a comprehensive list of activities which might be all-inclusive. I think the hon. member quite rightly expressed that there must be some expectation of personal integrity and accountability other than what might be set down in the form of legislation.

The hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn agreed with the principle of high standards of conduct and ethical behavior, and made reference to a couple of sections of existing legislation and to *Standing Orders*. The references he made with respect to legislation were to Sections 11 and 43 of The Legislative Assembly Act. I will refer more directly to those specific sections. At this time I'd like to read into *Hansard* the reference the hon. Member for Forest Lawn made to Standing Order

31, respecting the conduct of MLAs. Standing Order 31 refers to pecuniary interests and reads:

- 31 (1) No member is entitled to vote upon any question in which that member has a direct pecuniary interest and the vote of any member so interested will be disallowed.

And subsection (2) of Standing Order 31 reads:

- (2) If a member feels that the member has a direct pecuniary interest in a matter to be voted upon, the member shall so declare to the Assembly and shall leave the Chamber before the vote is taken.

I read that into the record because the legislation before us deals very directly with the code of conduct of Members of the Legislative Assembly and senior members of the public service, and the matter of ethical conduct.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member dealt further with accountability of every member to the electors of this province as being a most essential and fundamental safeguard of ethics and proper conduct. That surely must speak very strongly to cover all those areas or aspects of conduct in public service which cannot be completely and totally covered in written form.

In his remarks on second reading, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview dealt with several points, and I will refer to a few of them. He used a quote which referred to the principle of politics and morality going hand-in-hand, and that if one felt they could be separated or dealt with individually, one really could not have a proper understanding of one or the other. I have no disagreement or dispute with the principle that politics and morality must go hand-in-hand.

Another basic principle the hon. member raised was that we must begin with the presumption that basically people are honest and accept certain responsibilities in life with the basic premise of honesty. I think it is essential to accept that. However, he went on to say that of course honesty had to be supplemented with guidelines or rules of the particular game one is involved in. I have no quarrel with that.

The hon. member referred to the rule that a member of the Ontario Legislature must abstain from professional and personal day to day business while in the public service as a minister of the Crown, and the limited extent to which one may own property. In his legislation and in his remarks he dealt with a cooling-off period, with which I will deal more extensively.

Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on May 31, I dealt with the history of the development of rules and guidelines in written form and interpretation for the public. I indicated that prior to 1971, there were really no written guidelines that the public could refer to, to examine the performance of a Member of the Legislative Assembly other than The Legislative Assembly Act. In 1971, the Premier of this province requested ministers of the Crown to file with him the necessary personal data to ensure that they would not inadvertently participate in some action that could create a conflict of interest between their duty to the Crown and their personal interests.

Then I referred to May 1973, when the Premier went further and requested that there be public disclosure, and the guidelines and details requested were set out. At this time I will not go back and read each of those items, except to say that one of the matters I raised in

previous my remarks was that guidelines for the performance both of Members of the Legislative Assembly and of senior members of the public service were certainly set out for public knowledge and scrutiny.

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to delve a little farther into the matter of what is in The Legislative Assembly Act, so those who perhaps are not familiar with all the requirements under the Act but are reading *Hansard* might be more fully informed as to whether it's a matter simply of interpretation of guidelines and requirements, and what is in fact set out in detail for public scrutiny. I think it is very important that we remove any suggestion that the guidelines or standards we refer to are not a matter of interpretation, depending on which side of the House we sit. Initially I had in mind to read into *Hansard* the contents of the various sections that pertain, but it appears that I do not have sufficient time to go into that detail. I will try to summarize briefly, Mr. Speaker, since I believe the indication was that I probably have about three minutes left.

Section 8 sets out the ineligibility for an MLA; that is, a person who is a member of the Senate or a member of the House of Commons may not serve as a member of a Legislative Assembly. Section 10 sets out the conditions under which an individual is not eligible to be an MLA to begin with. Sections 11 and 12 set out circumstances under which an individual or an agent for another party having a contract or agreement with Her Majesty is not eligible to be an MLA.

