

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

Title: **Wednesday, April 28, 1982 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

**head: PRESENTING REPORTS BY
STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES**

MR. KNAACK: Mr. Speaker, the Private Bills Committee has had under consideration certain Bills and recommends as follows: that Bill Pr. 1, Lethbridge Country Club Amendment Act, 1982, Bill Pr. 2, Holy Cross Hospital (Grey Nuns) of Calgary Amendment Act, 1982, and Bill Pr. 6, Montreal Trust Company of Canada Act, be proceeded with; and that Bill Pr. 8, Edmonton Convention and Tourism Authority Act, and Bill Pr. 9, Edmonton Economic Development Authority Act, be proceeded with, with certain amendments.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 40
Public Utilities Board
Amendment Act, 1982

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to introduce Bill No. 40, the Public Utilities Board Amendment Act, 1982.

This proposed Bill would create greater flexibility as to the number of members who might be members of the Public Utilities Board. Length of term would be given greater flexibility, as well as the manner of appointment of part-time members. In addition, it would remove the need to bring to the Legislative Assembly an address to remove members of the board, while preserving the position of existing members of the board, and eliminates the age limit of 65 years.

[Leave granted; Bill 40 read a first time]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, today I have the honor to table the annual reports, as required by statute, for the University of Alberta, the University of Calgary, the University of Lethbridge, Athabasca University, and the Banff Centre for Continuing Education, and for the following public colleges: Keyano College, Grant MacEwan Community College, Lethbridge Community College, Medicine Hat College, Lakeland College, Red Deer College, and Fairview College. I point out that in each case, the audited statement by the provincial Auditor General is included in the report.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to introduce a group of 18 grades 4 and 5 students from Callingwood school in your constituency of Edmonton Meadowlark. They are accompanied by parent Mrs. Dedels and by teachers Mr. Zonneveld and Mr. Burgers. I'm not sure which gallery they are sitting in, but I ask them to stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Lacombe constituency, this afternoon it's a pleasure to introduce to you and members of the Assembly 125 grade 6 students from Lacombe elementary. The young people are here to see democracy in action. With them are Mr. Damant, Mrs. McLaughlin, Mrs. Gish, Mr. Start, Mr. Osterlant, Mrs. Otto, Mrs. Johnstone, and Mrs. Williams. They are in both the public and members galleries, and I ask that they rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Oil Sands Development**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question today is, quite naturally, to the Premier. My understanding was that if there were a possibility of a response from the consortium with regard to Alsands, the Premier would still be in Toronto. In terms of his presence here in the Legislature, could the Premier indicate that the Alsands project will not go ahead, or that there is no possibility of the consortium responding this week and that, potentially, negotiations will continue for some time?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the only way I can answer that question, with its preamble, is to review the situation as it exists today. There are ongoing discussions between the remaining participating partners in Alsands and the two governments involved. Those discussions are continuing, and the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources has remained in Toronto and is participating in them.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the Premier indicate — possibly in general rather than specific terms, because I'm sure that's not possible today — whether the governments of Canada and Alberta have offered the consortium new concessions, to try to make it possible for Alsands to proceed?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition would not want to prejudice the ongoing discussions. For our part, we are trying to do our best to see that this project proceeds. From a short-term employment point of view, we recognize that it has a slow build up and won't have a significant bearing on the job situation in the province in the anticipated economic downturn period. But certainly from a long-term revenue point of view, it is an important project for the province of Alberta. Therefore, we've been trying to do all that is reasonably possible to assure that the project proceeds. I am unable to respond today to the question as directed by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for clarification. The Premier has indicated that

there are only four participants in the discussion. Could the Premier indicate, then, that there is no possibility of additional members joining the consortium and the governments in working with Alsands' possibly proceeding?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I didn't mean to leave that impression with the hon. Leader of the Opposition. The discussions I've referred to have involved, in a direct sense, the remaining private-sector participants and the two governments involved. In addition to the federal government, PetroCan is a participant, so it's obviously a remaining participant to that extent. But there have also been discussions with other private-sector organizations in Canada that might be interested in the project, and they have been involved as well.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the Premier indicate whether the April 30 deadline holds, with regard to negotiations? Or is there a possibility that there will be an extension of that deadline, and further cost sharing of operational costs by the federal and provincial governments, relative to Alsands?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, as of this moment, it would not be my anticipation that there would be an extension past April 30; the decision would be made, one way or another, in the next few days. But having regard to the complexity of what is involved, there's always the outside possibility that something new might be injected into the discussions that raise that point.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the Premier indicate whether the members of the consortium, specifically Gulf and Shell — which, as I understand it, also have annual meetings today and possibly on Thursday — will be considering any proposal by the governments at their general meetings or board meetings this week, and responding to the government on the matter prior to Friday?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, first of all, with regard to the meetings, perhaps some clarification is in order. Gulf Canada had its annual meeting last week. I believe the hon. Leader of the Opposition is referring to Shell Canada, which held its annual meeting today.

The important meeting involved is the meeting of the Alsands consortium itself, which is scheduled for tomorrow. That is the meeting I was referring to. The discussions are under way, leading up to that meeting.

MR. KESLER: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. Premier indicate whether approaches as to participation in the Alsands project have been made to foreign investors outside the North American continent?

MR. LOUGHEED: I presume the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury is referring to that in the general sense of a period of time that has occurred with regard to this project, rather than currently. If that is so, my understanding is that discussions of that nature have occurred. What is obviously involved is that the interest of foreign investors in this project has to relate to the question of the product that would flow. The product that would flow from the Alsands project would be used for Canadian oil needs; therefore, the interest of investors in other countries is limited, in a project of this nature.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. Premier. On Monday, the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs indicated that the discussions between the Premier and the Premier of Ontario were, essentially, to bring the Premier of Ontario up to date on the project. I ask this question because of press speculation: is the Premier in a position to advise the Assembly whether any discussion beyond that took place with the Premier of Ontario, including the possibility of some form of direct or indirect participation in the project by Ontario?

MR. LOUGHEED: No, Mr. Speaker, that didn't occur. The discussion was a briefing with regard to the Alsands project generally. There was no request for involvement by the government of Ontario.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the hon. Premier. It's with regard to a contingency plan the government may have in place, or a plan that may be part of the economic resurgence plan, in case the Alsands plant does not proceed. Has the Premier addressed that question, or is a member of cabinet responsible for that kind of activity, in terms of the project not going ahead?

MR. LOUGHEED: I'm somewhat surprised at the question from the Leader of the Opposition and others, Mr. Speaker. If I understand the situation, members of the opposition groups have not been encouraging or supportive, with regard to the project. For some months now, I think our view has been that we have not in any way been counting upon the Alsands project, with regard to economic activity in this province. I think that was clear with regard to the debate on the Speech from the Throne, and clear from the debate with regard to the budget.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I take exception to the Premier's remarks that just because they ask questions, the members of the opposition are not supportive. I think he should go back and read *Hansard* and get the details and the facts straight.

