

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

[Leave granted; Bill 222 read a first time]

Title: Thursday, April 9, 1981 2:30 p.m.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

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

## PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

## Bill 204

## An Act to Amend The Expropriation Act

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 204, An Act to Amend The Expropriation Act.

In 1973 this Legislature passed a new Expropriation Act based on the concept of a home for a home. Since the Act has had a number of years to prove itself, it has come to the attention of many people that landowners are not being compensated fairly for land. Therefore this legislation will make it imperative upon the expropriating authority to pay market value or to compensate the landowner by obtaining comparable land for them.

[Leave granted; Bill 204 read a first time]

## Bill 206

An Act to Amend  
The Alberta Energy Company Act

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 206, An Act to Amend The Alberta Energy Company Act.

The prime function of this Bill would bring accountability, as far as the Alberta Energy Company is concerned, by making it mandatory that a resolution come to the Assembly from the government, naming the individual who would exercise the proxy vote and outlining the direction given to that individual. Failing that, the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources would attend and deal with the matters at the meeting.

[Leave granted; Bill 206 read a first time]

## Bill 222

An Act to Amend  
The Alberta Evidence Act

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 222, An Act to Amend The Alberta Evidence Act.

The principles of this Bill are in recognition of the role of the member of a legislative body today. More and more members are being involved with confidential matters. The intent is to try to amend The Alberta Evidence Act in such a manner that there would be a degree of confidentiality between the Member of the Legislative Assembly and a constituent, in such a manner that the member would not be compelled to disclose matters of a confidential nature, whether written or oral, before a court in the province of Alberta.

MR. MAGEE: Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 48 senior citizens who have travelled here from the Red Deer constituency. They represent all the lodges and seniors' self-contained units we have in the city. They're accompanied by Mrs. Emma Goings, their hostess; Alma Mann, assistant; Barlett Moore, a nurse; and Ken Miller, the bus driver. I would ask that they rise and receive the normal greeting from the Legislative Assembly.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to introduce to you and to the members of this Assembly 28 students from my constituency. They are from the Chester Ronning school, in the rose city of Alberta, Camrose. I would like to point out that the school was named after one of Camrose's most prominent citizens, a former ambassador to India, an educator, and a former member of this Legislature. Last year I had the opportunity to visit their school when they had Stamp Around Alberta day, where each class presented illustrations of tourist spots in Alberta. I will ask them now to stand and be recognized by members of this Assembly.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you and to members of this Assembly 17 students from the grade 6 class in Wabamun school. It is special to me in that I have a daughter with the group. They are accompanied by their teacher Kent Hoffman; parents, Diane Purdy — and that name sounds familiar to me — Sharon McDonald, Sue Gray, and Karen Steffes. They're in the members gallery, and I'd ask them to rise and receive the cordial welcome of this Assembly.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce to you and to the members of the Assembly 14 students from the Alberta Vocational Centre in the constituency of Edmonton Centre. These students represent the following countries: Russia, Chile, Afghanistan, New Zealand, Czechoslovakia, Vietnam, and Iran. They are accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Marg Belyea. I ask hon. members to join with me in wishing them welcome.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

## Cold Lake — Economic Development

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to continue my questioning about government performance in growth areas of Alberta, in terms of economic and social problems. My question today relates to the centre of Cold Lake and is directed to the Minister of Environment. I find that some cheques were rushed to the town of Cold Lake and other ones by the M.L.A. Could the minister explain why those cheques took so long to get there? How long did they sit on the minister's desk?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, the cheques were not rushed. It requires a . . . [interjections]

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, that's the best answer I've had yet. They weren't rushed — nine months later;

\$40,000 interest later by the local authority.

Is the Minister of Environment, through the Provincial Treasurer, prepared to pick up the interest cost caused to a local authority by the delay in payment by this government?

MR. NOTLEY: By the government incompetence.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I didn't have an opportunity to complete my response to the member. In the process of approving programs under the water and sewer program, we have to go through certain crosses and checks to make sure that both the local authority and the engineer responsible do their jobs properly. That exercise takes time. We in Environment processed them as rapidly as we could. We require proper completion of forms and an analysis of the situation, because we're dealing with people's money. Until I'm satisfied that everything has been done properly at the other end of the exercise, it's my responsibility as minister not to permit procedure.

Insofar as the interest on funding is concerned, it has always been the policy of Environment to pick up the interest charges during the time in which the project is processed, and that exercise we continue to do.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the program is an exceptionally good program. It's been welcomed by all municipalities within the province and involves a considerable amount of money.

MR. R. SPEAKER: The hon. minister may try to tell us here that it's a great program, but out at the local level where the taxpayer is facing difficulties . . .

Mr. Speaker, I'm not satisfied that interest is being paid, because it isn't. My further question to the Minister of Environment is with regard to economic development and social problems within these communities, with regard to the promise given by the government of a task force to look at some of the social and economic problems that occur in the communities. Maybe I'd like to direct the question to the hon. Premier, as I'm not sure the Minister of Environment is responsible. Has the Premier looked into the possibility of implementing the task force promised to Cold Lake to look at economic and social problems coming because of the potential resource development?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could respond this way. We had a meeting with representatives of the Cold Lake area at Government House in November or December; I do not have the precise date in my mind at the moment. It involved representatives of the local government, representatives who were involved in the chambers of commerce, and representatives of the hospitals and school authorities. We had a very useful and effective meeting with the MLA for the constituency. We have a cabinet committee, under the chairmanship of the Provincial Treasurer, co-ordinating our activity in that area. I believe we'd best be able to handle any questions from the Leader of the Opposition if they were directed on a specific subject.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the Premier in light of that response. At the present time some \$15 million is going into water, sewer, other improvements, but some of the social problems in that area are being neglected. One very simple one, a drop-in centre for senior citizens . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. leader making an announcement or is he asking a question?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in light of that specific example, who in the government is responsible to assure the government that social concerns, social programs, social facilities are being looked after, as well as some of the major, larger expenditures going into that area at the present time?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, as with any other area in the province that is of growth or potential growth, the area has concerns of course. The MLA has the basic overall responsibility representing the people in the area. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition has a specific he wishes to raise, I can either refer him to the hon. minister or, if it covers a number of ministers, assure that he receives a reply. So if we can have a specific question, I or other members of Executive Council would be happy to respond.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the Premier, in terms of a specific request. Checking with the manpower centre in the area, 1,000 people are registered waiting for work. That's outside of farmers or including the people on the military base. In terms of the work force, 20 to 25 per cent of the people there are looking for work. Who in the government would be looking at a specific problem such as that in the area of Cold Lake?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, if there is any validity to that information, I'm sure the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower would be happy to respond.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the particular facts alleged by the Leader of the Opposition are those which would normally be the responsibility of the federal government with respect to registrations at manpower centres, but I will take that matter under advisement and check the facts brought forward.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, that's certainly the way this government performs. That problem is out there, and the answer should be immediate.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the Provincial Treasurer is a supplement to the question I asked the Minister of Environment. Does the Provincial Treasurer have a policy of paying interest to various municipalities across this province with regard to cheques that are delayed?

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, there has been no evidence of delay for any wrong reason, as indicated by the very full, complete, and fiscally responsible answer of the Minister of Environment. It's quite in order, quite proper that cheques have to be made with respect to the payment out of public moneys, and in this case that was done. It's a program that has been very well received, involving some tens of millions of dollars. The proper and appropriate expenditure of the public money after proper checking, in contrast to the submissions of the hon. member, is what this government has been doing and will continue to do.

MR. NOTLEY: A question, if I may, to the hon. Minister of Environment. As a result of the very significant inconvenience to the people of Cold Lake as a result of the delay in meeting the terms of an agreement, and the sizable costs involved, what steps has the government

taken to review the method of allocating funds under the program so that it can meet the objective of being fiscally responsible, but a little faster than nine months at the expense of the local people involved?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I want to correct two statements; one by the Leader of the Opposition, who suggests we don't pay interest. I want to make that clear. If he has evidence to the contrary, I would like to see it. Secondly, there was no delay on the part of our government. I've said earlier, and I'll repeat it, that until those applications are properly processed — and I'm dealing with money that belongs to the people of Alberta — until that's done and I sign that document, there will not be a transfer of funds. However, we take delays into consideration in our calculation, which would include interest costs, even if they are the responsibility of other parties.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister saying to the House that the sole reason for the delays in the expenditure of funds lay with the local community involved, and that there was no responsibility on the part of this government, in any way, shape, or form, for the delay involved?

MR. COOKSON: Well, I think I've made my point clear. I'm not sure where the delay was, but it certainly wasn't with this government.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. The minister has indicated that the delay was not with this government. So there's no misunderstanding: as a result of the minister's investigation, concerned about sound fiscal management, as the Provincial Treasurer tells us, there was absolutely no delay on the part of any agency or employee of the government of Alberta. Is the minister in a position to tell us what the reason was for the delay which caused a great deal of inconvenience for the people of Cold Lake?

MR. COOKSON: I think I commented on the first part of the question. The second part of the question is up to the hon. member opposite. If he perceives that the delay is at some other source, perhaps he should pursue it with the other source.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. The question is whether or not the government has in fact fully evaluated its role in this rather sad performance, to assure us as members of the Legislature that it's not the government that is primarily responsible for the problems faced by the people of Cold Lake.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, we have a very capable member of government who represents the area, and he's made very successful submissions to us on this matter of funding. We don't have to have anyone in the opposition going out and, I might suggest, not really clarifying the issue of the problem, in terms of paying out in the way of these very generous programs. So I don't think I can comment further on it.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to assure the House that he has personally conducted a complete and comprehensive review of the reasons for the delay in sending the cheque to the community of Cold Lake, bearing in mind the commit-

ments that were made by the government with that community? Is the minister in a position to assure the House beyond any shadow of a doubt that, as a result of the minister's review, there is no responsibility on the part of any member of his department?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm extremely proud of the efficiency of my particular department.

MR. R. CLARK: A supplementary question to the minister. Notwithstanding the minister's pride, has the minister had an official of the department follow through the process that was used specifically in this Cold Lake project? Has the minister had that kind of investigation done in the department, or is the minister simply glossing over the thing?

MR. COOKSON: I think I've answered that, Mr. Speaker. If the member of the opposition wishes to pursue it, in terms of responsibility of others who are involved in the final drafting of the agreement, that's perfectly within the gentleman's prerogative.

### Energy Negotiations

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my second question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. It's with regard to the energy negotiations and to the energy package. My question is not in terms of specifics with regard to what is going to be presented next week, but in terms of what may be happening. Looking at the July 25 agreement, that I have in my hand, I wonder if the minister could indicate whether, in the six months that have passed, there are going to be amendments to the July 25 agreement, whether there will be a new agreement, or whether the presentation will stay as is.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, despite the caveat put on the question in the opening remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, he's really asking me to comment and give particulars about the negotiations. As we've discussed on a number of occasions in this Assembly, one really can't carry on this type of negotiation publicly.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order for clarification. The question was posed in regard to the July 25 agreement. It's my understanding that it was the July 25 proposal on the part of the Alberta government. I wonder if that could be made clear.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, certainly the July 25 document, which I took it the Leader of the Opposition was referring to, was the energy package offer made by the hon. Premier to the Prime Minister in July of last year.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. Is it the government's intention to alter its position from the July 25 proposal?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, that sounds to me very much like the first question.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister with regard to the time lapse that has occurred, which has been of some concern to us in the opposition. Since this July 25 document, and since the national energy program, we've had a presentation on November 17 by the minister with regard to comparing

the impact of the national energy program. As well, a joint communique of ministers was made available to the public. In it there were some indications of Alberta's position. Since that time as well, a book has been put out by the Fraser Institute. It's been some time lapse. Could the minister indicate to the Legislature what areas or what specific types of data or problems have occurred in this last six months that have prevented negotiations from proceeding with haste at an earlier date?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, following the budget and energy proposals of October 28, 1980, some weeks after that, it was agreed between the federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and me that we should have our officials meet to review the data that was being used in calculating such things as revenue flows to the industry, to the federal government, and to the provincial governments, in an effort to ascertain why those figures were coming out so significantly different. We wanted to do that not in the expectation that we would agree on what the figures should be, but so that at least each side would know how the other was calculating them. That is a fairly complex matter, Mr. Speaker. The federal and provincial officials met on a number of occasions to do that work. They completed it a few weeks ago and were in the process of preparing a preliminary report to the federal minister and a preliminary report from the Alberta officials to me.