Section 12 clarifies circumstances not affecting eligibility to perform as an MLA. Those are lengthy, from subsections 1 to 30, and they set out all the circumstances under which an MLA is not affected in his ability to represent citizens in this Assembly. Section 14 permits certain remuneration to MLAs with respect to appointment to commissions and committee functions. As we move through The Legislative Assembly Act, identifying the particular sections might [make it] easier for members of the public who want to inquire into the existing code of ethics to know precisely the sections they might refer to.

Section 36 is interesting. It identifies that the Legislative Assembly may compel before it the attendance of persons it deems necessary, if there is evidence that a Member of the Legislative Assembly was wrongfully dealt with or conducted himself or herself in an improper manner. Then there are sections 43 and 44. Section 43 in particular is very often referred to, because it sets out that

The Legislative Assembly is a court and has all the rights and privileges of a court for the purpose of summarily inquiring into and punishing any of the following...

Then it sets out specific references to various situations or circumstances of conduct, not only of the performance or conduct of Members of the Legislative Assembly but also of members of the public at large who attempt to influence Members of the Legislative Assembly to perform in a way that would cause one to be in a conflict of interest or unethical performance.

Mr. Speaker, if I may have the indulgence of the House for just one or two minutes to round off my remarks, I would certainly do so.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS. CHICHAK: Thank you.

I think it's very important to recognize that Section 43 — and I hope that one or two of the members speaking after me will in fact make very specific reference, because they will have more time this afternoon, to Section 43(l)(f) and Section 43(l)(i) of The Legislative Assembly Act, and a few other subsections, and refer to the kind of penalty that can be dealt to a person who is in contravention of Section 43. That penalty is set out in Section 44 of The Legislative Assembly Act.

I would like to cover one more point if I may, with regard to the cooling-off period. The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview certainly referred to one or two examples in his remarks on the occasion of that debate and of the other debate. He had set out particularly two examples with respect to former ministers being appointed to positions by the government. He referred to the former hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud and the former hon. member for the constituency of Edmonton Belmont.

I would like to raise one point specifically with respect to the [former] hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud. Is the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview suggesting that the government should have thrown out for competition the advisory position the former hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud was appointed to, with respect to the negotiations on energy vis-a-vis the provincial and federal government and the work being carried out with respect to Cold Lake? Is he trying to suggest that we should say, let's hold all of this back for one year, for this cooling-off period, and then we may continue with this hon. member, who has served without question, and the public certainly will know and will honor that his conduct ...

MR. NOTLEY: [Inaudible] convince him to run again.

MRS. CHICHAK: That's another matter.

But his conduct of performance with respect to that particular portfolio and the work he was asked to carry on, to continue for a period of time, surely is not of the nature that can be open to competition. I think the hon. member should certainly have taken that kind of reference into consideration, as to how well in fact such a step would serve the people of Alberta.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. L. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to rise and speak on Bill 202.

On May 31 the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview stated in his opening remarks: I think it is important that the place to start is with honest people. I have no disagreement with that remark. But he goes on to state that then there must be laid down a set of rules and a code of ethics. In my opinion, rules are only effective when you are dealing with an honest person. The only really effective code of ethics is one's conscience and respect for one's own reputation. I'm sure I and everybody in this Assembly would have no respect for anybody who used his office for personal gain. Mr. Speaker, I myself would have no time for such a person.

I must speak against this Bill because I feel it is too restrictive. If restrictions of this type are placed upon this Assembly, it will be very difficult to attract the type of people we need to run a government. Let's look at

Section 4, under conflict of interest:

No Minister may carry on business other than [the business] as a Minister, except

- (a) a family farm; or
- (b) a business carried on through a blind trust.

To me this means that to be a minister of this government, you could not have any other business but a family farm.

For the life of me, Mr. Speaker, I can't see why they put farmers in a different category than any other businessman in this province. I really don't know whether to be flattered or insulted. I don't know whether they put us into this category because they feel we'd be no competition to the professional politician, or whether they feel we're more honest and more capable than the rest of the businessmen. But I must admit that we farmers are very capable people, seeing I am one. And I would not suggest for a minute that we are the only capable people in this province, not very loudly in this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that if you're going to run a government for the people of the province — and I believe that's what government is all about — then the government should be for all the people. To have that type of government, you must have representation from all walks of life. We must have policies in this government that not only permit but encourage businessmen from all walks of life to enter government. To have a successful business, you must have the expertise that the many types of businessmen bring into this Assembly. If you put the types of restrictions this bill would put on members coming into this Assembly, and add to that the restrictions on those who leave to go back into private business, you will no longer have the flow of people from business to government and back to business, which I believe is so essential for any government.