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is to the Minister of Economic Development. Can he indicate if he has had any discussion with the Shell people in the Scotford area, where the Shell refinery is being built at this time? Does that refinery depend upon the Alsands project going ahead? Will their supply of crude be coming from sources other than the Alsands project?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, before the hon. minister replies: I would welcome a debate in due course. The information I have, and the public statements made — and I'm not referring specifically to the hon. Member for Clover Bar — have been negative with regard to government involvement in the Alsands project, and statements advising the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources to forget it.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question on the point the hon. Premier raises. As a government, has the Premier now decided that the Alberta government is going to take a larger equity position in Alsands, so it can proceed? Is that what the Premier just said? If so, I think he should confirm that in this Legislature.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'm not about to confirm or deny that. In due course, that will become apparent, and we'll have a good debate.

MR. SPEAKER: We still have pending a question by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

MR. PLANCHE: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. Yes, we have had conversations with Shell Canada Limited, and the refinery will go ahead.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. In terms of the review by the Alberta government, what assessment has been given to the softening world oil price situation, in light of the fact that last fall it was clear that the consortium would have to have world prices and the forecast world prices were somewhat more optimistic than they are at the moment? Is the Premier in a position to advise the Assembly whether there has been any detailed assessment of the necessary price for Alsands oil to make it a viable proposition, and whether or not the softening oil prices create additional problems somewhat greater than was the case last September?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I realize the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview does not favor our involvement in the project and, in due course, we will no doubt have a debate on the question.

I do think it is important, though, that we be involved in assessing the fact that it is the forecast of the price of world oil at the time Alsands comes into production in 1988.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. I don't mind saying: right, I think investment in Alsands would be the worst possible mistake this government could make. I don't mind saying that in the House, outside the House, or wherever. [interjections]

But to the hon. Premier: what specific review has been made of the necessary price for Alsands, in view of the softening world price? To be viable, will Alsands have to have a price higher than the forecast world price?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that we now have on the record that statement by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. I think the time for responding to that question will be shortly, and we will shortly respond.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the one I raised earlier. Is the Alberta government, through the Premier, considering guaranteeing loans to possible new members of the consortium, present members of the consortium, or both? Is that a new approach the government is using at this time, in terms of attempting to have Alsands proceed?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I really have to revert to my original answer. Discussions are under way, and I don't want to prejudice them by getting involved in what is or is not being discussed.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier, seeing that we're all giving him some advice. If he likes the result of the Saskatchewan voting, my advice to him is not to get in too big a hurry about this debate we're going to have in public.

My question to the Premier: I know it's a calculated guess, but in their discussions, what time frame are the government and the federal government looking at to indicate — or will there be an indicator — when the world glut of oil would possibly bottom out and we'd start looking at a shortage? Is it a six-month term, 18 months? Has the government been looking at any ballpark figures as to when this glut will diminish?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the preamble of the question, I'm sure the hon. Member for Clover Bar would want the leader of government to be responsive to the citizens of this province, to be listening to them, and to be bringing in items with regard to our Alberta economic resurgence program, over a period of six to nine months. We'll be responding as the hon. Member for Clover Bar wishes us to do.

With regard to the matter of the forecast, most forecasters look at the situation this way: essentially the price of world oil today, in terms of its decline, has related very directly to the world economic situation. Most forecasters are of the view that when the world economy moves out of the recession and back into an expansionary phase and the demand increases, that will significantly alter the supply/demand ratio, first of all, then the price situation. In varying ways of time frame, it's anticipated that that will occur in a period of between one and three years, depending upon the nature of timing as to when the recession ends worldwide and the rapidity with which there is a recovery.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the hon. House leader, with regard to this whole question of Alsands and the payment of \$4 million during the month of April. Could the hon. House leader indicate that this will be one of the items of supplementary estimates? Could the \$4 million be a matter of discussion during the supplementary estimates that may come down this week or early next week?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on the hon. leader's undertaking that he won't say that I've disclosed a budgetary matter, I think I can assure him that the amount will be in the supplementary estimates.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. When an announcement is made, and should the announcement be that they are going to recommend investment in Alsands, will the government commit to table in the House the review undertaken on the construction costs, which the Premier and the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources alluded to some time ago in the question period? Will there be an outline of the forecast for energy prices? The precedent was set when the Syncrude project was announced, and we had the forecast given at that time. Will the government's intention be to table that information, as part of any announcement with respect to Alsands?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the question of forecasted oil prices, it definitely will not be the position of the government to put out such a forecast. We'll let the Member for Spirit River-Fairview be a forecaster as well, and we'll all make our respective forecasts.

With regard to the question of estimated construction costs, I would have to take that as notice. I believe the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview directed that

question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, and I don't have a present recollection of his qualified answer.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

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

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, upon finalization of the Alsands discussions, whether successful or not — hopefully on the basis of being successful — could the Premier indicate that the matter will be brought before the Legislature, in the form of a resolution, and that the position of the government would either be endorsed by the Legislature or rejected as such, in terms of the resolution? Is that the Premier's intention? From his earlier remarks, there seemed to be an indication of a public discussion in the Legislature, and I want to assure myself as to that.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I was just saying that I welcome debate; I don't know that it will start that way. It may be that what will occur is that the supplementary estimates the hon. Leader of the Opposition was referring to provide an appropriate place for debate, but there may be others. No doubt, we would be presenting the position of the government of Alberta, that we've tried in every way we can to see this project proceed, and I believe that's the general sentiment of the citizens of Alberta. We can then have a debate, if we are successful or unsuccessful in that regard, and we'll welcome the debate. As to exactly what form it will take or at what place, I would like to give that further thought.

Labor Dispute — Public Health Nurses

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to either the hon. Minister of Labour or the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health. It's with respect to today's announcement by the Public Health Association that staff nurses will be locked out as of Monday next week. First of all, to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health: was there any discussion between the government of Alberta and the health unit associations, with respect to the lockout?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, there are 27 local boards of health in this province. They are autonomous bodies, represented by the Health Unit Association of Alberta. Any discussions on the question of negotiations with bargaining agents for employees of those health units would be at either the board level or between the boards and the provincial association; definitely not with the Department of Social Services and Community Health.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the Minister of Labour in a position to review for the Assembly what assessment the department has made of the proposal by the United Nurses of Alberta that there be voluntary binding arbitration, as a way of avoiding the lockout announced for next Monday?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, if I may supplement the response to the earlier question asked by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. I would indicate that the possibility of a lockout and, for that matter, actions

by both parties in the dispute, were discussed with a mediator. To the extent of my information, other than a very brief discussion which, by coincidence, happened last evening and involved me with a mediator, at one occasion with a representative of the health units, and with a number of nurses who were at the bargaining, that is the extent of any discussion. And it really wasn't a discussion; it was statements of information given to me.

With respect to the other question, I'm not in a position to provide an assessment or evaluation of the proposal of any one party, if that is the question. I don't think it would be helpful to either party, to the dispute, or to the general public, and certainly it would not be useful, if I or staff from the Department of Labour were to comment publicly on a proposal that either one had advanced. At the present time, it is a matter on which there is more speculation than hard fact. I make that statement because, to my knowledge, at 2 o'clock or later this afternoon, there has not in fact been a delivery of a lockout notice. We will have to wait and see whether that does occur.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question. What contingency plans has the government developed to be even-handed? We passed legislation to send the nurses back to work. Will we be dealing with legislation to stop the lockout?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as we're dealing with an anticipated action rather than a fact, I really can't — and don't propose to — comment beyond that. It's not yet at all clear whether there will be a lockout. There has been quite a bit of discussion. In fairness, I have to say that it's not beyond the realm of possibility that some of that discussion isn't for purposes of trying to influence the nature of events at the bargaining table. Until events bear out some of the suggestions, it's not a fact.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Given the obvious need for strong preventive health measures, what position has the government of Alberta taken with respect to the general policy of parity between public health nurses and general hospital nurses?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, it would be inappropriate for me to stand in this Assembly and pass judgment on employees who work for the health units, just as it would be improper to discuss that question as it relates to other employees of autonomous bodies within the province.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question with respect to the 12 per cent offer, which is significantly below the offer of the Alberta Hospital Association.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. member is prefacing one question after the other with debatable propositions. This happened earlier in the question period. When that happens, in fairness, I guess I have to allow a certain amount of debate.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. It's not really a debatable point. It's just . . .