It was at that time that I wrote a letter to Mr. Lalonde suggesting that, as that work was nearing completion, we should have a meeting in Winnipeg in the early part of April. That was responded to by the federal minister suggesting April 13. So really the reason for it occurring at that time was to give our respective officials sufficient time to review all the data and make reports to us.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. We have been concerned about the delay and have certainly been critical with regard to it. Could the minister take on the responsibility to table some of those new data information packages that are available? Would they be available to the members of the Legislature, along with the respective dates when various studies were completed?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't want to rule out tabling with the Assembly data on the calculations, but certainly wouldn't want to make a commitment to table the reports and documents that are prepared by officials for our information. As all members of the Assembly are aware, in the ordinary course we would not table in the Assembly reports from departmental officials to ministers.

MR. R. SPEAKER: This certainly isn't the ordinary circumstance. A supplementary question to the minister. Number one, I asked for the information. Number two, one of the concerns I have is that the information was delayed in order that the negotiations would occur after the cutback. Could the minister indicate to this Assembly whether that type of strategy was in place?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that one can discuss in the Assembly the details of the strategy regarding these negotiations. As I've said on a number of other occasions, there's no point having a strategy for negotiations if you're going to announce in public what it is.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want that answer to be taken to

have any significance with respect to the question that has just been asked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, merely stated as a principle, and I don't think it should be departed from in answering that question.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the minister. At the appropriate time in this series of negotiations going on, could the minister make a commitment to table in this House the material that is available to him, in terms of economic studies, data bases, so that the members of this Legislature may review the matter accordingly?

MR. LEITCH: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I'll consider providing additional information to the Assembly. I thought I had said that in response to an earlier question. But I didn't want to leave the implication that we would be tabling documents that have been prepared by the department for the information of me or the government. It's a practice of all governments not to table or make public communications from departmental officials by way of advice or information to the government.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister, for clarification.

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

MR. NOTLEY: The minister indicated that the discussions had to take place with respect to the differences in the data base. As a result of the discussions between officials, is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether in fact there has been a reconciliation, if you like, of the data, and that now, when negotiations are taking place, there will be a common set of figures for the negotiations? Or are there still problems between the federal and provincial assessments of what the figures are?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, there are areas in which federal and provincial officials have agreed on the numbers. But there would be other areas in which they haven't agreed on the numbers, and that's because it involves different judgmental factors and how they're arrived at. For example, if one's estimating the corporate tax revenue that will flow to the federal government, you have to make a judgment on how high the reinvestment level will be. If the reinvestment level is very high, the profits tax flowing to the federal government is correspondingly smaller. There are a number of such areas which involve judgments as to what's going to occur in the future. I never expected, and I don't think anyone else does, that we would agree on all those areas which involve such a judgmental factor.

So really, this work by the officials has done two things: at least let each side know how the other is arriving at its conclusion, and in some areas we've been able to agree on volumes, prices, and things of that nature. So to some extent we've cleared up the differences on the numbers. Certainly in the other areas we now have a clearer understanding as to how each side is arriving at their numbers.

#### **Royalty Payments**

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Last

week a court case was concluded in Calgary. At that case the chief executive officer of Cansulex Limited was acquitted of fraud. Has the department been monitoring that case to determine whether there are any implications for the provincial government?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member developed his question and expounded upon it, I heard everything except the name of the firm. Perhaps if he could raise his voice when he comes to that, it would assist me.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, the name of the firm is Cansulex. It's one of the world's largest exporters of sulphur.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to check with the Alberta Securities Commission to see if any monitoring of that particular matter was undertaken by them.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Part of the successful defence was the revelation that the petroleum companies that export sulphur practise double billing. Would the minister undertake to determine whether that has any impact on the royalties paid by the petroleum companies to the province of Alberta?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, unless there is some hidden meaning to the question that I haven't fathomed, it would seem to me the question might be better put to one of my colleagues who has responsibility for the collection of royalties the province of Alberta is entitled to. That doesn't fall within my responsibilities. The double billing concept is interesting, and perhaps the hon. member might want to expound on that. But at this point I find a little difficulty in addressing my mind to the question as falling within the responsibilities I must answer for in this Assembly.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, if I might elaborate, and then the appropriate minister respond. The petroleum companies used a double billing practice, where one price is fictitious. However, they are charged the royalty payable to the government on one or the other price. I am trying to determine which price they pay it on, the real price or the fictitious price, and the impact that would have on revenues received by the province of Alberta.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to look into the matter and endeavor to provide an answer to the hon. member. It may be that I need more information than has been provided so far, but I'll do what I can with what has been provided.

MR. SINDLINGER: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, my second question is to the Minister of Transportation. It's with regard to ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Possibly the hon. member might come to his second question when we have given other members the opportunity to ask their first. [interjections]

#### Vehicle Registration

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My

question is to the hon. Solicitor General. Does the Solicitor General have any statistics in his department which would indicate the response of the public to the mail-in forms now available for vehicle registration renewals?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I have a rough figure. I understand about 20 per cent of the people have renewed by mail this year, which is a considerable improvement over last year.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Now that the mail-in forms are in place and the 20 per cent is mailing in, they don't have to have proof of insurance. Has the Solicitor General had any reports of increases of motor vehicle drivers who don't have insurance on their automobiles?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, with the co-operation of the Insurance Bureau of Canada membership, the officials are carrying out a survey to determine the validity of the responder certifications on applications for licences. That work has not been completed yet. I could make it available when it is.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the Solicitor General's Department spot check with insurance companies with regard to — an applicant for insurance comes in and has a pink card. Do they check for sure to see that there is insurance on these automobiles? Are any spot checks made?

MR. HARLE: At the present time, I believe the only checking has been to see that there is in fact a pink card. But as all of us know, pink cards are very easy to come by. Over the years we have tried to work out a better system of trying to have valid pink cards and some kind of inventory, if you like, of pink cards. But I don't think that has been very practical. At present, as I've said, we're carrying out a study on the mail-in certifications first.

#### After School Program

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health. It flows from the decision this morning by the social services committee of the Calgary city council to reject the province's offer on after-school care. The city estimates the total costs of maintaining the present provincial program in the range of \$2 million, and the province's offer is only \$570,000. What consideration is being given by the government to increase the per-child amount for after-school programs in this province? What, if any, specific action is going to be taken as a result of the decision in Calgary this morning?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, first of all, once the provincial budget is brought down by my colleague the Provincial Treasurer next Tuesday evening, further data will be available, and we'll be able to discuss the matter more fully at that time. I can say that it is our intent to ensure that those youngsters currently enrolled in after-school programs funded by the provincial government will continue to receive their funding, whether or not there is an agreement with the municipality of Calgary or any other municipality in the province.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The minister has indicated that there will be a continued

payment regardless of whether an agreement is reached with the municipality. But in view of the fact that the municipalities have to bear a fair percentage of the cost, what will happen in the event that an agreement is not reached with a given municipality? Who will pick up that portion of the cost, and how will it be determined? For example, who will make the decisions?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I can address those questions more fully once the provincial budget has been brought down. We can then address the entire matter in the fullest context.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. In view of the increase in the demand for after-school care, is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether the government is giving any consideration to capital cost and start-up funding, in addition to the per-student or per-child funding for operations, once an after-school care operation is established?

MR. BOGLE: Again, Mr. Speaker, matters which I'll have to defer until after the provincial budget is brought down, as we are discussing matters which will more properly be dealt with at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the last supplementary.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In view of the information municipalities must obtain in order to make decisions, what specific consideration is now being given by the government, first of all, with respect to the increase per annum which, according to the figures from Calgary, is 9.5 per cent — and we have an inflation rate significantly above that — and whether there's going to be any commitment to cost sharing for administrative support, when in fact the documents given to the city of Calgary indicate there won't be? Is this matter being reviewed? Can we expect some announcement to be made in the budget with respect to equalling the inflation rate plus cost sharing for administrative support?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, as tempting as the hon. member's questions are, they'll have to wait until the budget is brought down.

#### **Building Standards**

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour and is a follow-up to some questions addressed to him Tuesday. I'd like to ask the minister whether he could explain to the House what objections he has to the proposed NRC prescriptive building code for commercial buildings, with particular regard to insulation standards.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I think I should immediately make the point that the responsibility of the building code is primarily for public safety and general safety. That may differ in some respect from the objective the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry has in mind in addressing his question. It's fair to say that in adopting the Alberta building code, which was just recently revised, effective shortly, the standards for insulation — and they are really thermal insulation standards — were altered, as I explained a couple of days ago, in order to bring them in line with the standard of practice for over 50 per cent of the building in the province now, so there

wouldn't be any inconsistency between the standards in the building code and those of the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation or, for that matter, at the present time, the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

When it comes to commercial buildings, that's a totally different situation with respect to the objectives of general safety and public safety as opposed to energy consumption. Mr. Speaker, if it is your wish, I would be quite ready to move into the area of discussion of prescriptive building codes and the alternative performance requirements for energy consumption for commercial buildings. If I do that, let me simply say that, while the National Research Council suggested code ostensibly was to specify performance requirements, in critiquing the recommendations of the National Research Council, the associate committee of the national building code said that it is recognized that certain requirements, especially those for mechanical and lighting systems, will restrict the use of some present day practices.

I would go further and say that in a speech, I believe just a week ago, a former president of the Building Owners and Managers Association indicated that, given the lack of knowledge general in the industry, and the variety of alternatives available, some of the insulations would in fact be of much higher cost in terms of energy consumption than need be the case.

In short, Mr. Speaker, technology is changing, and man's ability to keep up with it, weigh it carefully, and use it in the proper context, have not managed to remain abreast of technological changes.

MR. COOK: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In its building code, Quebec has included a prescriptive building code that takes effect July 1. Many jurisdictions in North America are moving in this direction — the United States, certainly. Could the minister assure the House that officials of his department are monitoring developments in Quebec and other jurisdictions in North America, to find out what their experience with a prescriptive building code is?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to assure the hon. member that indeed officials of the Department of Labour and several other departments of this government are working jointly with respect to codes, energy consumption, and performance requirements of buildings. The fact that other jurisdictions may have proceeded to go in a prescriptive or performance requirement manner does not take away from the concerns I have advanced that the general consensus in this area isn't as widespread as, in our view, would warrant the action that others may be taking.

MR. COOK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister's concerns seem to be of a technical nature. He's not satisfied that a prescriptive code would in fact be functional. I wonder why that might be? Is it a lack of technical staff to train the work force to install the kind of equipment, or design the buildings to cut back on energy conservation? Is it the inspectorate that would be required? What motivates the minister's concern about prescriptive codes in particular?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, we have now ventured well outside the mandate of my ministerial responsibility and into that of one of my colleague ministers. But I will simply offer the personal observation that I have a great concern, that I think is shared by my fellow ministers,

with respect to undue regulatory processes. There's no question that evaluation of performance requirements, when there are many different technologies and systems which could conceivably lead to those performance requirements, would engage government upon a tremendous bureaucratic exercise.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the last supplementary. The Chair has some misgiving that perhaps we're involved in a research exercise which perhaps the hon. member might pursue outside the Assembly.

MR. COOK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister's department calculated the cost of heating commercial buildings in Alberta, the experience here relative to other jurisdictions where there is a code, in particular the new buildings going up and their design efficiencies, and secondly, what the impact might be on the natural gas price protection plan, which offers almost a one-third cost subsidy from the Provincial Treasury for inefficient buildings?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I'm obviously being questioned well beyond the ministerial responsibilities I have. To begin with, I would simply say that the premise on which the question is based is a comparison of heating costs for buildings in Alberta as opposed to in the United States primarily, because I'm aware of no other place in North America where those codes are observed yet. That would mean that the climatic conditions would be totally different. Equally, I suspect many of the construction practices would be quite different.