It's essential that they keep in touch with people in the businesses in this province in this manner. Why do I feel it's essential? I feel it is essential because the only people who really know the concerns and problems of the farming industry are farmers. The only people who know the problems of the oil industry are people who have been in the oil industry. The same with every other one. The only people who know the concerns of this province are the people themselves. This government cannot afford to lose this type of person. Every day we see examples of the expertise that various businesses bring to this Assembly. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is essential that we keep it easy enough, and not so restrictive that these people cannot enter this government and abandon the government to professional politicians.

Thank you very much.

MR. PAYNE: In introducing Bill 202, Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview referred to the French philosopher Rousseau and quoted: "Those who would treat politics and morality apart will never understand the one or the other." If I may speak not only for myself but for my colleagues in this House, I would like the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview to understand clearly that for me and my colleagues politics and morality are synonymous terms and that we very clearly understand them both.

Early in this spring sitting, Mr. Speaker, I made reference to even greater standards of parliamentary excellence. Implicit in that phrase is excellence in the

area of ethical standards. I want to emphasize at the outset that I regard my own ethical standards and those of my colleagues in this Assembly as more important than virtually any other area of service in the Legislature and the constituency. Despite my deep-seated feelings in this matter, however, I rise in my place today to speak against Bill 202.

Mr. Speaker, in earlier debate on this legislation, other hon. members have spoken very perceptively regarding the deficiencies of the Bill. I believe they have pointed out quite correctly that Sections 11 and 43 of The Legislative Assembly Act, as well as Standing Order 31, are existing mechanisms that bear directly on the subject of legislator conduct and ethical standards.

Earlier in today's debate, the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood made reference to Section 43 and suggested that a following speaker make additional reference to it. I'm facing my own time constraints, Mr. Speaker. However, in deference to her very good judgment, let me cite a few words from Section 43 of The Legislative Assembly Act, if only to make the point:

The Legislative Assembly is a court and has: all the rights and privileges of a court for the purpose of summarily inquiring into and punishing any of the following . . .

A very comprehensive list of anticipated possible misdemeanors by legislators follows.

These hon. members have also quite correctly spoken critically of the Bill's potentially negative implications for citizen participation in government. In my view, Mr. Speaker, it would be a retrograde step to make it more difficult for people in industry and other walks of life in the private sector to enter public life and then return to the private sector after a term of service. I suggest that kind of cross-pollination makes for better government, not worse.

Mr. Speaker, underlying the debate on this Bill and implicit in the Bill itself is the fundamental and basic question: what are the sources of one's ethical standards? Might I suggest that each member here today address himself or herself to that question: what are the sources of my ethical standards?

A code of ethics Bill, as proposed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, is of course founded on the premise — in my view the questionable premise — that a published code of standards is potentially one such source. Might I suggest that ethical conduct springs not from codes of conduct nor even from law, but from deep-seated attitudes formed very early in life; that is to say. I have some very serious reservations about the premise that a legislator's ethical standards are shaped or influenced by external factors, such as the proposed Bill. I am prepared, however, to agree that if external factors can influence our ethical judgments — and I underline "if" — our constituents, the electorate of Alberta, represent a far more potent influence than any written code. Speaking personally, the 20,000 voters of Calgary Fish Creek most assuredly are capable of rendering their collective judgment regarding my ethical standards and those of my government colleagues.

In presenting his Bill, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member pointed to precedents in several other jurisdictions and the private sector. I suggest those precedents must be questioned. Even though the concept of published codes of ethics is comparatively new, it has already been demonstrated that unethical behavior in government

or in the private sector is not eliminated by such codes. In other words, ethical legislators behave ethically regardless of the existence of a code of conduct. Similarly, unethical legislators behave unethically, regardless of the existence of that selfsame code of conduct.