MR. SPEAKER: It may not be debatable to the hon. member, but I'm not sure that all his conclusions are shared by everyone in the Assembly.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. The conclusion is up to the hon. members, but the offer is a matter of fact. However, so there's no misunderstanding at all, my question is: the minister advised the House that there was no consultation between anyone in the government of Alberta and either the Health Unit Association or any of the health unit boards, in terms of discussion of their offer to the UNA?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, that question was very clearly answered in my first response. The hon. member may wish to review *Hansard*.

Public Health Regulations

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health as well, and it has to do with public health in a more direct way. Has the department recently received any complaints regarding the storage of animal carcasses — mostly dogs, I believe — at the premises of the veterinarian in Rocky Mountain House? If so, has any action been taken, in view of the increasing health risk, with the rising temperatures?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that early this month, a private citizen lodged a complaint with the RCMP detachment in Rocky Mountain House. The charge was that a veterinary clinic in Rocky Mountain House had in excess of 40 carcasses of dead animals in an open area behind the clinic. As this is in clear contravention of health regulations, a warning was issued by the RCMP. As well, the Red Deer health unit investigated the matter. It followed up with a letter to the operator of the veterinary clinic in the community, ordering that the situation be cleaned up immediately, as it is so clearly and flagrantly in violation of the health regulations.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Are the regulations as specific as they are for dealing with anatomical or surgical human tissue? Are they equivalent regulations, or is this left mostly to the integrity of the individual concerned?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, it would seem that the information he wishes to get should come from another one of the self-governing professions.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, in view of your remarks: in view of the episode that occurred, would the minister give some assurance that veterinarians will be reminded of their responsibilities under the regulations?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I believe this is an isolated case. In the three years I've occupied this portfolio, I'm not aware of a similar circumstance. We will continue to monitor this matter very closely. If there is a recurrence of the infraction of the regulations, appropriate action will be taken.

Truckers' Licences

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, my question today is to the hon. Solicitor General. In reports from the Olds-Didsbury constituency, many trucking firms are having difficulty meeting their licensing commitments. In light of

that, has the minister had an indication of a significant reduction in the number of applications for commercial trucking licences?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, some representations have been made through the Department of Tourism and Small Business. At the present time, I have under consideration some proposals, and they're being looked at.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, could the hon. Solicitor General indicate what some of those solutions might be?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I can't do that at the present time.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the minister be prepared to offer a further three-month extension beyond the April 30 deadline, with hopes that the oil and gas resurgence program may have a positive effect on the economy?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, as I said, we're taking a look at some possibilities. When I have the matter resolved, I'm sure an appropriate announcement will be made.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the hon. minister indicate what kind of time frame we're looking at, before there would be an announcement?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, as soon as possible.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I believe I made this suggestion to the Premier several years ago. Is the government giving any active consideration to having the deadline for commercial truckers' licence applications extended for three months after the ordinary licensing period? At this time of year, usually there are bans on the road; there's no cash flow. Has the minister given any active consideration to making this thing happen?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, until the present application was made — I'm really not aware of any particular problems that occurred in earlier years.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Because of the extreme level of bankruptcies in this province at this time, [interjections] would the hon. Solicitor General commit to the Legislative Assembly today that an answer will be forthcoming within the week?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I said that as soon as I have the matter resolved, an appropriate announcement will be made.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate if there has been a backlog in the program of licences being sent by mail? Have some of the licences not been sent out?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, not that I'm aware of. The mail-in program has been extremely successful, with about 420,000 renewed by mail.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. It's unclear to me why the minister can't reveal the options being considered for the various truckers, so they

can make some plans. Could the minister outline those options for the Legislature, so that we know what considerations are being made and so that if representations are to be made by the truckers, they could be made?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, a proposal has been made for some relief. We're trying to see what sort of options are open with the existing legislation and the regulations under which they operate.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Will the Solicitor General commit to the Legislature today that they'll hurry?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Bow Valley, followed by the hon. Member for Spirit . . .

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I didn't hear the answer. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: I don't suppose it's up to me to make an observation of that kind, but I understood the hon. minister used the words "as soon as possible" a few moments ago.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier, with regard to the question. I respect the fact that details can't be given when negotiations are proceeding. I've respected that in this Legislature, whether I agree or not, because that has been a government format. But in terms of questions, could the hon. Premier assure the Assembly that when questions are asked which aren't a matter of any ongoing negotiations, or when details that can be made public are available, the ministers will provide those for the Legislature? Will he review that with his respective cabinet ministers?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I try to listen as carefully as I can to the questions that are asked, with just that point in mind. I think a considerable amount of information is provided.

I've been listening to the exchange in this last question, and I thought I understood — perhaps the record will show differently — the Solicitor General to say that he had received a proposal to be flexible on this matter, was considering the proposal, and would come back with an answer as soon as possible. I have been in the same chair as the hon. Leader of the Opposition. He will no doubt judge when "as soon as possible" is, but I think it's a reasonable matter. As I understand it, he has a proposal from the truckers and will look at it, and we should give consideration to the nature of the flexibility.

Beef Cattle and Sheep Support Program

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Could the minister indicate the final response to the cattle and sheep subsidy in the province of Alberta?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, just over 61,000 applications were received. Those covered the total applications in all phases, including the sheep applications.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate if all the cheques have been mailed to producers at this point, since April 8 was the final date for applications?

MR. SCHMIDT: No, Mr. Speaker. The cheques are still going out and will continue to do so for perhaps another 10 days.

MR. MANDEVILLE: One final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate if many appeals have had to be dealt with, where applications for the subsidy were refused?

MR. SCHMIDT: Very few, Mr. Speaker. The appeals are ongoing at the present time. Those appeals held with the local Ag. Development Corporation boards are still ongoing, and two or three of the applications are still being reviewed. Other than that, the numbers were very few, considering the number of applications made.

Telephone Services — Remote Areas

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the Associate Minister of Telephones, with respect to the optional calling plan. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether, in addition to making this program available for geographically adjacent exchanges, some emphasis will be placed on those exchanges that share an economic tie? I raise that because of some of the problems in some of the border communities in northwestern Alberta, Bear Canyon in particular.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before in this House, the optional calling program will be on trial in six different exchanges in the province. The access in the trials will be to adjacent exchanges. If that program is instituted on a province-wide basis in 1983, it will certainly not resolve all the problems of some areas where they want to have access to their market centre; the hon. member raised the example of Bear Canyon. The intent is to investigate to see whether the program can be extended beyond the adjacent exchanges, and that will depend on what happens in the trials. So that those particular areas will have their market centres taken into account.