#### Public Service

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to put a question to the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration. It's related to the report of the Ombudsman that you tabled in this House the other day. Before I put the question, I'd like to ask the minister if he's had an opportunity to read the report, with particular attention to page 3, relating to the public service.

MR. STEVENS: Yes I have, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The Ombudsman comments, 'Ombudsmen in this part of the world work on the theory that the Public Service is anonymous ...' I find that intriguing in that many of our programs carried out by this Assembly are implemented by them. Specifically, the Ombudsman claims that the level of service to the public in the province of Alberta is in great danger of further deterioration, and this must not be allowed to happen. Could the minister advise the Assembly if that is his perception and if he has taken any steps to correct this?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the question from the Member for Lethbridge West. I appreciate also that the Ombudsman is an officer of the Assembly. The report has been tabled, and a select committee is yet to be established. There may be details that will need to be looked at by the committee. But on this question dealing with the public service, the Ombudsman took the time to bring his concerns to my attention. We discussed them.

I perhaps should point out that in his report he mentions that the majority of our public service in Alber-

ta are dedicated, concerned, and hard-working individuals. I share that view, and on behalf of all my colleagues, in fact all of this House, I'd like to go on record that the labors of our Alberta public service are appreciated. They work very hard. But I think in any organization — one might think of shopping, visiting a garage or any other industry or large enterprise — there are going to be some insensitive people. Of course the Ombudsman has done all of us a service in bringing these to our attention, and through the year.

I might comment also that in going through the report there is a table. I think if I just take a moment — I have the report here, and not all members may have it. On pages 25 and 26 a table talks about the summary of dispositions by the Ombudsman. I notice, for example, that 11,527 complaints were received and 1,251 complaints were justified. My mathematics suggest that's about 10 per cent. I think that's a pretty good record. I'd like to see it a lot less.

We've established a number of training programs in the department ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo with a point of order.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order regarding the length of responses to questions. I apologize to the hon. minister for interrupting him. I think quite often questions are asked that could be satisfied with a yes or no response. However, because the ministers are in a good position to have more background information on the questions, they give more data. That's to be desired, because to have more information brought before us is a function of the House. I'd just ask, sir, that perhaps similar toleration could from time to time be given to those asking the questions.

MR. SPEAKER: With regard to the point of order, I agree that a ministerial answer needn't analyse public information. But there is a very, very considerable amount of leeway in the questions being asked, and it would seem that there should be similar leeway in the answers. Occasionally if a question has barbs in it, it would be less than fair if a minister were not allowed to deal with that part of the question, because those are in fact disguised or undisguised debate. It's almost impossible to have a question period in which some element of debate doesn't enter into either the questions or the answers. If I can be made aware of any undue latitude in answers that doesn't have its counterpart in questions — and I'm not aware of that at the moment — I will be glad to deal with each instance as it arises.

MR. STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To be brief then, each department has a training program. In addition the central personnel office has a series of training programs which encourage our employees to understand the sensitivity and awareness they must have in carrying out their duties.

I apologize for the length of my answer. On the other hand I think it was important, on behalf of 34,000 employees, to state that we appreciate their services in Alberta at this booming time in our economy.

MR. GOGO: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Ombudsman goes on to say that "I feel that new exerted efforts must be put into effect immediately." I'd be quite prepared if the minister would care to

respond to me in a memo. I simply would like his comment as to whether or not he accepts that judgment and if, in effect, steps are being taken immediately.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I'd be very pleased to provide the member with the list of our programs and our exerted efforts in this area.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister, for clarification. The minister said he was responsible for 34,000 civil servants, I believe. Is that the figure the minister used?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I indicated approximately 34,000 people are in the bargaining unit, exempt and opted out management groups.

MR. SPEAKER: I apologize to the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury and the Member for Calgary Buffalo, who was going to ask a second question. Again perhaps there was too much latitude in regard to supplementaries. For example, on the first question we had four supplementaries by the hon. Leader of the Opposition and six by other members.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that questions 110 to 112 and motions for returns 113 to 119 all stand and retain their places on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

MR. SPEAKER: Might the hon. Member for Drumheller revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. L. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me today to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 100 grade 9 students from the Samuel Crowther high school in Strathmore. Strathmore is not only the fastest-growing town in my constituency; it's one of the fastest-growing in Alberta.

AN HON. MEMBER: Second to Airdrie.

MR. L. CLARK: Second to Airdrie maybe. Anyway, they are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Bill Murray and his wife, Mr. Wally Hawn, Donna Cameron, Mrs. Helfrich, and Mrs. Galarneau. I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure that *Hansard* will have duly recorded the motion by the hon. Deputy Government House Leader, but the Clerk and I are not in that happy situation. We were not able to note the numbers as the hon. deputy leader mentioned them. Perhaps he might repeat them please.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, all the questions and motions are included in my motion. Those are: questions

110 to 112 inclusive and motions for returns 113 to 119 inclusive.

#### head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

208. Moved by Mr. R. Speaker:

Be it resolved that this Assembly urge the government to suspend the maximum petroleum production regulation under The Mines and Minerals Act for 30 days as an indication to all Canadians of Alberta's good will and serious intent to negotiate, in good faith, an energy pricing agreement with the federal government.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, it is with that intent that I intend to make my remarks here this afternoon. I've placed this motion before the House today because it certainly deserves close attention by all members. We're facing a very serious situation in our province and our country because we have not reached an energy agreement at this time, after some months of negotiation and some delay that is unexplainable in this Legislature and has certainly been unexplainable to Albertans. It has been our point as an opposition group to try to determine why that delay has occurred. But we haven't. So today we're faced with a situation where we must be prepared to move ahead with a motion and give our support, assistance, and direction to the government to move into those negotiations in the best possible manner.

What about this motion before us today, Mr. Speaker? The motion calls for a temporary halt to Alberta's oil cutbacks in an attempt to give Alberta the upper hand as our Minister of Energy and Natural Resources finally returns to the bargaining table next week. Our motion continues the Social Credit plan for this session of providing a fresh, different approach by urging the government to improve the atmosphere of negotiations and to take the ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. SPEAKER: ... put Ottawa on the defensive ... [interruption]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I hesitate interrupting, but I just wonder what's going on here. Is there some problem with the sound system? Is the hon. Leader of the Opposition being heard?

HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not understood, though.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, as an aside in my remarks, in the renovations of this Assembly, I certainly hope we're able to have television cameras with good equipment placed on that side of the Assembly, as is done on this side of the Assembly. That is why we're in the situation we are at the present time. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. This is perhaps not the time to deal with this matter. But I assure the hon. leader most emphatically that the Chair is not aware of any difference in quality between the facilities provided for the media on one side of the House from what is provided on the other. It is true that the television position on one side of the House is larger than on the other.



But that is to accommodate the use which in fact takes place.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, and that's what it's become, I certainly hope the Speaker will take under consideration that the facility on that side of the Assembly become as large as the facility on this side, and that opposition in this province has equal opportunity to the press and the media as the government has. [interjections] There's only one way an opposition can be effective in this province. We're a small opposition. Big government put their thumb on us all the time; think they can. But they're not going to put their thumb on the opposition. [interjections] Mr. Speaker, I plead to you that the medium through which we as an opposition reach the people of this province — we may be one; we may be four — is the free and good use of the press. It's unfair when this Assembly doesn't make that provision.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I wonder if the Chair would allow the press to adjust their equipment for this speech. Apparently it's just a matter of placing it in a different position until something else can be done to correct it.

MR. SPEAKER: No objection at all. Perhaps one of the pages or we can ... But this is not the time, and certainly I don't intend to enter into a debate. Perhaps it would not be improper to say in passing that insofar as I'm aware, no parliament anywhere in the Commonwealth provides freer and more wide-open facilities. They are not under government control. The government doesn't conduct a so-called electronic *Hansard*. However, if specific items can be improved, certainly I'm interested.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. As you say, it's not the place to bring this up. But the opportunity for equipment is just not adequate on that side. Quite obviously, my constituents wouldn't recognize me from the front, because for 12 years they've had nothing but the back. I think that is the point we are trying to make. [interjections]

DR. BUCK: It may be subtle to the — fine for the 74 puppets who sit over on that side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I don't think the amount of space available to the press on the other side of the House affects the visibility of the hon. members of the opposition so much perhaps as the lack of research that goes into their work. They would get better press if they had better work.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would respectfully suggest that we drop the matter now. It has been duly brought to the attention of everyone in the House, including me. I undertake to look into it. With the concurrence of the Assembly might I respectfully suggest that the time taken for this item not be counted in the time limit for the designated motion. Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on another point of order. With regard to the innuendo raised by the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry about research about

the facilities, I feel the hon. member should withdraw that remark.

DR. BUCK: Apologize, withdraw.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I amend that to a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: I regret that the point of privilege has escaped my perception. I'm unable to deal with it. I'm not saying I didn't hear what was said.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I guess I'll agree with you. Those words don't amount to very much anyway. They're normally not very well thought out.

I'm sorry we have been diverted from the importance of the matter at hand. Energy negotiations and the energy future of not only Alberta but Canada is a matter we must settle and that this government must accept as a responsibility. The Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, who is going out for coffee, has a big responsibility in settling that argument in negotiations next week. The Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, who really doesn't want to hear what this Legislature has to say, has left as well. They feel they can run it by themselves and that this Legislature doesn't tell them how or when to negotiate or what approaches to use. Everything is done behind closed doors and behind the backs of Albertans. I think that is an affront to the democratic process and to this Legislature, that goes on day after day after day.

This government thinks that it runs the affairs of Alberta. This government is not the last body of responsibility. It is this Legislature that makes decisions, then the government is responsible for carrying out that activity. That is not the process respected by this government. I hope the people of Alberta soon recognize that fact. I'm glad the media was able to see the demonstration that went on here a few moments ago about the affront to the legislative process, because that kind of message must be gotten to Albertans about the performance of this government in this Legislature. Oppositions don't matter. People don't matter. It's what happens to their jobs and their future, because they're complacent with the power they think they have.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we are in difficulty in negotiations with Ottawa, because the very same approach is used. It's not a negotiating approach. It's one of confrontation, not caring about the future nor about Albertans or other Canadians. That is why we're in difficulty with regard to negotiations, and the approach of this government is very upsetting to me and my colleagues. We are attempting in a very positive concrete way, to suggest to this government that there is at least one thing they can do in moving into the negotiations. In the negotiations we recognize this government has painted itself into a corner. They have sacrificed ownership of natural resources by Albertans, and we can only say that this position at the present time is certainly creating a threat to Alberta and Albertans.

I want to talk about where we stand as a Social Credit party. We stand very firm, Mr. Speaker, in the position that Alberta's ownership of its natural resources must never be questioned. That is a basic position that should not change. That is a principle that Social Credit has stood for for years and for 36 years as government maintained a very firm position. Mr. Speaker, a Social Credit premier never sold Alberta's oil for less than the

fair market value. That is on the record.

We all recognize that the sudden rise in world oil prices in the early 1970s caused strains on the Canadian fabric. As Alberta sought better value for its energy resources, the federal government sought to deny the rightful value of those resources. But we on this side of the Legislature feel that the federal government's most recent and grave threats to the ownership of our natural resources are a consequence of the attitude and style of this Conservative government in the past years, and the style and image given to us here again in this Legislature today: a very sad performance, Mr. Speaker.

The serious threats of the Ottawa constitutional debate, of the national energy policy to the ownership of our natural resources would never have occurred, as it has today, had the Alberta government, this Conservative government, shown more skill in dealing with the federal government and the rest of Canada on the matter of energy price, Mr. Speaker. And I feel committed to and very firm about that. We believe that the actions of this Tory provincial government have done much to undermine Alberta's basic claim to the ownership of natural resources.