While on my feet today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to endorse an observation made in this debate by two of my colleagues. A code of conduct couched in platitudinous language and generalities would be utterly ineffectual. But the moment you step back from the platitudes and generalities and attempt to frame the code in more specific language, you run into a disturbing historical precedent. Over the centuries, a number of religious and fraternal societies have attempted to frame such codes with such specifics. Without wanting to impugn the motivation behind those codes, Mr. Speaker, I must observe that they're all subject to an ironic hazard: through the process of reinterpretation, changing circumstances, and new developments, there is a continuing need to amend, change, add on, embellish, and clarify, only to discover that unethical ingenuity has quickly generated the requirement for yet another layer of specifics.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I again wish to emphasize to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview that I obviously share his interest in maintaining high ethical standards in this Assembly. However, I regret that I do not share his obviously well-intentioned recommendation that a legislated code is the vehicle to achieve that otherwise desirable goal. I am fully persuaded that the ethical standards of the members of this Assembly are significantly higher than the standards detailed in the proposed Bill. Therefore it follows that the Bill provides no positive motivation to elevate our standards even higher. Suffice it to say that I cannot support Bill 202, primarily because I believe I sit among honorable members.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on Bill 202, introduced by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. I appreciate this opportunity to speak in a debate that is of much public interest; however, many points were noted previously during the debate in this Legislature on a very similar Bill. It is a good opportunity to reiterate some of those thoughts made on both sides of this House which also apply to Bill 202, and also to introduce a few new thoughts.

In order for legislation to be effective and achieve its purpose, it must include as nearly as possible all permutations. In this case, any legislation denoting a code of ethics and conduct must encompass a wide divergence of opinions. This effort is limited, as it must be acceptable to those whose lives it will govern. Essentially this is difficult, as it has been shown in this Assembly that many opinions are present.

In the expectations of the effectiveness of laws and the resulting implication, there runs a current of feeling that the law was necessary. The legislators of our province and country are elected publicly, and there should be and continue to be an implicit assumption that they are men and women of the highest moral order. As the hon. Member for Edson said earlier, and I quote from *Hansard*:

We are looking at doing away with the philosophy of previous centuries and are really being asked to accept the philosophy of the rule of morals, ethics, and codes of conduct by legislation

rather than by accepted practice.

I was elected as a member in this Assembly on the basis that I would live by the existing order and status quo; that is, to conduct myself in a moral, ethical, and conscientious manner.

Mr. Speaker, without appearing blind to the intentions of this Bill, I must say there are certain guidelines each person holding public office must consider. Being of an accounting background, there is a basis maxim that denotes our code of conduct, as in any other profession: not only must you be independent from any possible conflict of interest; above all you must appear to be independent. Expanding on this, there must never be grounds for anyone to point fingers or accuse. Embarrassing situations have no substance when the appearance of independence is diligently pursued. This state of mind is eminently comfortable, and the conscience is peaceful when this ideal is pursued constantly. This pursuit will effectively refute "a trend towards complacency and arrogance itself", and I quote the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury in *Hansard*.

With regard to some of the sections of Bill 202, I think it is an unwarranted waste of expertise and energy to disallow former MLAs from utilizing their knowledge, to ease transitions with minimal problems. In a province such as Alberta, which is on the economic, cultural, and social fast track, we must put a high premium on any available resources that will aid our development. If former ministers are able resources, willing to help out, so be it.

In keeping with the philosophy of a Progressive Conservative government that believes in the pre-eminence of free enterprise and the maximization of resources, those sections pertaining to employment following public office are, in my opinion, are definitely unacceptable. A point to be strongly supported, Mr. Speaker, is that in order to attract people of ability and interest to public office from the private sector or other positions, they must be guaranteed the right to return their skills to the private sector when they terminate their position in public office.

I have had researched the previous government's record on instituting a code of governing ethics and conduct. The previous government had no policy whatsoever, except a statement by Premier Manning that "members of the Executive Council should not indulge in business activity which could create possible conflicts with their public [office] as ministers". In May 1973 the Conservative government reported to the Assembly that ministers shall file statements of financial interests, in order that the Premier may be advised of any possible situations of conflict of interest. These include:

1. A legal description of all land in Alberta, including mineral rights, in which they or their families have any direct or indirect interest, whether as owner, lessee, mortgagee, unpaid vendor, shareholder of a private company or otherwise.
2. The names of all private companies doing business in Alberta in which they or their families have a financial interest.
3. A description of all proprietorships and partnerships doing business in Alberta in which they or their families have an interest.