As I recall, Bear Canyon does not have flat rate calling to any adjacent exchange at the present time. This new program would allow them access to one of the centres they wish, namely Worsley. However, many people there wish to go further, and we will certainly do what we can to accommodate them.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the minister. Will this program allow any exchange or arrangement with a telephone system in another province? Again, using Bear Canyon as an example, they are really looking at Dawson Creek and Fort St. John as their primary market centres; secondary market centres would be in Alberta. Will there be any consideration of working out an arrangement with B.C. Telephones on something like this?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, this particular issue has been raised by other members in the House, including the Member for Grande Prairie. Certainly at the present time, the program will not extend into British Columbia. There are agreements between B.C. Telephones and AGT to allow for some of the problems that exist, and this is certainly one we will be looking at.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I understand trials are presently under way, as the minister indicated. Is the minister in a position to advise the

Assembly when it's anticipated that the program can begin on a province-wide basis?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the trials begin on June 1 of this year, are anticipated to last one year and, if successful, will then begin to be instituted on a province-wide basis.

MR. NOTLEY: One final supplementary question. The minister indicated that an arrangement with B.C. Tel is possible. Will the minister assure the House that once the trials are completed, there will be specific discussion with B.C. Tel on the extension of this optional calling plan?

DR. WEBBER: As I've already mentioned, Mr. Speaker, where there are anomalies and the program will not resolve the problems of the exchanges, we will take each of them into account.

Truckers' Licences
(continued)

DR. BUCK: I have a further question to the hon. Solicitor General, to do with the extension of the deadline for commercial truck licences. Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the deadline is in about three days, can the minister indicate to the Assembly if he will have an announcement before that time? In many cases, these truckers have to put out \$1,000 or \$2,000 for licences. The road bans are on, and many of them can't move a wheel. Is the minister giving active consideration to that, and will we know within the three-day period before the deadline expires?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to respond positively, and was trying to do so. I'm trying to do my best to meet that time frame, and hopefully I can.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the hon. Minister of Culture would like to deal further with a previous question period topic.

Art Acquisition for Legislature Grounds

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, this past Monday, April 26, I was asked if a traffic study had been done on the pedways. A traffic study was done in 1976 by the Department of Housing and Public Works.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Minister of State for Economic Development — International Trade revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, today I am very happy to introduce to you six students and one teacher, Mrs. Erica Binder, from Bonnie Doon high school. They are here to see how question period operates and, I'm told by one of the students, especially to see our Premier Peter Lougheed. I ask hon. members of this Assembly to welcome them. Will they rise and receive the welcome?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

[On motion, the Assembly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole]

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

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the committee please come to order.

Bill 1
Hail and Crop Insurance
Amendment Act, 1982

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding the sections of this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the hon. Premier, I take pleasure in moving that Bill No. 1, the Hail and Crop Insurance Amendment Act, 1982, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 5
Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation
Amendment Act, 1982

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment to Bill 5, and it has been circulated. Are there any questions or comments regarding the amendment?

[Motion on amendment carried]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Bill be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

Bill 8
Transportation of Dangerous Goods
Control Act

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill 8 has an amendment, which has been circulated to committee members. Are there any questions or comments regarding the amendment?

[Motion on amendment carried]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 8 be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

Bill 13
Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation
Amendment Act, 1982

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding the sections of this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 13 be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 14
Clean Air Amendment Act, 1982

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment to Bill 14, which has been circulated. Are there any questions or comments regarding the amendment?

[Motion on amendment carried]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. PAHL: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 14, the Clean Air Amendment Act, 1982, be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

Bill 15
Clean Water Amendment Act, 1982

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding the sections of this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. PAHL: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 15, the Clean Water Amendment Act, 1982, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 16
Hazardous Chemicals
Amendment Act, 1982

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding the sections of this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 16, the Hazardous Chemicals Amendment Act, 1982, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 17
Criminal Injuries Compensation
Amendment Act, 1982

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have two amendments to this Bill, which have been circulated. Are there any questions or comments regarding the amendments?

[Motion on amendments carried]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 17, the Criminal Injuries Compensation Amendment Act, 1982, be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

Bill 22
Securities Amendment Act, 1982

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are some amendments to this Act. Are there any questions or comments regarding the amendments?

[Motion on amendments carried]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 22 be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

Bill 24
Farm Implement Act

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment here. It has been circulated. Are there any questions regarding the amendment?

[Motion on amendment carried]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding the sections of the Bill as amended?

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, a concern I've had brought to my attention is if a dealer has to carry the parts for any equipment. In some cases, they lease the equipment to someone else. I'd like the mover to clarify Section 25. I think it's on page 15. I would like the mover to indicate whether the distributor has to carry the parts, also anyone who is buying this equipment from a dealer and leasing it out. I'm thinking of a concern brought to my attention, where they're renting out pivots. Someone will buy some pivots from a machine dealer and then lease them out. In a case like that, would both the distributor and the person who is leasing out the pivots have to carry the parts as indicated in the Bill?

MR. MAGEE: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the member's concerns, this Act specifically states that machines will be handled by dealers, and the parts and supplies and so on will come from dealers in Alberta. Consequently, any financial institution that might want to enter into the leasing business, be it a bank or something of this nature, would then have to make an agreement through the dealer from whom he had acquired the machines to lease, to supply the parts and so on. I think this covers the situation, so that in all cases the dealer will provide the parts and service to ensure the farmer customer that he is protected.

MR. MANDEVILLE: If I understand the mover of the Bill, anyone who's leasing or subleasing the equipment does not have to carry parts. Is that the case?

MR. MAGEE: If he is in strictly the finance end of the business, then he does not have to carry the parts, because he is not a licensed person. But the Act does say:

No person shall carry on business as a dealer unless
he is the holder of a dealer's licence . . .

Therefore a dealer is the person who would enter into an agreement with the finance company to provide those parts and services. This will be clearly laid out in the regulations to a greater extent as it might fit different sets of circumstances.

MR. MANDEVILLE: I appreciate the answer that whoever is financing will not have to supply parts. I realize that wouldn't happen. But the case I was thinking of is where someone bought a number of pivots from a dealer. After purchasing the pivots, he leased them out to customers. In that case, would the dealer be responsible for the parts, or would the person leasing the equipment out to the consumer be responsible for carrying the parts?

MR. MAGEE: Anyone purchasing equipment he is going to lease out afterwards would purchase it from a dealer, who will be responsible for the carrying of parts and services. As I said, this will be clarified in the regulations to cover various sets of circumstances. Does that answer the member's question?

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. That clarifies the question.

On page 2, Section 2(2), "The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations exempting" a piece of farm machinery. Could the mover indicate the reason for this, or what type of equipment would be exempted by the Lieutenant-Governor? Why was this section brought in?

MR. MAGEE: In the previous Act, under the definitions of a dealer, there was a statement that a dealer was responsible for all equipment above the amount of \$1,000. In other words, everything below \$1,000 — say a grain auger or something of that nature worth \$800 — did not come under the Act. The farmer was not protected by the Act. Under a new Section 2 it was changed, whereby the Lieutenant-Governor could make regulations. This would cover the inflationary factors, because that same auger we're talking about could be worth \$1,100 or \$1,200 in two or three years.