Every negotiation has two parties, Mr. Speaker. The government seems to have forgotten the technique of negotiation, in terms of confrontation and a war, talk of war, talk of bleeding, continually with Ottawa. Two lessons in negotiation must be learned and raised at this time. First of all, in negotiations you must define your principles, define what you stand for. Those principles are not negotiable, Mr. Speaker. After that you define the terms which are negotiable, and then you negotiate with optimism and excitement. You avoid confrontation and never refuse to meet and discuss the positions which are negotiable. Can we say that has been done by this government? No we can't, Mr. Speaker. Secondly, we must be positive. We must take the initiative. It is better to be on the offensive than on the defensive. Those are the criteria I want to use this afternoon to again judge this government's performance, its responsibility to successfully — or not successfully, as I've pointed out — negotiate any energy pricing agreement.

Mr. Speaker, the Social Credit position is clear with regard to principle. We believe Alberta owns 100 percent of its resources and so should get 100 per cent of fair value. Ownership is a principle and we alone as a party in Alberta say that that ownership principle is not negotiable. What is negotiable, then, with the federal government? It is the sharing of the revenue, the sharing of the revenue from the sale of those resources, Mr. Speaker. I want to say very clearly that to be willing to settle for less than fair market value undermines the principle of ownership, and the Conservative government has undermined Alberta's claim by setting a goal of only 75 per cent of fair value of the resources. Mr. Speaker, that is the position of Social Credit. Over the past years, had this government used Social Credit policy, clearly defined principles, not talked of war, not talked of threats, I believe we could have avoided the stalemate we are in today. That, I feel, is the situation.

May I remind the House that the present Premier was the first to sell our resources for less than fair market value. Mr. Speaker, let's not have anyone in this Assembly suggest that the Social Credit position of 100 per cent ownership would solve the situation we face today and that the negotiators face next week. I'm not making that point this afternoon. I do not suggest for a minute that that is the solution. The present failure of negotiation is a

problem that the Conservative government created over the last eight to 10 years in their approach to government. My motion this afternoon offers them a way to show good will and a way to help them out of today's situation in a way that will give some support and some hope that the negotiations and discussions next week can be successful.

Mr. Speaker, I'm confident that the government members who speak on the resolution this afternoon will take great delight in reciting the November 3 remarks of the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. However, my attention will focus on what this government has done and failed to do since those remarks. On November 3, 1980, Social Credit gave the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources the benefit of the doubt, and we supported the government with regard to the position at that time and the concern about the cutback of oil.

I'd like to quote what I said on behalf of our party on November 3, 1980: we have said that if the negotiations are at a point where the government needs this kind of tool, referring to the cutbacks, to negotiate further with Ottawa and to protect our rights to our natural resources, specifically oil and gas, then we'll support that and go with the government at this point in time because that's most necessary.

I also said and qualified the statement:

I believe that in the next three months it's going to be very incumbent upon the Premier and the Prime Minister to try with every means and with every capability to bring about some kind of agreement that will accommodate the needs of . . . Canadians.

I pointed out in question period today that it has taken longer than three months. We've had a six-month period when we really haven't had anything happen. I mentioned there, that on November 17 the minister released figures about the impact of the national energy program. There was a communique of the ministers. There was a book written. But still these months have passed, and we felt that nothing was happening. There was scepticism on our part. Finally, a couple of weeks ago we said, if there are no negotiations, no initiatives from the government, we're withdrawing that commitment and support we've given the government.

I also say to the government at this time that if we see that meaningful and worth-while negotiations are going to continue, and the support is required with regard to the cutback, we'd be willing to reconsider that. But we feel the government was given our commitment on good faith that negotiations would happen. Mr. Speaker, we're not sure that that has been the case. We feel it's now time for a fresher approach and that this resolution contains a mechanism for breaking the deadlock we're in with Ottawa at the present time. The resolution offers a positive initiative, not a concession nor a capitulation to Ottawa in any way that I can see. We feel Social Credit offers a resolution to create a healthier negotiating environment where Alberta can take the initiative, and we will find the federal government more on the defence when they are faced with this kind of decision.

There is no doubt that the failure to reach an energy pricing agreement is in large part due to the attitude and extreme position of the federal government and, as I've said, the provincial government as well at the present time. But to increase the probability of success, and that's what we're trying to do today, we must create this favorable negotiating environment. A suspension of the oil cutbacks for one month would effectively serve that purpose. The suspension of oil cutbacks for 30 days

would not in any way weaken our bargaining position, Mr. Speaker. On the contrary, suspending oil cutbacks would strengthen that bargaining position.

I think it would strengthen it with regard to three aspects. Firstly, with regard to public opinion. Our Premier went on television on October 30 to get public opinion in that presentation, not only support from Albertans but other Canadians. If we move with this resolution and support it, I think we can gain certain public support to show that we really are trying here in Alberta. Is that just a concern of our Alberta audience? No it isn't. Hopefully that the message will go to our Toronto audience. That in turn affects our federal government's attitude. Just a short time ago a Goldfarb study was taken in the Toronto area with regard to attitudes on the cutback. Seventy-seven per cent of Toronto residents felt that the Alberta oil cutbacks were unjustified. Hopefully this resolution can get to some of those people, and they'll feel that we're really trying in Alberta. Mr. Speaker, I think the resolution can perform for us in terms of public opinion.

Secondly, suspension of the oil cutbacks would place the federal government in a more difficult position. Whether you call it the Lalonde levy or the Loughheed levy, that levy would have to be removed. If the federal government didn't do it, I think they would certainly be open to criticism by all Canadians. Thirdly, I feel that the suspension of oil cutbacks would effectively and clearly place the ball in the court of the federal government, and that's necessary.

Some other arguments have been placed in this Legislature, and I'd just like to relate to them very quickly in my final remarks. An argument has been made that a one-month suspension of oil cutbacks is unacceptable for conservation purposes and reasons. Mr. Speaker, the real situation is that our entire energy stalemate is unacceptable for conservation reasons. Is the resumption of 5 per cent of production for one month too high a price to pay for increasing the chances and the opportunity of securing an energy pricing agreement in Canada today? That's my question: is it too high a price to pay? Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is.

One of the other arguments that's placed before this Legislature is that the resolution doesn't make economic sense. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't agree with that argument either. Did it make economic sense when we talked about Cold Lake today, and the economic and social problems that are occurring up there that this government is ignoring every day? They don't even realize what's going on up there. Every month that goes by costs an extra \$150 million with regard to that. Between \$1 billion and \$2 billion will be lost if we delay the project a year. It's a question whether the project can even get back on stream if we delay it past June. Does this really make economic sense? Lift the cutbacks for a month and bring negotiations back to a sensible stage.

Mr. Speaker, we are saying this to this government: be tough with Ottawa. The way to be tough at this time is to seize the upper hand, to show initiative, and to place Ottawa on the defensive in public opinion and in the substance of negotiation. A 30-day suspension of cutbacks is just what it is, a positive way to improve the chances for success at next week's negotiations. That's what I think all members of this Legislature should want. In discussing this, and when we debate the issue, that should be the focus of debate.

Is there a better way to bring about a healthy atmosphere for negotiations? If some member has a better

suggestion, then lay it on the table. But I hope the debate doesn't become distracted into other issues. There is one issue here: we're creating an attitude, a willingness to show good will. We as a Legislature should get behind such an idea and support it in Alberta and Canada. We are attempting to play our part, and we will, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ISLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand totally opposed to Motion 208, put forward by the hon. Member for Little Bow. Further, I am confident that the vast majority of the people in the Bonnyville constituency support me in that opposition. I remind the hon. members of this House to keep in mind that I represent a constituency that is experiencing real economic suffering as a result of the lack of an overall energy pricing agreement and a go-ahead of the Esso project. I have a difficult time following the logic, or lack thereof, of the hon. Member for Little Bow. I had the occasion of serving on a select committee of this Legislature with the hon. member, and I developed a respect for him. I felt that he had a feeling of the people of this province. But I would suggest that with what he's putting before this House, he is losing touch with the feeling of Albertans.

DR. BUCK: Of course, if you don't believe what the government says, you're nothing. [desk thumping] Sure, you puppets.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ISLEY: I suggest . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I realize this expression has been used on a number of occasions. It's not a parliamentary expression. I would invite the hon. member to reconsider.

DR. BUCK: There's another one, Mr. Speaker: if the shoe fits, wear it. I will not withdraw that statement.

AN HON. MEMBER: Withdraw.

AN HON. MEMBER: Retract.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the hon. member wish to give no further consideration to withdrawing that expression.

DR. BUCK: Withdrawing which expression, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The word "puppets" as used to all the other colleagues in the House, with the possible exception of the opposition.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I will have a look at *Hansard* and then I will make a decision.

MR. SPEAKER: I regret that the Chair is unable to accept that. There can't be any doubt in anyone's mind as to the word that was used. There's no question about it. I would certainly defer to the hon. member if there were a genuine need to refer to *Hansard*, but I'm unable to perceive that need.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, the voting record of the members of this Assembly will justify my contention that they do what they are told to do and ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is not the point of substance. The point of substance is a rather insulting expression used with regard to other members of the Assembly. That's my concern. It's not what the voting patterns may be on either side of the House.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, could you be so kind as to indicate to me which section of *Beauchesne* indicates that the term "puppet" is unparliamentary?

MR. SPEAKER: At the moment, I'm unable to do that. I must simply rely on my knowledge of what is appropriate and what is not appropriate. This is a term of insult.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I humbly submit that that is your opinion. My opinion is that people who do what they are told to do, and their voting record in this Legislature indicates that, are manipulated. To me, manipulated means that you pull strings. They do what they are told to do, Mr. Speaker, and that's why I've used the term. I didn't think it was derogatory.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I would suggest it is quite irrelevant whether or not the hon. Member for Clover Bar regards the opinion of the Chair to be somewhat less than consequential. The fact of the matter is that the Chair has ruled. If the hon. member refuses to withdraw the remarks which have been found by the Chair to be offensive to the Assembly and to the traditions of this House, I would ask that the Chair take the necessary steps to have the hon. member comply.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I'd like to raise with the Speaker *Beauchesne*. I have reviewed the list of terms listed in *Beauchesne* on pages 106, 107, 108, and 109. To my knowledge the word "puppets" is not one of those I find listed. Mr. Speaker, I think the decision would set a precedent, and on that basis should be reviewed accordingly.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. If the hon. member would refer to page 104, Section 319(3) points out that it's improper "to impute to any Member or Members unworthy motives for their actions in a particular case". The hon. Member for Clover Bar is clearly assigning to us some motives that we're incapable of acting for ourselves. He's reflecting poorly on the government members. As a member of the government members' caucus, I support your ruling and ask the hon. Member for Clover Bar to withdraw his comments.

MR. YOUNG: Rising on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of hon. members to page 114 of *Beauchesne*, and particularly Section 324. I draw the attention of all members to the point made in *Beauchesne* that "much depends upon the tone and manner, and intention, of the person speaking". It is beyond any doubt, with respect to what we have all witnessed, as to the tone and the intention. And the hon. Member for Clover Bar has gone further and expressed his intention to you and to members of the House by way of elaboration. So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the hon. member seriously consider the decorum of the House, and the respect in which the Chair should be held.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, arising to speak to the point of order. I want to deal with Section 319(3); I believe the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry raised this. It relates to imputing "to any Member or Members unworthy motives". The hon. member seemed rather upset" because the suggestion of being a puppet would imply a lack of ability. Mr. Speaker, it is not an unparliamentary expression to imply lack of confidence in a member's ability. That is part of the political process. That's a part of the debate.

If the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry is upset that some hon. members in the House may question his ability, I regret that. I regret it very deeply. But unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it is not something he should get exercised about, because it's not a point of privilege. And it's surely not "something [to] which, frankly, a Speaker should apply the rules. I think it is clear and distinct that if a statement or an expression or the use of language implies an improper motive for doing something, then the member clearly has an obligation to withdraw. Because all members of this Assembly are honorable members, and we are not entitled to question in any way the honor of another member of the House.