Action can then be taken.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it appears that when

considering the possibility of running for office, elected members should be aware that they will be accountable to the electorate of Alberta and, more importantly, to their individual consciences. This deliberation of the responsibilities one will assume if elected, will serve as a reminder of the personal burden of maintaining a high, irreproachable code of conduct and ethics. I therefore reserve my support of Bill 202.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the debate on Bill 202, The Code of Ethics and Conduct Act, when it was first introduced I, like all other members, was willing to accept it. It looked a reasonably good Bill. But after listening to the proposer of this Bill, I wondered many times whether there's a real need for such legislation.

After listening to the debate, I thought of several phrases that could very well tie in with this. One of them was: set a thief to catch a thief. We always understand and believe that the police are people who are brought up and trained as well-respected citizens. How much harder it is for them to catch a thief. But one who knows the tricks would be much more capable. Another area is mentioned particularly in my mother tongue: *Na zlodvowe wsia shapka horet*. Mr. Speaker, that means: a thief's cap is always on fire.

Before I go further, one other area that may be interesting was a reunion of a class of a certain year. All the former students met; one was our parish minister of the gospel. As they met and introduced each other, one of the ladies who hadn't seen this man for something like 40 years said, I thought to be a minister of the gospel you had to be a very good person, almost like a saint. Remembering what you were like, how the hell did you ever get where you are today?

Mr. Speaker, I really feel such legislation is not necessary, particularly for the members of this government. We are in our third term, and I think our capabilities and honesty have been proved. The people of this province showed it in the March 14 election.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to make some references to *Hansard* and to the papers. Just a week ago, a group of interns from British Columbia sat in your gallery, Mr. Speaker. The results were in the paper. It says: "A flock of parliamentary interns from British Columbia looking down on Alberta's legislature last week were astounded . . ." Then it goes on to say: "They watched in disbelief [the opposition] attack [the] Housing Minister [Mr.] Chambers." Further on: "Where was the big scandal, they later asked . . ."

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure these students think back to what is happening in their province. They have one government for one term, the next time they throw that government out and select another one. The recent election was very close again. I am convinced the feeling is that one isn't very good and the other is worse, and the people just can't decide which would be the right one.

Another thing that really bothers me: the Leader of the Opposition continuously about those free airplane rides. Mr. Speaker, I wish somebody would offer me a free airplane ride to Hawaii. I sure wouldn't hesitate to take it. But, "the Premier has quite properly issued directives to civil servants not to take gifts," and on it goes. "The latest incidence of the unsound reasoning is the Premier's admission that he accepted . . ." Sure he accepted. He did nothing wrong when he accepted. Had he accepted those rides on Pacific Western Air-

lines, which is Alberta's own air line, it would be different. But accepting rides on Air Canada or Canadian Pacific — there must have been a reason, that they felt the Premier was worth it.

But when you go further: "Clark admits taking free flights". He can stand in his place and argue and argue. Here it is in the Calgary *Albertan*, November 9, and we've been hearing about those free rides since last fall. It's in the paper: he can accept them. I feel very sorry he is not here today. I think he has accepted other things besides ...

AN HON. MEMBER: Not airplane rides.

MR. BATIUK: Not airplane rides; there are other things.

We look at another issue, May 23, 1979: "Chalmers said in an interview [that] Social Credit has used legislature funds for about three years to pay Ken Mandeville, son of Bow Valley MLA Fred Mandeville". Now if this goes on, I wonder what the opposition is talking about. There's no way I have any opposition to seeing the son of an MLA working. Just because the father's an MLA, the son shouldn't be denied privileges of working anyplace or with a government. But this just shows you, as I had mentioned: practise what you preach, or whatever the other areas are.

What really perturbs me is when the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview makes statements such as: "Ministers' aides get cushy jobs, Notley claims". A number of them — I guess 10 in all — are mentioned here. The first one is Murray Rasmusson. He was an executive assistant of the former Minister of Housing and Public Works. I think this person deserved the place where he was put. When we look at the success of Alberta Housing and Public Works during the time of the former minister, who could carry on those policies better than the one who was so capable of assisting the minister?

We go on to the others. What about Mr. Getty? He has been asked and looked for by others: "Getty approached by Nu-West". Here it says very clearly:

Getty, a former Calgary oilman and Edmonton Eskimo football player, was considered one of the Lougheed administration's most capable ministers. He decided not to seek re-election ...