Maybe an auger isn't the best example. Let's take garden equipment that might be operated by a small landowner. He doesn't make his living from farming, but he would purchase it as a piece of farm equipment and avoid federal sales tax on that equipment, because it would fit into the position of being a piece of farm equipment. In this way, the Lieutenant Governor in Council can accept things such as lawn and garden equipment when sold to a small acreage owner or someone who does not make his living farming.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member, with regard to the Act as such. I remember when we did a rewrite of this Act back in 1964. At that time, one of the concerns we had was the cost to the implement dealer in carrying out the responsibilities the Act sets down. We had the major agencies, John Deere, Massey-Ferguson, White, and a number of others sit down with us — the Minister of Agriculture and two or three MLAs — and try to consider the cost factor that was built into the legislation. Talking to agents at the present time, who are

feeling the economic pressure — sales of farm equipment are down significantly; their cost of interest is up significantly — some are going to be in difficulty if this month isn't a good one in terms of sales.

I can think of two or three constituent problems I've had with regard to this Act, where the Act took precedence and the dealer had to make expenditures, right or wrong, to fix and supply equipment. It was a significant cost. The one instance I recall was \$1,200. You get four or five of those — today that could be more than a profit and half the salary of one of the agency's employees.

I'd like to know from the hon. member whether the legislation was considered in light of present economic conditions. The last three or four years when we didn't have that, a farmer would walk in and say: I'll take that tractor; put it on my bill; I want to send it out with somebody. That doesn't happen today. People are just not buying. Machine dealers had more flexible cash to meet some of these extra commitments. I'd like to be assured by the hon. member that that was considered, and that the method by which the Act will be enforced during these difficult times will certainly be considered.

MR. MAGEE: That's a rather general statement. Maybe I could best say that this particular Act has been seven years in the making. It's been absolutely approved by the Farm Implement Board. No complaints have been raised by the major manufacturers. The Farm Equipment Dealers Association has approved all the items in the Bill. Mr. Chairman, this Bill really gives considerable advantage to the farmers and dealers throughout. I could go through it piece by piece and highlight all the factors, but it's safe to say that it gives considerable benefits to the farmers and to the dealers in their protection and the conduct of their business. Is that a satisfactory answer, or do you want to get into all the details? [interjection] I can't hear the member.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member. I want to know the attitude at this point in time, and whether the matter had been considered. Did the hon. member indicate that meetings have been held with the major machine companies at this point in time, let's say 1982 or late 1981, to discuss the content of the Act again? Has that occurred?

MR. MAGEE: As I say, this Bill has been ongoing for seven years. The Farm Implement Board has representatives from the prairie manufacturers, the major implement company, and a group of farmers, who are the greater number. I think there is one from the major implement company, one from the prairie implement dealers association, and one from the Farm Equipment Dealers Association, and I believe four or five farmers sit on this board. I think it's a make-up of eight, and probably nine with the chairman, who is also a farmer. These people have approved all the details in this Bill to their satisfaction.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, just a few comments on Bill No. 24. I sent copies to the implement dealers in my constituency, and I had discussions with one. Looking through this Bill, his comments were that the majority of things in the Bill are things the average good implement dealer does, has done, and will do if he remains successful. In his brief overview, he didn't see any major problems with it. As I've said, they've been in business in that particular location — well, I guess it's the longest history

of any dealer of that brand in Alberta, so they've been around a while. Their feeling was that the things in this Bill are things they have done without legislation for many, many years — and so have a lot of other successful dealers — in order to help their clientele, build up their clientele, and be fair to the farmer, themselves, and the implement company they represent.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, just one short question to the hon. member, with regard to comments he made that regulations covering some parts of the Bill would be coming out. Could the hon. member indicate when the regulations to cover Bill 24 will be brought out?

MR. MAGEE: In talking to the person who supervises the Farm Implement Board just last week, it's my understanding that all these regulations are now in the printing stage. If they don't come out simultaneously, it will be a matter of days following the Bill.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. MAGEE: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 24, the Farm Implement Act, be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

Bill 23
Water Resources Amendment Act, 1982

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding the sections of this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 23, the Water Resources Amendment Act, 1982, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 25
Alberta Order of Excellence
Amendment Act, 1982

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding the sections of this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 25, the Alberta Order of Excellence Amendment Act, 1982, be reported.

[Motion carried]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration and reports Bills 1, 13, 15, 16, 23, and 25; and reports Bills 5, 8, 14, 17, 22, and 24 with some amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

Bill 28
Alberta Opportunity Fund
Amendment Act, 1982

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of Bill No. 28, the Alberta Opportunity Fund Amendment Act, 1982, and talking about the principles of the Bill, initially what we are after is to increase the authorization for the Alberta Opportunity Company to bring the total amount of borrowings by the company from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund from the present \$150 million to \$300 million. Of course that is a result of the fact that the present borrowings of the company are fast approaching the \$150 million maximum. I believe they're somewhere around \$124 million to \$128 million right now.

The second principle is to assist in the approval of the loans by changing the Act to increase the limits. The Alberta Opportunity Company may approve loans, except those approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, from the present \$750,000 in the Act to \$1 million. The reason for that adjustment is that the last 10 major loans approved by the company through the Lieutenant Governor in Council were all over the \$1 million amount. So we are adjusting it in tune with the times, in the sense that the larger loans appear to be \$1 million or more, thus we're moving that limit up to \$1 million from \$750,000.

Mr. Speaker, Section 3 of the Act is to ensure that the Alberta Opportunity Company is covered by the management pension plan. There was a bit of an anomaly between the management pension plan Act and the Pension Fund Act, and the Alberta Opportunity Company Act, in that one said contributions were to be fifty-fifty and the other was to be by percentage. So we're correcting that particular anomaly and assuring the continuity of the pension plan for members of the Alberta Opportunity Company.

I feel that Section 5 will be very important, in the sense that the company has requested permission to appoint more than one loans committee. Under the present Act, they are able to appoint one loans committee to handle the review of loans accounts, and that particular committee has been what we might term overworked. We are changing it to allow the board to appoint one or more loans committees. We feel this process will assist in speeding up the applications received for approval by the Alberta Opportunity Company; I guess I should say for approval or rejection, because a number of them are also covered in that particular sense.

Mr. Speaker, one word is changed in Section 6. Under the old Act, the section stated that:

The recommendations of the Alberta Research Council, or other agencies as required, shall be obtained . . .

We have changed that to "may be obtained", because we have not had to go to the Research Council on as many occasions as was considered to be the case when the Act was first struck. So that change just makes it a little more flexible, in the sense that if there's a need to seek advice

or recommendations from the Alberta Research Council, we can do that by the "may" clause in there.

Mr. Speaker, those are the main points in Bill No. 28, the Alberta Opportunity Fund Amendment Act, 1982.

[Motion carried; Bill 28 read a second time]

Bill 29
Financial Administration
Amendment Act, 1982

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 29, the Financial Administration Amendment Act, 1982.