The hon. Member for Clover Bar didn't do that. In his expressive way, the hon. Member for Clover Bar raised a comment about the competence of the government members of the House. While not every Albertan may agree with the assessment of the hon. Member for Clover Bar of the competence of members of the House — although I think a growing number do, and we hope even more will — the fact of the matter is that that is not an unparliamentary expression. It would only be unparliamentary if the motives were imputed, and they were not in this case. The competence was, and that is clearly within the purview of any hon. member of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: It's not necessarily a question of motives. Usually motives are apparent from what is being said. There are a number of examples given in *Beauchesne*, some of which are very much milder than the one we're dealing with now; for example, the reference in 320 (l)(e) to "a servile follower of ... government". Now if ever there was a diplomatic way of saying "puppet", that would be it.

I really must say that the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview has hit the very essential of the question. All of us sit here by reason of having been chosen by voters of Alberta. They are the judges of competence. To affront in an unparliamentary way a member who has been elected by those voters is, of course, a lack of respect not only to the member but also to the people in his or her constituency, whom the member represents. There is no doubt at all in my mind that in the best parliamentary tradition and standards the expression is unparliamentary: I would respectfully and earnestly ask the Member for Clover Bar, out of consideration not only for his own constituents but for those who are represented by other members in the Assembly, to give serious consideration to dealing further with the matter.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, something disturbs me very greatly. We members on this side of the House somehow have the feeling that if we do not do and say exactly what the 74 members on the other side of the House say, it is either unpatriotic or not the thing to do or not the people's will or un-Albertan. What I am trying to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, is that when the hon. Leader of the Opposition got up and entered into debate, he was trying

to express to the people of this province, of this Assembly, that we have a different point of view. What disturbs me is when he is immediately followed by a government member who is practically rising in righteous indignation because somebody would have the audacity to have a viewpoint other than what the other members of this Assembly have. Mr. Speaker, that is when I think I have the right to say that they are not thinking as they would like to think, but they are thinking as the strings indicate to them. If that is offensive to the government members, I find very disturbing that we on this side of the House do not have the freedom of speech to which we think we are entitled.

I don't know what they did with that Bill of Rights, but I wish they'd bring it back here so those Tories could read it ... [interjections] ... because they are trying to muzzle me. They are attempting to muzzle us. Mr. Speaker, that's not what I think we're here for. Some people may be able to stand that. One member over there couldn't stand that kind of muzzling.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Where is he?

MR. R. CLARK: He got kicked out of the government caucus.

DR. BUCK: He's been so ostracized — that man has a lot of intestinal fortitude to even be here, with the ostracism he receives from the other side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Withdraw, withdraw.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I am not withdrawing anything. If you are what I said you are, then you are. I think my right to free speech is being taken away, and I will not withdraw.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I don't think this debate needs to be prolonged much longer. Clearly the hon. member clearly is trying to cloud the issue. There are two ways to define the concept of being parliamentary. One is by definition, a broad, general point on what is parliamentary and what is not. The other is to go through and cite previous examples. To say it has not been used before and therefore not cited in the examples offered by *Beauchesne* is not to say that the language or tone is parliamentary or unparliamentary.

I have a great deal of respect for your rulings, Mr. Speaker, and I think the hon. members in the House do too. I think we would like to support that ruling. I would again ask the hon. Member for Clover Bar to withdraw his comments, which are clearly unparliamentary in that they reflect on the conduct of the hon. members on the government side.

MR. SPEAKER: I must say that the incident and the need to intervene are matters of very, very substantial regret to the Chair. I don't know whether the hon. Member for Clover Bar wishes to consider the matter any further or make any further observations which may be pertinent to the question under consideration. If he wishes to do so, I would be glad to hear him.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I think the opportunity to speak what you think is very, very important. The freedom to speak is the foundation, the basis of our parliamentary system, our British tradition. If you, in your wisdom, were to say that I should be thrown out of this

Legislature because I've called the government backbenchers puppets, Mr. Speaker, I would consider that, if that was just the first time I had made that statement. But I would have great difficulty understanding why a ruling was not made previously, if you, in your wisdom, think that ruling should be made now.

We've heard the term ... [interjection] Never mind the yes or no. Why don't you do something, Johnston? Get the negotiations back on track.

The term "rubber stamp" has been used. What is the difference between a rubber stamp and a puppet? [interjections] I guess the difference is that one has strings and the other, you just tell the guy what to do.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very, very strongly on this point. I can understand that the hon. members take offence. That's fine. I guess if you have a large majority, as this government has, and you feel you can do anything you wish and no one must question it, then I guess you would be sensitive if you were called a puppet. But the record of people voting en masse in instances when constituents sent volumes of mail to them indicating that is not our wish; we wish you to represent our views, not the government views — that record indicates that the elected people on that side of the House are not doing what the wishes of their constituents indicate. I think maybe my case is that these people have voted as the government wanted them to vote, not as their constituents wished to have them to express their views.

Mr. Speaker, the last point I want to make: I cannot understand how, if an hon. member — I think I'm an honorable member, and I think all members of this House are honorable members — was asked to leave this House on an issue which I think is not that serious ... The rule book we go by does not use that term as an unparliamentary term. There are terms I would consider unparliamentary and that I would never use in this Assembly. But that was not the first time the term was used. Therefore if I was sitting in your position, I would have great difficulty rationalizing how I could throw an hon. member out of this Assembly at this time, when I did not do it in several instances before. I think I would have great difficulty with that, Mr. Speaker, sitting in your position.

On those grounds, because the rule was never enforced — if you are going to enforce a rule, it was not enforced in the first instance — it cannot be enforced in this instance. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I humbly say my conscience would not permit me to withdraw that statement.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. In view of the fact that this incident has taken so much time of the House this afternoon, I would suggest that time be taken to reflect upon what has taken place, that a review of *Hansard* be undertaken in order to deal with this matter more effectively at a later date, and that we should resume the debate which was under way. In view of the earlier unanimous agreement of the House with respect to the first interruption, I would also like to suggest that the time taken up with this particular point of order not be considered to have cut into the time designated for this motion, that the time that would normally have been allotted to it be allowed to continue, and that the hon. Member for Bonnyville be permitted to continue his remarks while this matter is under review.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I certainly support the hon. acting House leader. Mr. Speaker, you have made a decision and that decision is

very well noted. The hon. member has stated a word in a manner and tone, and amplified that word and what he believes he meant. Maybe he did not really mean that. But I agree that he should have time for reflection, and maybe calmness will prevail. It certainly would sadden all of us if that decision was not made in the appropriate manner. So he knows, and we all know what has taken place here. Time and calmness over time may change the decision.

MR. SPEAKER: With regard to the expression having been used before, I think that probably is so. As a matter of fact, I mentioned that when I first intervened. However, that does not really change the quality of the expression. Occasionally expressions slip by in the course of debate and are not always immediately apparent in their full significance. On this occasion, the expression stood by itself. It was rather obvious. It had what you might call a high profile in the House. Of course in following precedents, we should follow good ones rather than bad ones.

I'm prepared to deal with the matter. Our *Standing Orders* are somewhat unique in this regard, in that they say that if the Assembly considers the matter serious, the Assembly deals with it. I've always thought that under our *Standing Orders*, the Speaker should first ask whether the Assembly wishes to deal with it and then, if the Assembly does not wish to deal with it, the onus is on the Speaker. However, I detect a fairly substantial consensus that the matter not be dealt with further at the moment. If that consensus extends to unanimity in the House, then of course I must respect the wishes of the Assembly, and I shall do so. Therefore I'm going to ask the Assembly whether there is unanimous consent to follow the course advocated by the hon. Deputy Government House Leader. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there any dissent? So ordered.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that my Bill comes up at 4:30, I would certainly like to endorse the suggestion the hon. acting House leader made that, if the House wishes, the time used on the point of order would go on to the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: I'll have to ask the Clerk if he is able to make the necessary calculations. Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member who was speaking then continue; please.

MR. ISLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I must say that I am somewhat disappointed in two things: first of all, the rude interruption and, secondly, the implication that I was speaking someone else's opinion. I display to you my rough notes, to show that they are mine.

The question I was about to raise to the hon. Member for Little Bow is: suppose we followed the advice of his motion and suspended production cutbacks by 30 days, suppose the meeting next week with the federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources is another public relations activity, as we experienced for the previous year and a half, what would he then suggest we do? Turn the taps

off again? If that is his suggestion, isn't that something like putting the gun to the head of someone negotiating?

I was very interested in the hon. member's opening remarks about his fresh approach, the new Social Credit look. I tried to sit here and evaluate that fresh approach. I would have to define it as a weak-kneed, capitulating approach. A suggestion that all Canadians should start paying world prices, an elimination of any cost-competitive energy position for Canadians — I'm not sure I like the new approach.

The hon. member suggests we must show good faith. I submit that the offer our hon. Premier made to the hon. Prime Minister of Canada in July 1980 shows exceptionally good faith and a tremendous commitment by Albertans to create a stronger, more economically viable Canada. I'm not going to go into the details of that offer. I think most members are quite familiar with them, and I realize other speakers wish to follow after me.

I mentioned earlier that my constituency was suffering from a lack of an energy agreement and the approval of the Esso megaproject. Yet I've also stated that by and large the residents of the Bonnyville constituency oppose this motion and support our provincial government's action in, number one, reducing production of conventional crude and, number two, delaying approval of the Esso and Alsands megaprojects until we have an overall energy agreement. I'd like to deal with those two subjects separately: firstly, the suffering; secondly, the support and why I feel the support is there.

I think we're doing some political suffering in our area. I believe we suffered through the only two public meetings the Hon. Marc Lalonde held in Alberta. I must say the man is a very sharp, smooth, shrewd politician. He was received very coolly in our area, but very politely, which I think is a credit to the people of rural Alberta. He was sent back to Ottawa without achieving the goal he came here to achieve.

I think my constituency is also suffering from the amateur representation in this House by the hon. members for Little Bow and Spirit River-Fairview. I heard suggestions earlier today from those sources that 25 per cent of the people in the constituency were unemployed. That's hardly the constituency I'm representing. I heard about broke towns. I maintain constant communication with the mayors of the area, and that's hardly the message I'm getting. If they wish to assist me in performing my elected responsibilities, may I suggest to these two hon. gentlemen that they check with me first so I can give them the straight facts. [interjections] I'll also try to find a task for them to perform, commensurate with their abilities.

The Bonnyville constituency is fortunate in that it has a diversified economic base with major employment provided by: number one, agriculture; number two, Canadian Forces Base, Cold Lake; number three, an extremely well developed construction industry, both in roadbuilding and in building construction; and four, a developing tourism industry. In recent years the energy industry has become a fifth employer, particularly through experimental work in the heavy oil sands. This experimental activity is still progressing in the area, as evidenced very recently by the official opening of the second Esso pilot project at their Leming site and by the nearing completion of the PetroCan pilot project in the Muriel Lake area.

The announcement of an anticipated Esso megaproject in 1977 led to a flurry of activities in the area. First, for two or three years, millions of dollars have changed

hands in land speculation. Many people have become wealthy. But the bubble is breaking, and some speculators are now facing substantial losses. Mr. Speaker, I cannot work up sympathy for this group of people. I don't believe they need a bail-out program. I support a free-enterprise economy. To me that means an individual has the right to make a successful business deal and walk away with his profits. On the other hand, he must suffer the losses of his poor deals. If you want one right, you must accept the other responsibility.

A problem that is developing in the area is that private-sector investment, which has been extremely active in land development and the construction of housing and commercial projects over the past three years, is grinding to a halt. The reason is that a surplus of housing and commercial space has been created, and at the moment we are experiencing a downturn in jobs in the construction industry. We also have a number of small construction industries facing serious financial difficulties. However, I think the initiatives taken by the hon. Henry Kroeger, Minister of Transportation, will have a positive, substantive impact on roadbuilding and the Cat operators. Further initiative anticipated under the Cold Lake contingency plan will, I think, go some distance to alleviating the building construction industry problems.