What is wrong with having a person of that capability who was a minister of the Crown and has proved himself? I think it's much better than the former administration. They used to put [in] their own people, but they used to put [in] the losers.

Another area that perturbs me: I think Executive Council did the right thing by appointing the past Minister of Business Development and Tourism as commissioner for the seventy-fifth anniversary of the province. I think back, and I may have mentioned it earlier, to when this gentleman was elected in 1971 and appointed as Minister without Portfolio responsible for Tourism. I believe his accomplishments and how well his department handled the century celebrations of the RCMP helped put tourism as the third largest industry in Alberta, and very close to the second. Because of his capability I think he is one person who is going to do a really good job for our celebrations next year.

I have to speak on behalf of the people I represent. Here is something very, very interesting: in the readers' column of Tuesday, June 5, one of my constituents, an elderly lady 70 years of age, with a write up.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's very essential to know that I feel very proud of this person. It says:

I am tired of listening to [the] opposition party leaders in the Legislature. Apparently, they have forgotten the real definition of the duties of Her Majesty's Opposition and have settled into a course of least resistance by regurgitating last session's beefs.

According to Webster, the opposition assists the government ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. member is probably aware that apart from the usual restrictions on quotations by which persons who are not members indirectly enter debate into the House, there is also very clearly a rule that proceedings in the House or remarks made in the Assembly by hon. members are not to be commented on by way of quotations from those outside the Assembly, howsoever eminent or respectable the source of that quotation may be.

MR. BATIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'll try to indulge you.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of whether I read this or not, this person in particular was very concerned that so much time is being lost at the cost of the taxpayer. She felt that when you elect a person, you elect them to represent well the people they are elected for. Well, I'll just stop reading. I'm glad I had the opportunity to use my last ...

I just wonder about ourselves as hon. members, particularly myself, using a gasoline credit card. Would this code of ethics apply to me? I know it's allowable to use it to do my government work. But when I think back to last fall, while in the Legislature I had an appointment for my eyes. It was on a day when we were in session. I had made it for the late afternoon. Then I thought to myself when this Bill was introduced: was I entitled to everything? Maybe I should return about one-twentieth of a tank of gas, because probably I used a little of it coming to Edmonton. Otherwise I would have had to make a trip.

Then there was the \$40 subsistence. Maybe a twenty-fourth of that should have been returned, because I also used that. How far can you go? The only thing I realized that maybe I did wrong was that I took advantage by having my eyes examined and was provided with trifocals. But I'm just wondering how much good they did. Previously I had bifocals. When I looked to my right I used to see two members for Spirit River-Fairview, now I see three. [laughter]

Mr. Speaker, we can go a lot further. You can go into a restaurant with a friend of yours, and if you accept a cup of coffee as a treat, what is wrong with that? On the other hand, maybe that person who's giving you coffee wants something done in return. How far can you go? It's the same with a meal. You go together. Whether you buy a meal for somebody or he buys it for you, you still have to look at that and you may consider the person wants to benefit from it.

I must say that the former administration in particular would be very proud if they had a record just like us. As I mentioned earlier, this is our third term, and not one member has yet lost his seat because of a conflict of interest. I am sure the opposition here would be glad to be able to say that over their own record.

Mr. Speaker, with those few comments, I must say I am going to oppose this Bill. Thank you.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I very much regret I do not have sufficient time left this afternoon to engage in debate on this Bill with the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. Therefore I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. minister adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, this evening the House will reconvene in subcommittee to study estimates of various departments. Tomorrow the House will reconvene at 10 a.m. and will continue with debate on the budget.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. Deputy Government House Leader care to remind the members where the subcommittees will be meeting this evening?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I believe the places are posted appropriately. Unfortunately, I do not have that information available to me in the Assembly at the present time.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, if I may add to what the hon. Deputy Government House Leader has said, Subcommittee A will meet in 312, and Subcommittee B will meet in the Carillon Room.

MR. SPEAKER: Under the circumstances, perhaps an hon. member would like to move that the Assembly adjourn until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn until tomorrow morning at 10 a.m.

[At 5:29 p.m. on motion, the House adjourned to Friday at 10 a.m.]