There are essentially four amendments in this Bill. The major features are as follows. Firstly, in view of the declining surplus and the projected deficit of the province this year, as indicated in the recently tabled revised financial plan, an increase in the authorized borrowing limit, from \$500 million to \$2.2 billion, is proposed. Secondly, there is fine-tuning in the Bill with respect to the list of eligible investments in the General Revenue Fund and other government funds. For example, the pension fund already contains the provision in here, which enables it to be applicable to other funds. Thirdly, it amends the section on the consolidated cash investment trust fund to make it clear that profits and losses are to be allocated to depositors on a regular basis. Fourthly, it provides that all interest on government debt would be a statutory charge on the General Revenue Fund. That provides the necessary assurance to our creditors that the interest owing to them will definitely be paid.

[Motion carried; Bill 29 read a second time]

CLERK ASSISTANT: Bill 32, the Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Amendment Act, 1982.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Dr. Reid, could I ask the Clerk to call Bill No. 35, and we'll return to the other one later.

Bill 35
Special Waste Management
Corporation Act

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of Bill 35, the Special Waste Management Corporation Act, I would like to say a few words about the importance of this legislation, in view of the continuous concern by the Alberta public in general insofar as handling these problem materials, particularly in a province such as Alberta, that's growing and expanding its industry.

I think one of the concerns people have is the problem of distinguishing between what really are hazardous wastes and what are called "special wastes" — it's a term used out there. In my experience, an awful lot of the materials that flow up and down the highways and railways today could be considered hazardous, depending on the quantities being transported and the combination of circumstances. Practically all materials have varying degrees of hazardousness, depending on a lot of variable factors. So it's important that when we discuss this, we are really talking about the materials that will basically be laid down by the Hazardous Chemicals Act, which will have a special schedule and will specifically define the materials involved in terms of this piece of legislation.

What we will have, upon eventual approval of the legislation I've brought in this spring — including legislation by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, on the transportation of dangerous goods — is the total concept of proper management of special materials which are not readily and normally handled under present circumstances. If not the first in Canada, certainly it will be one of the first to deal totally with the problem.

I think our government can be proud of the fact that we have initiated these major steps and that Albertans, in years to come, will basically benefit from the legislation before me today, including the amendments to the Hazardous Chemicals Act and the transportation of dangerous goods. I expect that when everything is in place, we will have a situation whereby all industries that are licensed to operate — and that includes most of the industries in Alberta — will be licensed under the clean air and clean water legislation. Under the Hazardous Chemicals Act licensing, they will also be required to identify for the Department of the Environment the material or materials they would classify as waste material which cannot be disposed of in the usual manner. The industries will have to account to us very clearly insofar as disposal is concerned. That is to say, they won't necessarily have to be involved with this particular Crown corporation requirement, but they must be accountable for how they plan to dispose of that particular waste product.

This legislation will enable those industries that cannot, under normal circumstances on their own property or by their own means, properly neutralize and handle those special wastes. It will make it possible for them to go to a Crown agency and say, I have this material; please advise as to the best way of disposal. Under this legislation, the Crown corporation in a sense will be responsible for seeing that those particular materials find their way either to a Crown-owned corporate facility or to a private facility.

It is not the province's intention to lay on the public in general and industry in particular a lot of heavy-handed bureaucracy and administration. We want to make the system as simple and as effective as possible. Also, we want to encourage private enterprise to deal with the problem themselves as much as possible. In a sense this will be a back-up position for a situation where industry doesn't find it easy to do that.

As I project the way the total operation will function, under the Hazardous Chemicals Act the industry will be required to issue a manifest. That manifest will indicate the specific material and the quantities. It will be assigned a certain number, and it will then be the duty of the industry to fill out the manifest and arrange for transportation to either a privately owned facility or, if necessary, a Crown-owned corporate facility. At that facility, it will be the responsibility of either the private industry or the corporation itself to see that the materials are properly neutralized. It is anticipated that sometime in the foreseeable future, we will have a facility in the province that will be used for incineration of certain products which cannot readily be neutralized or disposed of by any other means.

Going briefly through the contents of Bill 35, first of all the definition:

"Corporation facility" means a hazardous waste management facility established or operated . . .

- (i) by the Corporation, or
- (ii) pursuant to an agreement under section 15(1).

Section 15(1) then makes provision for private enterprise.

It says:

The Corporation may establish and operate, or enter into agreements with other persons to establish and operate, such . . . facilities as it considers necessary to carry out its objects.

I think it's important to underline to the public in general, and in keeping with the philosophy of our government, that hopefully private enterprise will be able to operate the total facilities in this respect. As a government, our responsibility through the corporation will be very limited, in the sense that private industry will do the job for us.

In that respect, I think it's important at this time to say too that we have at least four major companies interested in a facility in the province. We are presently reviewing the short list of four, and will soon be making recommendations to the government insofar as prioritizing the list. Hopefully that will take place before too much time passes.

I think it is important that the corporation, as spelled out in the objectives, be mentioned at this time, because the public in general will be asking what the corporation's total intent is. It is:

to ensure the establishment and operation of sufficient Corporation facilities . . .

By corporation facilities, I refer to both private operations and any that are actually constructed by the corporation

to deal adequately with hazardous waste that is not being adequately dealt with by other waste management facilities . . .

It's to ensure that once they are established, they are operated and maintained

in a manner that will protect the health and safety of the public and the environment. . .

That's an extremely important section to explain, because the legislation the Department of the Environment now has — as you know we made amendments to both the clean air and the clean water legislation this year, and updated them. Those pieces of legislation, along with the Hazardous Chemicals Act amendments, will be administered by the Department of the Environment to ensure that whatever plant is constructed will be maintained in a manner that will protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.

There are a number of sections in the legislation which spell out the actual administration. First of all, consisting of not fewer than 5 members . . . appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

One of the members appointed will be a chairman or the chief executive officer. There's provision for payment to the five or so members, and there's provision under Section 7(1) to

- (a) employ technical or professional persons . . .
- (c) prescribe the duties of its employees;
- (d) engage any person to provide to the Corporation any services of a professional nature or requiring special technical knowledge or training . . .

A section in the legislation makes provision for by-laws which have to do with job classification governing application of salary ranges and payment of benefits to employees:

The Corporation may by by-law establish [a] non-contributory pension, including death . . . plans

and so on, which are general clauses for corporations of the Crown.

I referred to some of the duties of the corporation. The

by-laws of the corporation — those I've outlined briefly — shall be "approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council". Any that have not been included in that section will have to be approved by the Minister of the Environment.

There's a requirement for regular meetings, which puts a limit on the maximum time that should elapse between meetings of the corporation. There's also provision for the corporation to borrow money and issue notes, bonds, debentures, or other securities, or pledge any of the corporation's property:

The Lieutenant Governor in Council may . . .

- (a) authorize the Provincial Treasurer to guarantee on behalf of the Crown the repayment of all or part of any money borrowed . . .
- (b) prescribe the form of the guarantee . . . and
- (c) specify who may execute the instrument on behalf of the [province].

Section 12 is important. There may be a situation where we might wish to provide a grant to the corporation. There's provision for the Crown to

make grants to the Corporation from money voted by the Legislature for that purpose.

Their fiscal year will be the same as for the province, April 1 to March 31.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. With respect, I'm reluctant to interrupt the hon. minister. But it would appear that we're really getting into the details of the Bill and away from the idea that debate on second reading should be debate on principle. It would seem to me that we're now into committee study of the Bill, even to the point of discussing what the fiscal year of the corporation is going to be.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I thought I could complete both stages at the same time. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: I suspect we'll have to have the chairman of committees join me in the Chair.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, on completion of second reading of Bill 35, I just want to say that we've undertaken an extremely important piece of legislation. Probably we're only the second province in Canada that has this type of legislation. We hope this will be a positive contribution to the future environment of the province.