Many newcomers have come to the constituency over the past two years with high expectations for jobs and services. Some of these people are currently experiencing a frustrating time. The towns of Cold Lake, Grand Centre, and Bonnyville and the village of Glendon have been caught partway through the process of providing oversized municipal infrastructure and expanded services. Although they are proceeding with these projects, they are doing so nervously because of the high debt loads involved. Currently the hon. Marv Moore's department is assessing that situation with those municipalities, and I'm confident that problems will be worked out so that, in the event of a long delay, the local taxpayer isn't left bearing the burden of debt for oversized facilities.

I will now move to my second point, the support. In view of the economic problems created in the Bonnyville constituency by the lack of an energy pricing agreement and a resulting indefinite delay of the Esso project, why do I feel the majority of the residents of the Cold Lake study area support our government's stand on the energy issue? Most of my constituents are true Canadians. They're offspring of hardy pioneer stock that settled western Canada, and they're proud Albertans. They believe strongly in provincial natural resource ownership rights and are not prepared to capitulate like the hon. Member for Little Bow. They are prepared to endure short-term suffering in order to protect the heritage of their children and their children's children. They also realize that the megaprojects are an important lever in negotiating the return of natural resource ownership rights to all Albertans.

Mr. Speaker, I will acknowledge that I have in my constituency a small vocal group that is prepared to give up all principles in order to reap what they feel will be the economic benefits of an immediate go-ahead of the Esso project. Recently this group is supported by the immature editorializing and sensational reporting of one of the northeastern Alberta weeklies, which has recently started spreading stories of extreme doom and gloom in northeastern Alberta. I was amused to note that the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview and his socialist friend from the northeast recently got taken in by one of that paper's sensational stories about towns going broke.

Without checking the facts, they discussed this issue at a press conference on provincial affairs. Fortunately for the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, he didn't raise the issue in this question period. Otherwise he would've ended up with all the egg on his face. Unfortunately for the hon. Member for Little Bow, he is now relying on the same source of information, and today he took the first part of the egg until he was bailed out by his wavering friend from Spirit River, who took the balance.

Mr. Speaker, in closing may I impress on all members the following point: now is not the time to weaken our resolve in any way. We must push for an overall agreement. If that means further oil production cutbacks, so be it. Neither my constituents nor I will support the type of capitulation being recommended in Motion 208.

Thank you.

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly look forward to entering this debate. I must confess that I was rather amused to listen to some of the comments today from the hon. Member for Bonnyville, particularly his comment that if anybody wants the facts they have to go to the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker, although we're almost a one-party system in Alberta, we still have other political points of view, and we still have mobility. All hon. members of the Legislature can go anywhere in the province and talk to any citizen. An interesting thing that hon. members of the government caucus are going to have to realize is that the good citizens of this province not only talk to their hon. member, but they talk to other hon. members as well. And they've been talking to hon. members of the opposition about the government's performance in the north-eastern area of the province, in particular the Bonnyville constituency. Not just the editor of a particular newspaper, but many citizens in that community have talked to hon. members of the opposition; not only people who have traditionally been Social Credit, New Democratic, or Liberal but, I might add, hon. member, people who have traditionally been Tory.

Mr. Speaker, it's worth noting that many of these good citizens who talk to all hon. members of the opposition are not entirely enthused with the government's performance; indeed, they are very critical. The information which to a large extent was explored in the question period came from municipal authorities who brought their concerns about the performance of this government not only to my attention but, I'm sure, to the Official Opposition's attention.

The resolution before us is not the record of performance of the hon. Member for Bonnyville, but whether or not we're going to get negotiations under way again. Members of this Assembly will know that I did not vote for the resolution last fall. Just to restate my view, I think that in dealing with the energy future of our province — however profoundly important that is, and there's no question about it — it is just bad strategy to cut back on oil supplies. I think we invariably play into the hands of the federal government by so doing.

Mr. Speaker, last fall during that particular debate, I recall making the observation that we should suspend our decision on the cutback for one month. While I think we must go beyond this resolution and suspend the cutbacks, there is no question that if negotiations are going to be under way again in a meaningful way, in my judgment we simply cannot continue a policy which is going to paint the province of Alberta into a corner.

We must remember that the strongest card the province

of Alberta has — and perhaps ultimately the only card we have — is public opinion, an appeal to the fairness of our fellow Canadians. Mr. Speaker, we do not appeal to that sense of fairness among our fellow Canadians by appearing to do something which is going to hold them hostage in a battle between two levels of government. I say as sincerely and as coolly as I can that the issue will only be won if we can attract to our side on this matter, if you like, the good will of our fellow Canadians. We don't do that by the action we took last fall.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go beyond the narrow definition of this resolution and put before the House today some suggestions that I believe would be helpful to facilitate negotiations between Alberta and the federal government. A few weeks ago, on behalf of my colleagues in the New Democratic Party, we released an energy paper — not an energy paper that represents traditional New Democratic Party thinking in every dotting of i's and crossing of t's, but an energy paper which we felt might go some distance in bridging the gap, if you like, between two positions that must be resolved if not only Alberta's future is to be secure but if we are to play a positive role in the future of our country.

Mr. Speaker, in addressing the question of what moves we should make, it seems to me incumbent in a debate of this nature that we lay on the table those areas where perhaps changes and adjustments in the position of not only the province of Alberta but the federal government can in fact be achieved. In his discussions with the Prime Minister on July 25, the Premier outlined some proposals which, frankly, I agree with. For example, I thought the proposals on western transportation were excellent. I regret the fact they were tied as rigidly as this government insisted to an acceptance of the rest of the package. But I think those proposals on western transportation were well worth considering.

At the same time, I believe the proposition on price moving toward 75 per cent of the North American composite price by 1984 was a reasonable position for the province of Alberta to take. It was a position that recognized our need to get something like reasonable commodity value but at the same time recognized that in a country as far-flung and diverse as Canada, energy is a bigger component to the cost of production, and that that 25 per cent difference allows some competitive advantage to Canadians as a whole. So on the pricing question, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the proposals of July 25 had a good deal of merit.

Unfortunately what the government didn't do on July 25 was deal with some of the other important elements of the package. Of course the most important is revenue sharing. We are simply not going to be able to convince Canadians today that Canada's share — that is, the share of the federal government — will only be worked out through some kind of profits tax system. It just isn't going to wash, in my judgment.

The proposal that my colleagues in the New Democratic Party and I worked on for some time is to take a look at a totally different approach to revenue sharing. We see this first of all in the context of a negotiated set of prices. Regardless of where we sit in this House, I think that if we as Albertans are genuinely concerned about provincial ownership and control of resources, the one thing we must insist on is that pricing and revenue-sharing arrangements be a result of negotiated settlement, not unilateral action. I agree that we shouldn't accept unilateral action by the federal government. It seems to me that once you accept that, no matter how much we may battle

in this House, using all kinds of inflammatory expressions — talking about capitulation, references to Munich, Churchillian language of fighting on the beaches, and all the rest of the rhetoric used by the Tories as they try to get people enthused to back their position — the final reality is that if the pricing schedule stands as a result of the budget of the federal government — the pricing schedule developed unilaterally by the federal government — we will have done more to undermine provincial ownership and control of resources than any other action imaginable. So our position has to be to try to arrive at a negotiated settlement. Some may say, it's fine to have a negotiated settlement. But if you have to give too much in terms of revenue to do that, so what?

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the energy package we are negotiating now is not the only energy agreement that will be negotiated. We have a lot of oil left in this province, we have vast amounts of natural gas, and we have enormous quantities of coal. As an energy-producing province, we in this Legislature cannot set a precedent which will haunt us for generations to come. We would be better to go that second, third, fourth, and tenth mile in terms of the revenue-sharing element to reach a negotiated settlement and keep before us the clear indication that oil and energy pricing in this country is essentially a two-way street, a negotiated settlement between a willing buyer and a willing seller. That is the cardinal principle that must be underlined. But in order to nail that down, hon. members of the front bench, it seems to me we have to win the battle of Canadian public opinion. And you can't win that battle by cutting back on oil production.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at this business of revenue sharing. It seems to me that we get ourselves caught up in the kind of arguments between levels of government that politicians delight in battling. The province says, the only kind of access to revenue that the federal government should get is through corporation tax and some kind of profits tax. The federal government comes back and says, we don't want that because we're not going to get a reasonable enough share and, besides, we have these other taxes that we can apply as far as the constitution is concerned. And yes, they can. I don't think there's much doubt that they will probably win the legal battle, if not on natural gas which is actually owned directly by the province, at least on oil and natural gas produced by private oil companies on Crown leases.

The fact is, why should we not look at a division of revenues between the federal government, the provincial government, and the oil companies on a negotiated basis? Let's repeal all these other taxes that are in place, and let's look at a royalty rental arrangement. In World War II, when this country desperately needed the money to fund our commitment overseas, the provinces and the federal government had enough sense to get together. They said, all right, we're going to have tax rental agreements. The provinces didn't exactly like the tax rental agreements in principle, but the demands of getting on with the job were such that they voluntarily sat down with Ottawa and worked out a set of fiscal arrangements based on tax rental.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that negotiation of a royalty rental arrangement — and you could talk about any kind of division you like; I'm sure the division I propose would not meet with the enthusiastic response of the oil industry. I might just say to members of the House that when my colleague and I released this proposal, we did meet with officials of IPAC and the Canadian Petro-



leum Association, and the people we met with were rather attracted to the concept. They didn't agree with our split of 40 per cent for the producing province, 25 per cent for the industry, 15 per cent for an energy self-sufficiency fund, and 20 per cent for the federal government. Naturally they wanted more for the industry. But quite frankly what they were attracted to was the concept of a negotiated revenue-sharing arrangement.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest we take a look at that, and not just reject it because it comes from this side of the House. Let's take a look at it. Try to work out some kind of practical approach to things, because in the final analysis Canadians don't want to be intimidated by other Canadians. More than anything else Canadians have a sense of what is practical, what will work, that sort of horse sense. I suggest that's what we have to attempt to do, Mr. Speaker. I ask the members of the Legislature this afternoon to re-assess the government's position on the revenue-sharing aspect.

Now let's move beyond the question of price. I indicated that we feel that the proposal the government has made for pricing is reasonable, but that they have not gone as far as they should, or as far as would be desirable in the area of revenue sharing. Let's move to certain other aspects that I think are important too. If we're going to be serious about an energy policy in Canada, we have to make a major commitment to energy self-sufficiency, not just get the money back to the oil companies and hope the industry will funnel it back into the appropriate kind of investment. There are different components to the energy mix. We've got hydro requirements. We've got tremendous potential for the development of alternative energy. In my judgment, we've got to get under way in a serious fashion with proposals for energy conservation.

I don't always agree with the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry, but he has consistently made some good points on the need to do much more in the area of energy conservation than we've done to date. [interjections] Once in a while, the red Tory tendencies of the hon. member for Edmonton Glengarry come through. That's one of his more desirable characteristics. But I see he's . . . [interjections] Boy, there are always some people who are quitters you know.

Mr. Speaker, we have to do more in the area of alternate energy and conservation. I say to the members of the House that while that should involve a good deal of stress in any energy policy, I don't think that all of a sudden you just pull the rug right out from under shielding of other types of energy. I was rather surprised when that hon. member, for example, was quoted as saying that perhaps we should take a look at our natural gas rebate plan. Mr. Speaker, I for one think we have to continue the natural gas rebate plan. But if we are going to move toward 75 per cent of the U.S. commodity price, we're going to have to single out, in my judgment anyway, certain uses of energy and shield those uses.

There are various ways one can do it. We've had suggestions in this House about elimination of the royalty. If you had a royalty rental arrangement, that would be a relatively simple thing to do because you could not only eliminate the provincial share but the federal share as well. Obviously for farmers with farm fuel bills that are going to mount significantly, with the impact on fertilizers and chemicals, this sort of thing is an important aspect that has to be addressed. We simply can't answer by saying our rebate to the farmers is greater than anybody else's, therefore we've done enough and that's that. It seems to me that we have to look at the question

of shielding.