[Motion carried; Bill 35 read a second time]

Bill 36

Alberta Corporate Income Tax Amendment Act, 1982

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 36, the Alberta Corporate Income Tax Amendment Act, 1982.

There are essentially three major improvements to the laws of the province — because they're all tax statutes — in the rather lengthy and complex wording of this Act. They are as follows. First, it exempts some 30,000 small Alberta businesses from having to pay monthly income tax instalments. That initiative was announced in the budget. It should save those businesses something over \$6.5 million in 1982 and a further \$6 million in each of the succeeding years. The new exemption was effective on April 1, 1982. It's being put forward on the basis of also trying to simplify the administration and paperwork re-

quired by these many, many smaller companies, which are in fact the backbone of the province because, as members know, most employees in the province are employees of small business, not large businesses.

Secondly, the amendment implements a very significant boost in the royalty tax credit, effective September 1, 1981. That is a major portion of the activity plan. Members will recall that in the budget speech, that royalty tax credit, which is in effect a reduction of royalty delivered through the tax system, was doubled from 25 to 50 per cent of the royalties. The maximum annual credit went from \$1 million to \$2 million.

With this statute and following and reflecting the activity plan, the tax credit goes to 75 per cent of royalties payable, to a maximum of \$4 million. That benefit is backdated to September 1, 1981, and carries forward for two years. The increase in cash flow, which will be available essentially to the smaller petroleum companies, is about \$565 million above the benefits announced in the budget itself. This means that a significantly large number of cheques will be going out in June and July of this year, particularly to the smaller oil companies, which will make up the royalty tax credit.

Thirdly, the amendment in Bill 36 provides for the extended Alberta rental investment incentive tax credit. Members will recall that that was extended for two years and was enriched. The benefit per unit for an individual or corporation wanting to invest is . . . increased from \$3,000 to \$8,000 per unit. We expect and hope that it will result in 4,000 new rental housing units. I believe it's a good move, Mr. Speaker, because it has the goal of trying to get private-sector dollars into the housing market to complement those which have been invested in the sum of close to \$1.5 billion through the government of Alberta, the Crown corporations, and the heritage fund. It provides about \$15 million in refundable corporation tax credits — that's the estimate for the forthcoming year — and about \$10 million in grants to individuals. The other modification is that the benefit is up from 5 to 12.5 per cent of capital cost. It applies to all units whose footings are in place prior to December 31, 1983.

Those are the essential elements of the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I want to make a comment with regard to the Alberta rental investment tax credit in Bill 36. I think the Provincial Treasurer and the Minister of Housing and Public Works really haven't blown their horns loud enough, because we're well aware in this province that the great slowdown in housing starts is a direct result of several factors. There's no question that the first one has been the federal initiative with regard to curbing the MURB program; secondly, the federal budget.

I would like to draw to the attention of members of the Assembly this particular program, announced by the Minister of Housing and Public Works, which is now in Bill 36, the corporate income tax amendment. I think the government is providing a substantial incentive to the citizens of Alberta to get construction under way, by increasing its contribution from \$3,000 to \$8,000 — if I'm not mistaken — or 12.5 per cent of the capital cost. I think it's one all members of the Assembly should strongly endorse.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Motion carried; Bill 36 read a second time]

Bill 32 Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Amendment Act, 1982

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in moving second reading of Bill No. 32, the Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Amendment Act, 1982.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill is very straightforward and simple. There are three parts to it, and they are only clarifications of the existing Bill. The first would clarify that an independent member, of which we appear to have several, may now register his constituency association with the Chief Electoral Officer. That is simply a clarification of what was always intended.

The second matter is to reinsert a section in the Act that was apparently deleted when the *Revised Statutes of Alberta 1980* were printed, which gave clear direction to a candidate who did not intend to run in the next election or a future election with regard to how he might transfer any moneys he had previously received by way of contributions that were then held in trust by him.

The last clarification is simply to indicate that a party or constituency association is the organization that collects contributions during the non-election period. During the election period, the candidate himself collects any contributions donors may wish to give.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two on this Bill. First of all, I'd like to say it's just about time in the history of this province that we looked at some honest-to-goodness electoral reform as far as public funding being used in supporting candidates who run for legitimate political parties. I know that speech never comes from the government side of the House. But our so-called Liberal government — which has great tendencies to lean to the left in this great Canada of ours — has moved in the direction of some degree of public funding being used to support legitimate candidates in an election. Our neighbors in the province of Saskatchewan have made a major step in that direction. Surely if the government believes every candidate should have an equal chance, and democracy believes every candidate should have an equal chance, it's time we looked at two things: one, limiting the amount of funds that can be spent per voter in each and every constituency; and two, looking at as much as, say, 70 per cent of election expenses being paid out of the public purse.

Mr. Speaker, at committee stage I'm sure government members will come up with dozens of reasons why this should never be looked at. It's such a great advantage to be sitting on the government side when you're trying to raise election funds. But that doesn't make the principle right or wrong. If the government has access to greater funds than the other parties, that should be a greater incentive and greater reason, because government's are responsible for policies. If democracy is going to survive in this province and this country — and democracy is a very fragile flower; it requires constant nourishment by forward-thinking people to keep it alive.

Look at what's happening in this province right now. When we call an election, the other parties don't have an equal opportunity. They don't because dollars speak. In the last election, the party in power spent and collected nearly \$800,000. I would like to be able to look into the bank account the government had before we had the election contributions Act in place, to really see how much money they had. I would like to have just the interest on that big bundle to run a campaign.

So what happens to the other parties? The Socreds, the Liberals, and the NDP go into debt about a quarter million dollars. Then it takes them four years to get out of debt so they can go back into debt another quarter million dollars to run in the next campaign. Mr. Speaker, I think the principle that we look at some type of funding is very, very important. And I don't say all the funding. I say as much as possibly three-quarters should come out of the public purse.

I know people will say, how can you limit the amount of funding per voter? Many of us have been in this game of politics for a few years. I can tell you, within \$100, how much my opponent is spending. I can tell you, within a couple of hundred dollars, when he declares how much he has spent, if it's legitimate or if the figures have been fudged a little bit. People who have been in this business know how much it costs to run a basic campaign.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Some of us haven't been around that long.

DR. BUCK: Some of us haven't been around that long. To the hon. government party Whip, if you've been around once, that's long enough. You learn very, very quickly.

Mr. Speaker, I know that if we could enforce the rules, there would be a limit on the amount of spending. A great portion of the campaign funds should come from public purse. That way, all legitimate candidates would have to look at the aspect of maybe a larger deposit. So if they were just running frivolously, they would put up a large deposit and lose it, or if they came up to X number of votes, they would get the \$1,000 or whatever it was. Some other jurisdictions have made a move in that direction. I think it behooves this Assembly to take a very serious look at giving every political party a legitimate chance to run credible candidates and a credible campaign, and let the people decide who they want to vote for.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm rising in response to some of the points made by the hon. Member for Clover Bar. I think the hon. member either conveniently overlooks or forgets that the provision now exists under our taxation legislation. For those who aren't aware of the date, I think we have two more days to file our income tax return.

DR. BUCK: Send me a cheque, Julian.

MR. KOZIAK: Included in the information you have when you file your return is a provision for a claim for a contribution from the provincial government for any contributions you have made to a political party during the course of that year. In fact the percentage returned is equal to the percentage the hon. member raised in his remarks. It's 75 per cent. So if I contribute \$100 to a political party, the provincial government returns \$75. However, that contribution must be made by an Albertan before such funds are returned by the provincial government.

I think the only difference in the concept that presently exists and the one proposed by the Member for Clover Bar is that somehow we would require a payment of that \$75 by government, not on the basis of decisions made by individual Albertans to support that person, but on the basis of the decision of one individual to seek office and

to spend money in seeking that office, without any support or without anybody contributing to that campaign. Part of the democratic process requires support of those you represent. The hon. member is suggesting that the government should somehow provide funds to someone who no one would support, so he could run. To my mind, that is a funny quirk on the forward-thinking democracy the hon. member was suggesting. The system now in place is a proper one; it treats all registered candidates equally. There is no advantage to government . . .

DR. BUCK: Oh, Julian.

MR. KOZIAK: . . . no advantage to the members of the Official Opposition, and no advantage to the independent members. What it does is give us a day of reckoning. The fact that a party — to which the hon. Member for Clover Bar at one time was a member, while it was in existence — may have a substantial debt is an indication of either the irresponsibility of that party by spending more than it took in or the lack of support by the people for that party. In either case, that's democracy at work.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. KOZIAK: Of course.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs aware that when large contributions come in, there's a sort of . . . I'll get to the question, Mr. Speaker. Can he indicate to the Assembly that when a contribution is made — let's use a figure of \$100 — the person says, 60 per cent goes to the party in power and the other 40 per cent is divided. Is the minister aware that that's the rule of thumb most contributors go by?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps in posing the question, the hon. member is giving us some insight into the practice prior to 1971. He's probably more knowledgeable than I am on events that took place then.

DR. BUCK: That's a good lawyer's answer.

MR. SPEAKER: I should say there's some doubtful status in the "Is the member aware" question, because that can preface quite a line of debate by listing a whole lot of points the member might not be aware of. However, I don't think any harm was done.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, speaking to second reading of Bill 32, particularly with regard to comments by the hon. Member for Clover Bar, I'd like to remind him of several points. One, he was a member of a government which enjoyed a substantial majority in the Legislature for many years, and legislation was not in place. This government recognized that all Albertans should have an opportunity to participate. For that reason — and I don't like the word "government", because we're not dealing with a question of government — the provision of the Act whereby all Albertans can participate, not the government, is there.

Frankly, if he's at all concerned about the public participating, they can indeed participate, to the tune of 75 cents of every dollar they contribute up to the first \$100, as mentioned by the Member for Edmonton Strathcona.

I think that is very important for those people in the province who wish to participate in the democratic process by way of financial contribution.

I think it is also incumbent upon those seeking office to recognize that it's in their interest to form a political party, have it registered under the Act and, by so doing and meeting the requirements laid down by the Chief Electoral Officer, qualify as a recipient of those funds. As I'm sure all hon. members know, once a person who is officially nominated after a writ, becomes a candidate, that candidate or his agent can go out and raise funds for 60 days following that writ. Mr. Speaker, I think every opportunity is afforded both to political parties and candidates in this province who want to seek political office. Indeed, I've heard some people say it's a provision that really shouldn't necessarily be there. But this government has done that.

One argument not made, that I would certainly listen to, if the Member for Clover Bar wanted to make it, is that in view of inflation, government or somebody should perhaps consider an amendment to the Act, increasing the limits presently allowed.

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[Motion carried; Bill 32 read a second time]

Bill 39

Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Amendment Act, 1982 (No. 2)

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in moving second reading of Bill No. 39, the Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Amendment Act, 1982, (No. 2).

In my mind, the exercise we've just seen reflects two things. One is the responsiveness of the members of the Assembly to constituents' needs. By way of explanation: during the week, I live in the riding of the Member for Edmonton Strathcona. I thought he gave a marvellous explanation of where we were, in terms of contributions under Bill 32. That is an example of a member responding to a constituent.

An example of the government responding to an MLA is the recommendation just made by the Member for Lethbridge West, that we increase the limit of contributions. That is what Bill No. 39 is all about. The simple principle in that Bill is to increase the limit of contributions by 50 per cent in each category where contributions are permitted. I would say that we had had the Bill in mind some time before the member suggested it, but certainly we were glad to be able to respond as quickly as we did.

DR. BUCK: The Tories will get another million dollars, Stu. They'll need it.

MR. McCRAE: One other amendment goes with the amendment to increase the contribution level: the credit for income tax deduction, which again goes up by 50 per cent. Recognizing the inflation factor in our economy, and the desire to let all constituents — wage earners, salary earners, and business people in Alberta — participate fully in the democratic process, I urge all members of the Assembly that we increase the limits and tax credits as recommended in the Bill.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the hon. minister piloting the Bill through the Assembly indicate if he, or the

sponsor of the Bill, is giving any consideration to limiting the amount of spending per voter in each constituency?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, we have given consideration to that recommendation and this time have rejected it. We think the limiting or patrolling rule is the fact that contributions over \$250, I believe it is, are required to be listed with the Chief Electoral Officer. That has the good feature of full disclosure of what is happening in the electoral process. Frankly, I think trying to limit the amount of expenditures has not been required by members on this side. There has been no concern about the number of dollars. I think that regardless of the dollars you spend, if you have a good platform, a good candidate, and a good party, a good candidate will succeed.

DR. BUCK: You'll need it next time.

[Motion carried; Bill 39 read a second time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, those are all the government Bills available for second reading this afternoon. I wonder if hon. members want to give unanimous consent to proceed with second reading of five private Bills, reported earlier today by the chairman of the Committee on Private Bills.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. Government House Leader have the unanimous consent requested?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

head: PRIVATE BILLS (Second Reading)

Bill Pr. 1 Lethbridge Country Club Amendment Act, 1982

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill Pr. 1, the Lethbridge Country Club Amendment Act, 1982.

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. 1 read a second time]

Bill Pr. 2 Holy Cross Hospital (Grey Nuns) of Calgary Amendment Act, 1982

MR. BORSTAD: In the absence of the Member for Calgary Fish Creek, I move second reading of Bill Pr. 2, the Holy Cross Hospital (Grey Nuns) of Calgary Amendment Act, 1982.

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. 2 read a second time]

Bill Pr. 6 Montreal Trust Company of Canada Act

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move second reading of Bill Pr. 6, the Montreal Trust Company of Canada Act. This received the very speedy approval of the Private Bills Committee this morning. It follows the model legislation used last year. I don't think any questions need to be posed.

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. 6 read a second time]

Bill Pr. 8

**Edmonton Convention and Tourism
Authority Act**

MR. MACK: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill Pr. 8, the Edmonton Convention and Tourism Authority Act, as amended.

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. 8 read a second time]

Bill Pr. 9

**Edmonton Economic Development
Authority Act**

MR. MACK: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill

Pr. 9, the Edmonton Economic Development Authority Act, as amended.

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. 9 read a second time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the intention is that the House not sit tomorrow evening. I move that we call it 5:30.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 4:41 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]