Then, Mr. Speaker, this government has never really met the challenge of Canadianization. I know that members of the House are not very enthused about significant moves towards Canadianization, particularly moves that involve expansion of the public sector. I have no doubt that if the hon. Member for Yellowhead, who is now the Leader of the Opposition, had used a little more sense in his statements about Petro-Canada in the fall of 1979, he would probably still be the Prime Minister of Canada. I have a hunch that most of the hon. members of this Assembly privately agree with me on that too. I note with some interest that on the road to Damascus, Mr. Clark has suddenly changed his view of Petro-Canada.

But I think what we have to do is not seem to be blindly opposed to Canadianization and say, that can only take place in the private sector; we'll have a few incentives here and there, but we don't want to move. Among Canadians today there is a very strong view that we must gain a significant percentage of the energy industry. Whether that is done through the co-operative movement or through expansion of provincial agencies — we have the Alberta Energy Company in Alberta, we have Saskoil in Saskatchewan, we have different agencies, we already have the bulk of the hydro industry of this country under some form of public ownership. The fact is that whether or not Canadian public opinion has sifted through to the members of this Legislature, there is strong support for substantial moves in that direction. And frankly, Mr. Speaker, we have not addressed that in a very serious way.

In concluding my remarks, Mr. Speaker, coming right back to the issue at hand, the one-month suspension, I think this resolution would have been a good deal stronger if we had said we're going to suspend the cutbacks. It is really very difficult to argue that we must win Canadian public opinion if we still say that we'll re-introduce the cutbacks. I think you've got to make that choice. Either you argue the case of fairness and equity to other Canadians, and you work within the political system as we know it in this country — and I think the Premier should be travelling extensively across the country. I don't see what value there was in that little leaflet we sent out to every Albertan, tub thumping to Albertans. I've always supported the point that the Premier and senior ministers of the government should be travelling extensively throughout the country to argue Alberta's case.

But how much better that case can be argued if it's argued on the basis of what our position really is: why we want provincial ownership and control. It's not provincial ownership and control which is somehow Alberta as an island unto itself. It's provincial ownership and control in terms of conservation, management, and development, but recognizing that we are part of Canada. We're not saying Alberta as a province should be able to set the price unilaterally, any more than that one person arbitrarily sets a price in a relationship between a willing buyer and a willing seller, but that the price should come as a result of negotiation between the two levels. That's the way it is between two people making an exchange, between a willing buyer and a willing seller.

That's the part we have to come back to, Mr. Speaker. And that's why I think the decisions of the federal government in the budget of last October are so ultimately dangerous to our position. Instead of a negotiated agreement as we had between 1974 to 1979, we now have a pricing schedule that is unilaterally set by the government of Canada. I would say that if this government is

half as concerned as they say they are about provincial ownership and control, we're going to do everything we can to convince Canadians in a positive way — not some sort of childish, macho game that we're going to cut back, and we're going to tell you people where you're at, and that's that. This is a country. There has to be some caring and sharing. But more than anything else there ultimately has to be an appeal to the fairness of our fellow Canadians.

This party that governs Alberta today — how far they've come from the sort of passionate commitment of John Diefenbacher to one Canada. One Canada. Yet we have a position of cutting back on oil to other Canadians because we're in a disagreement with the federal government. However profound that disagreement may be, the way to do that is to make the appeal to our fellow Canadians. I suggest to the members of this House that what we need from the government of Alberta in 1981 is a clear-cut willingness — not to capitulate, not to go into a sort of Canadian version of Munich; let's not use these kinds of inflated rhetorical terms — to show our fellow Canadians that as Albertans we have some important principles that we feel strongly about. But in feeling strongly about them, we are prepared to put them to the test of carrying the judgment of our fellow Canadians' sense of fairness.

I'm pretty optimistic about doing that. I'm optimistic about making the case to our fellow Canadians on the basis of the fairness and equity of our position. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that while this doesn't go far enough, if we do that perhaps it is one small step in the right direction, and on that basis deserves some support.

MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I was going to stand up and say that it was with particular interest and enthusiasm that I rose and did participate in the debate on this Motion 208. But on the basis of the shenanigans displayed earlier this afternoon, I really have less enthusiasm now than I would have an hour and a half ago. I feel fortunate that we didn't have a classroom or two of high school students in the Assembly.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, quite a long time ago a motion was introduced ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is indicating that some of your judgments and remarks to us in the Legislature this afternoon are classed as shenanigans — is that what he's saying with regards to your office? If he is, I'm a little concerned about that. [interjections]

MR. NOTLEY: On the point of order, I think there is a very important question that we have unanimously agreed upon, and that is that the issue is suspended while it's being reviewed. No decision has been made by the Speaker. Therefore any assertion by any member in a speech on the events this afternoon, classifying them in any kind of derogatory way, is in my judgment a breach of privilege. Until such time as we get a ruling from the Speaker, I suggest to the hon. member that he withdraw the term "shenanigans".

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I must confess to some lack of sensitivity to having anything I do or say classed as a shenanigan. However, I do agree that for the time being the issue is closed. I had some concern when it was adverted to by the hon. Member for Bonnyville. I didn't intervene at that time. Perhaps we could simply leave it aside and not deal with it further by oblique reference or otherwise.

May I say, too, that the time for the designated motion was extended because of the suggestion made by the hon. Deputy Government House Leader. However, we should have indicated when that time would end on the recalculation, and didn't do so. If the Assembly agrees, perhaps we can extend it by another five minutes — it has actually run out — so the hon. Member for Barrhead may deal with the topic as he had intended.

MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps because of the shortness of time, I would beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. My hon. colleague the hon. Member for Clover Bar has the Bill that would be coming up this afternoon, with regard to freedom of information. I'm not sure the government may want to hear some of his respective remarks. But we'd be prepared to proceed with the debate of this resolution and hold our debate on the Act at this time. We'd be prepared to proceed until 5:30.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, point of order. We are certainly prepared to concur with your suggestion to have the debate continue for another five minutes and then go on with the Bill. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I can proceed only with unanimous consent. The time limit is there. If there is unanimous consent that it be extended, then so be it. If there is not, then we're on the Bill now.

Is there unanimous consent that the time for debate on the designated motion continue for another five minutes?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: So ordered.

MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In reviewing the text of Motion 208, the operative words

[The fire alarm sounded]

AN HON. MEMBER: Could you retract those words? [laughter]

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, for the third time now: the operative words in Motion 208 in my view are "good will", "serious intent to negotiate", and "good faith". I don't believe that in the history of Canada a provincial government has ever provided more in the form of good will, serious intent, and good faith than this provincial government in the past year in negotiating with an intransigent, dishonest, and deceitful federal government. We've walked more than the extra mile, and we've been hit, bruised, hammered, and tripped along the way. But, Mr. Speaker, Albertans are a strong people and we'll accept that.

The many events through the year 1980 should be

reviewed by all members of the Assembly. The document of July 25 was an extremely important one. Concessions of a very great nature were made to all the people of Canada to the tune of billions of dollars; the contribution of Albertans in the 1970s, some \$35 billion of loan, by shielding Canadians from the true price of natural resources; a commitment from this government to provide, on behalf of every Albertan, some \$24,000 to all Canadians; a commitment from this government that would have reduced Canada's dependence on foreign oil by approximately 600,000 barrels a day by 1988; a federal proposal and a response that completely rejected everything Alberta was prepared to do.

The events that followed July have caused some concern in Alberta and in Canada. But the point is, Mr. Speaker, that the natural resources of Alberta are owned by the people of Alberta. The point is that Alberta must stand as strong in defence of its conventional oil, natural gas producers, as it must in defence of those individuals and groups who want to develop tar sands in this province. The essential point is, Mr. Speaker, that we as Albertans have to stand strong.

I know I have just a very, very small amount of time left. I want to illustrate to all members of the House one area of Alberta, perhaps harder hit than most — only three or four can experience the kind of savagery being attacked on them by an unfortunate federal energy policy — the town of Swan Hills, located in the constituency of Barrhead. Mr. Speaker, it will take me a very short time to read into the record a letter from the people of Swan Hills in support of this government. It's written by Mayor Sid Currie. There is nothing else in Swan Hills but gas and oil. There's no agriculture, nothing else. The citizens there rely entirely on energy for survival. Their letter:

Dear Mr. Lougheed:

On behalf of the people of the Town of Swan Hills, I would like to express the community's full fledged support of the stand your Government has taken in response to the recently announced Federal Budget.

The citizens of Swan Hills fully realize the complications and the impact your recommendations of cutting back oil and gas production will have on resource Towns such as Swan Hills.

The issue of oil pricing strikes very close to home in Swan Hills, where virtually every person in Town relies on dollars produced through oil and gas exploration, production and servicing.

In fact, the residents of Swan Hills would have felt cheated if you Government had taken any other stand on this matter.

Swan Hills has suffered recessions and depressions in the past, due to fluctuating oil prices and is prepared to "weather the storm."

In closing, I would like to make it perfectly clear, that you can count on the unanimous support of the people of Swan Hills.

Sincerely yours,

S.W. CURRIE  
MAYOR

Mr. Speaker, that is real support from the people of Alberta. That's not a figment; that is an actual statement of support from citizens who have more to lose because of the very arbitrary and unfair decisions and policies of an intransigent federal government.

Next Monday our Minister of Energy and Resources will meet and speak to his federal counterpart. The best we can ask of him is that he use everything he has in his power to arrive at a conclusion and a solution, but not with anything more than flexibility. He must not arrive with any degree and any concept of capitulation. Mr. Speaker, the people of Alberta are behind that concept.

I think in view of the time, I'll beg leave to adjourn the debate.

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

**Bill 201**

**The Freedom of Information Act**

DR. BUCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This afternoon I am pleased once again to present Bill 201, The Freedom of Information Act. The Bill has been before this Assembly for the past five or six years. One of these years I think the government caucus and backbenchers may finally decide that maybe the people of Alberta are concerned about what is going on with their government, what is going on behind closed doors, and how governments arrive at conclusions.

Mr. Speaker, I am a little nervous when we see the action this government takes in many instances, when so many decisions are made behind closed doors. The people of the province are concerned about what goes on behind closed doors. Probably the largest concern of all is, who is making the decisions on behalf of the people of the province with the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Is it a fund used for diversification? That doesn't seem to be happening. Is it a fund that is being used in the best interests of the people? Or is it a fund that's just being used as an adjunct to a budget which in most instances in the record of this government doesn't really mean too much, because all you do is go to special warrants and just keep spending it.

I am really pleased to present Bill 201, The Freedom of Information Act. This Bill is much more needed now than when I first presented it in 1975. I suppose a person should get discouraged when they present a Bill such as this, a freedom of information Act or a sunshine Bill, but in light of the fact . . . [interjection]

That's right, one idea. The hon. member in the far corner — as I said to the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry, the further west you move, the better your chances are of never making it back inside that door. Sometimes that happens, hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud. So you're on your way out.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about open governments, about the taxpayers' right to know. This is why I keep bringing Bill 201 and its counterparts back to this House. When we look at the background, a Bill similar to this was first introduced in 1965 by a member of Parliament from British Columbia, the hon. Barry Mather. He was joined by a very, very prominent Tory, the hon. Ged Baldwin, who for years pioneered, indicated to the members of both sides of the House how important it was to the

people of this country that we have a freedom of information Bill. Finally, it's very, very interesting, Mr. Speaker, that a Tory Prime Minister, short-lived as his reign was, started the wheels in motion to present Parliament with a freedom of information Act. I'm pleased to see that the Liberal federal government has followed the trail blazed by the hon. Mr. Baldwin, and is seriously looking at freedom of information.

It's not good enough, Mr. Speaker, in our parliamentary system that we take at face value that everything the government tells us is the way it is and the way it appears to be. The electorate are questioning more and more: do we as legislators, do we as members of government really know what we're doing? I think the people of this province, of this city especially, have been very, very concerned about what their elected people are doing, when we take a look at what has happened to the convention centre. Is there no control by elected people anymore? And if they have figures to back up an expenditure of the taxpayers' money, where is the background material? Is that material available to the taxpayer? We see the convention centre going from one figure and then it doubles; when we see the Walter MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre triple and quadruple; when we see Kananaskis park go from \$40 million to \$210 million. Mr. Speaker, maybe the taxpayer would like to see the background information on what happened. Have the politicians lost control?

Maybe the people would like to see the decision the government made on the Red Deer dam. Where was that background? On what background did they make that decision? The same thing with Syncrude and PWA. It always quite amuses me. After the inner sanctum of cabinet made the decision to buy PWA, it was interesting to find out that some of the Tory backbenchers ...

[The fire alarm sounded]

DR. BUCK: Is that for real, Mr. Speaker, or do we keep going?

MR. SPEAKER: Just another unparliamentary interruption.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, it bothers me. Do something about it, will you? [interjections] Well, it could happen to some of the Tory — what do you call them? [interjections] Mr. Speaker, I will not use the term "puppets" anymore. I will say, if you pull the strings, we act accordingly. That wouldn't be unparliamentary. But I wouldn't even do that on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure my hon. colleague the Member for Edmonton Kingsway will get up shortly and tell us why we do not need freedom of information legislation in this province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where'd you get our information from, Walt?

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, there are ways of preventing information from being made available. We all know how it's done. There are interdepartmental memos. They say, I can't give you that information, it's interdepartmental; or we can't tell you what the deputy minister said to his minister. But on the other hand, we're not really asking for that. We are saying we want the stack of material the deputy minister used to make a decision to make a recommendation to his minister. That's what we're asking

for, not some of the other things that can certainly waylay or prevent freedom of information to the public. At all levels of government it becomes more and more difficult for information to be made available. Many times the taxpayer becomes very, very frustrated. He says, why fight city hall; you can't get the information anyway. It endangers our democratic process, our parliamentary system, when the voter becomes cynical, thinking he doesn't have any power anymore. Maybe this is why we have such low voting turnouts at our municipal, provincial, and federal elections.

Mr. Speaker, I think the taxpayer wants to know. He wants to become involved. Many years back — I can't remember if it was the former or the present government — we made a choice that annual statements would not be made available to towns, villages, and municipalities unless they were asked for. I went to many of those annual meetings. Sometimes there would only be a handful of people. But if there was a very contentious issue, there would be a hall full of people. Little by little we make this information more difficult for the taxpayer and voter to obtain. It's no wonder that that taxpayer and that voter becomes cynical.

During a debate on this Bill, either last year or in previous years, I was challenged by several hon. government members who stated that Albertans have a legal right to information held by the government. But I'm saying they do not have a legal right. If we put it into the statutes that you have a legal right, then that information must be delivered to you, or you have recourse to go to the courts and make that information available.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not under any false illusion that just by passing a Bill similar to this, we're going to solve all the problems of government secrecy. Again, when you're on the government side, you think it's good for the taxpayer not to know such and such.

MR. COOK: Be specific, Walt.

DR. BUCK: Do you want a few, Rollie? Just keep reading your *Beauchesne*, Rollie. You may become an expert on the rules. That's probably your first crusade.

MR. COOK: Give us more generalities, Walt.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, it should not only be a moral right to government information, which belongs to the taxpayer, it should be a legal right. We should not place roadblocks in the path of a citizen when he's trying to obtain information. We should encourage him; we should make the information readily available to him.

MR. COOK: Give us examples.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry wants to keep yipping, I will indicate to him that all he has to do is go back to *Hansard* and look at what happened when the opposition asked the hon. Donald Getty, former Member for Edmonton Whitemud, about the Levy report.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's what your high-paid research staff came up with, Walt.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I think that if the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry would go back and look at *Hansard*, he would find out how the minister at that time played little games. I guess I would have to be

suspicious and say the reason he was playing games was because he didn't want us to have the information. That seems to be the only conclusion you can draw. The minister knew which study we wanted. Why did he not make it available? That really reinforces the point I'm trying to make. That information should be offered willingly. If there's anything you learn, young hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry, if there's any way to get into trouble in politics, it's not to do public business in public.

You may think it's fine to hide everything behind caucus doors. We hear so much about the supremacy of caucus. How does anybody know? Nobody, except this one brave soul, who had the nerve to challenge that secrecy and supremacy of caucus. He is now an ex-member of that caucus. So if you don't do what you're told, that's where you end up.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's not true.

DR. BUCK: That's not true. Well, you know how it is. [interjections]

Just in case the Tory backbenchers don't know that I know how the system operates ... [interjections] I know how the system operates, Mr. Speaker. It's just a matter of logistics. When you have 73 members in a caucus and that caucus meets for two hours before a session — just using that for a "for instance" — you don't have to be as brilliant as the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry to figure out how much time each member has. You divide 73 into two hours. [interjections] I'm indicating, hon. Provincial Treasurer, if you had a two-hour caucus and 73 people wanted to participate ... [interjections] Extend it to four hours then, hon. Member for Peace River. Figure that out. It doesn't give you very much opportunity. Then a few more aggressive members monopolize the time. The ones who don't get their oar in may get to speak once every six months. But I know that would never happen to a Tory caucus, because it's free and open. Nobody tells you what to do. [interjections]

Mr. Speaker, let's get back to what was quoted in the budget debate of 1972. It went in this manner; this is a quote from the budget debate of 1972:

The next subject I'd like to deal with is public participation or open government.

I don't have my Harvard accent.

We are committed to this approach. The nature of our society in 1972 in Alberta demands it. We need to be better informed in terms of the public. We need to assure that the public is better informed, so that they can better understand some of the difficult decisions we have to make. And more important, as I've said on a number of occasions we need to assure that government is more responsive to the public view and the public's feelings.

Mr. Speaker, those are the words of the Premier of this province, the leader of this government, which has been forced into several areas where, by public pressure, people demand to know. People want to know. They want to know on what grounds and information government decisions are made.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the government members will be enthusiastic in support of this, in light of the fact that their Tory colleagues in the House of Commons felt it was very, very important that we have a Bill such as this. One of their most prominent members, the hon. Ged Baldwin, was looking at freedom of information. I'm sure they just can't wait to get up here and support this Bill. Otherwise it would be inconsistent of them as fellow

Tories.

Mr. Speaker, basically this Bill is required. It is required at the federal level, and they are going ahead. It is required at the provincial level even more so. I know that other members would like to participate. I am sure this government would now be glad to support it, because it was a Tory member who proposed it, and a Tory government that first moved it in the House of Commons. With those few opening remarks, I welcome the support of the members of the government caucus.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, as I rise to speak on this particular Bill, which deals primarily with information — unfortunately only 10 minutes are left, but I'll try to make a few remarks before adjourning debate. We know that information is knowledge and that it is important that the public have that knowledge, because that makes for a strong democracy.

But to be clear, Mr. Speaker, trying to tell Albertans that information is not getting out to the public, that all things are bad and it's terrible in Alberta, as the hon. member indicated, is really hard to believe. He spoke for over 15 minutes. He cited the federal government, the British Columbia government, the municipal government, and then he spent another 10 minutes talking about the good work the caucus members are doing as a team, communicating, co-operating, and coming out with policies and programs that are important for all citizens. I haven't heard one significant example here of information that the province of Alberta does not provide for citizens. No examples.

Mr. Speaker, it's great to raise the issue of freedom of information over and over again, to the extent that the hon. member is actually starting to believe that what he's saying is true. But I haven't heard anybody complain to me that they don't have information. I'm asking here in this Legislature, has anybody else heard from their constituents that they lack information on a topic, where the information is in fact there? Has the hon. opposition member cited one example where he could not get information? Not one. So I begin to wonder, Mr. Speaker.

He quickly cited PWA. But he failed to cite also that all the information on PWA was filed in this Legislature, every detail. And what do they complain about? They said, that wasn't enough; we want to know how much the president of PWA makes a year. He knows full well that every shareholder can find that out — you have to be a shareholder — and that PWA is at arm's length from the government.

Mr. Speaker, as an MLA I've never had any denial of information. I'm suggesting that no hon. member in this Legislature has had any denial of information from this government, except of course where there is confidential information regarding private citizens or corporations, or where it is in court, or in fact if the information is not available; unless the hon. member wants this government to reveal to the public, to the citizens, information — if it be that — in the formative stage, in the idea stage, the thinking stage. I think that's asking a little too much.

He cites the federal government. I suggest, hon. members, that the federal government is far from being a good example. I tremble for the hon. Ged Baldwin, a most distinguished and honorable MP for the Progressive Conservative government, when the hon. member tries to associate himself with that hon. gentleman when he's trying to bring in freedom of information respecting the federal government. When traveling abroad, MPs from both sides of the House, trying to get information can

actually get that information a lot quicker from the country they're going to visit. And that's information about Canada. That's why you need freedom of information or that type of information-revealing in the federal sphere, Mr. Speaker, but not here.

The hon. member indicates that citizens should have a legal right. How ridiculous. They do have a legal right. They have a legal right to come to any member of the Legislature and ask him to ask questions, inquire, and get the information on their behalf. Any public information by the province of Alberta is public information. They have a legal right to that information. The hon. member is nodding his head in the negative and saying they need information that is in fact in the formative, thinking, and planning stages, interdepartmental memos. I'm suggesting he's out of whack.

By this Bill, the opposition member would say that if certain information — and he's not quite clear on that — is not provided, he would go to court. The cost, the confusion, the cumbersome nature of that would undermine the essence of our legislative and ministerial responsibility, and the hon. opposition member knows that. The problem the opposition member cited in his previous debates is that we're in power. Mr. Speaker, we don't take that position. As elected by our electorate, we feel we are trustees in office to do the job well. The information is there. We were elected in 1971. In 1975 we were re-elected with a greater majority, and again in 1979 with a greater majority. Surely if the electorate felt this government were not responsive and open and provides the information, I suggest maybe that wouldn't have happened. Our policies, programs, legislation, and all the reports respecting all the departments are there to be had. And they're not speculative reports.

Previously the hon. member indicated that the Alberta Opportunity Company does not reveal information. Maybe he should ask the some 200 businesses that received over \$120 million regarding financing for small business, or people who received assistance from the Agricultural Development Corporation. But maybe he wants to get into the private details of which ones. Maybe we should put a sign on and say, this person received AOC funding — make it public and put him in an unfortunate position.

He refers to open government. Because of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I won't go on to the other items. But when we talk about open government, maybe we should remind ourselves and the hon. member should recall *Hansard*, television, cabinet tours, public inquiries. He mentioned the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. We had a debate for over two years prior to 1975, and what happened in the 1975 election? Again the people voted in the affirmative for the Progressive Conservative party, and in fact they voted in the affirmative for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Mr. Speaker, there is open debate. In short order we're going to have a debate on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Anybody in this Legislature can get up and make recommendations by virtue of a resolution and change the direction. As a matter of fact we could all vote here and cut off that fund completely. I haven't heard the hon. member do that. As a matter of fact I haven't even heard the hon. member indicate he has any ideas respecting that fund.

Truly, Mr. Speaker, citizens are informed to the extent they desire. Unfortunately it's not good enough, and I recognize that. As an MLA my salary is always equated with the MPs' salary, and we know that isn't so. That's an example. But the public library and the library downstairs are full of information and all the documents relating to the government on an ongoing basis. There is access to information. It's obvious and apparent, I suggest, through the many avenues we have — there are many, and I've cited them before — through question period, motions for returns, and so on and so on.

Mr. Speaker, the time to debate this Bill has ended today, and I'd be very happy to come back to it another time. I adjourn debate.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is not proposed that the House sit this evening. Before moving to adjourn I would bring the attention of the House to the Order Paper and indicate that tomorrow morning it is proposed to debate certain government motions on the Order Paper, specifically motions 2, 4, and 5, and then to proceed with second readings of government Bills as listed, specifically excluding Bills 7 and 15.

[At 5:30 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Friday at 10 a.m.]