

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

[The House met at 2:30 o'clock.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce some 25 Grade 9 students from Kenilworth School in my constituency. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Fors, who is making his second visit to the Assembly with a class this year. I would ask them now to stand and be recognized. They are in the public gallery.

MR. BATIUK:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Legislative Assembly 40 Grade 8 and Grade 9 students from Chipman School.

Chipman School is one of the smallest schools in my constituency. However, its smallness casts no reflection on its accomplishments because over several consecutive years Grade 9 students from this school have been the recipients of the Governor General's medal for the highest academic standing in their respective county.

They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Pruss and Mr. Borys, and bus operator, Mr. Babbik. They are seated in the members gallery and I would ask them all to rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and to the members of the House 39 students from the Nickel Junior High School in the Calgary Egmont constituency. They are here on this tour under the auspices of the Rotary Club of South Calgary, the tour conductor being Mr. Seaborn. I would ask them to now stand and be recognized.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly some 21 Grade 4 McDougall School students accompanied by their teacher, Miss Galbraith, and also some 20 Grade 5 students from McDougall School, accompanied by Miss Lorenka. They are seated in the public gallery. I would like to thank them for coming and taking an interest in how laws are made in this province. I'd ask them to rise now and be recognized.

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce to you and to the members of this Assembly the Grade 9 class, 19 strong, from the Killam Public School. They are accompanied today by their teacher, Manfred Jesswein, and bus driver, Rev. Richards. So they are in good company.

Killam has a population of approximately 900 people. They boast a modern ice arena. It's the home of the Killam Indians, and this team started Ron Anderson on his way to the National Hockey League and now the Edmonton Oilers. They are enlarging their facilities and the arena will house an indoor swimming pool, a bowling alley, a curling rink and other recreational and agricultural

needs. So if you want to see Killam, you had better go soon because it's changing so fast.

Old timers in the area claim they met at the turn of the century to give names to these areas. And what was to have been Catchem, Killam, Skinem and Eatem didn't turn out that way. However, Killam stuck to their guns.

They are in the public gallery. I would ask that they stand and be recognized at this time.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to introduce a young lady who is observing the proceedings today. She is from Washington State University and travelled approximately 800 miles to see this Legislature in action. She advises me that what she tells them at home about this House will depend on the proceedings today. Her name is Shirley Ness. Will she stand up and be recognized?

TABLING REPORTS AND FILING RETURNS

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to table a reply to Motion for a Return No. 173, asked by the hon. Member for Drumheller March 6, 1973.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a Motion for a Return to table today, No. 143, as requested by the House.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the reply for Motion for a Return No. 160, moved by the hon. member, Mr. Gruenwald.

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a reply to Motion No. 125, requested by the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Amendments to The Police Act

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I have two questions I'd like to ask today. The first one is to the Attorney General. I ask the Attorney General if the amendments he presented to the House yesterday dealing with the police commissions were discussed with the chairmen of the police commissions in Edmonton and Calgary?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I would say that over the past year I have spent perhaps as much as a week in consultation with the police commissions of Calgary and Edmonton and other cities within Alberta and the senior police officers, as well as representatives from municipal governments regarding the terms of The Police Act. So the specific answer to the hon. member's question is yes.

I should add that in addition to that consultation between myself and those persons, there was also a significant amount of consultation between members of the department and police commissions, police forces, and representatives of municipal government.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question to the minister. Mr. Minister, did you meet specifically with the mayors of Edmonton and Calgary to discuss the legislation once it was in draft form?

MR. LEITCH:

I met with the mayor of the City of Edmonton, Mr. Speaker, not to review a draft in bill form but we had prepared a discussion draft, and that I specifically discussed with all of the representatives of the municipal governments from Calgary, Edmonton, Lethbridge and Medicine Hat. At that

meeting there was the mayor of the City of Edmonton, but not the mayor of the City of Calgary.

Rural Gas Distribution

MR. CLARK:

Second question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Telephones and Utilities. I'd like to ask the minister if he is in a position today to announce the new rural gas distribution program for the province?

MR. FARRAN:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Cypress, followed by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

Sexsmith Rapeseed Processing Plant

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. I believe in reply to a question from the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview in regard to the establishment of a co-op at Sexsmith, the hon. minister replied that it had not been formed as yet. Is that correct?

DR. HORNER:

My understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that it is in the formative stages.

MR. STROM:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I'm wondering, does the hon. minister have any indication as to how soon they may have it formed? Also, in connection with that, I would be interested in knowing how large an area they may encompass as far as the co-op is concerned. Also, has the minister received other representations from other areas of the north?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, to follow up on what I said yesterday, yes, I have received other representations from Fairview, Hines Creek, McLennan and other points in northern Alberta, in regard to a site for a rapeseed plant. I want to re-emphasize again to all of the towns in Alberta that in my view once a company makes a decision and they made the decision on their own, that in fact it doesn't do the other towns any good to start trying to steal something away because they don't quite agree with the location the company picks. I think this is the worst possible thing for expansion of processing in rural Alberta. I would like to suggest, as I have before, that once we get into these kinds of arguments between towns, we in fact hurt our rural expansion program and that the towns should then be considering other forms of process. And there are lots of them. We still need cheese factories, we still need malt houses and innumerable types of processing plants that can, in fact, be developed in the Peace River country.

Again I want to say that the government did not choose the site, the company did. The government's contribution is strictly in relation to the formation of the co-operative to own 30 per cent of the facility. I might say it was my information that if it hadn't been Sexsmith it would likely have been Dawson Creek or the B.C. section of the Peace River bloc. So we are pleased they came into Alberta because I think it is important for our people in the area. It is our consideration that the entire western half of the Peace River country would be a drawing area for the plant located at Sexsmith.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question, and I appreciate the hon. minister's answer. I am wondering if he could tell the House which company it is he refers to. And also could the hon. minister tell us whether or not the government's offer is extended to any other groups or companies that may establish or are looking at other areas? In that context I am wondering as to whether or not the government is actually indicating by some manner or other which one they would favour.

DR. HORNER:

No, Mr. Speaker, we have made the same provisions, of course, for the Co-operative Association Act which are available to anybody. I have told the principals involved in the High Prairie plant that the same facilities are available to them. As a matter of fact, I think they are following up in that regard.

I don't think it is the government's responsibility to indicate location outside of any general area and I again suggest that part of the problem we have had with DREE is that sometimes the location did not fit the productive area. The situation we are in now with regard to rapeseed crushing where the only plant is in southern Alberta isn't a fair and equitable one for all the producers in Alberta and that is, in my view, one of the reasons for trying to expand them into the north as well.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the hon. minister could give me the name of the company he referred to.

DR. HORNER:

Rapeseed Processers Ltd.

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the last supplementary on this topic.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Are you in a position today, Mr. Minister, to advise the House what percentage of the capitalization would be equity capital and what percentage would be loan capital?

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. The equity capital would be in the -- I'll have to give rough figures for the moment -- about \$2.5 million, the loan capital in the nature of between 3 and \$3.4 million.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Fincher Creek-Crowsnest, followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge East.

Film Censorship

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation. My question is, has The Last Tango been submitted to the censorship board by United Artists for review, and if so, have any preliminary discussions taken place as to the acceptability of the film under the present criteria used by the board?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, The Last Tango has not been submitted to the censor board, and in fact we understand it is not expected in Canada for some time to come.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge East, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission Office

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Could you report to the House on the apparent need to upgrade the Drug and Alcohol Abuse Commission office in Lethbridge so that the commission can meet the needs of southern Alberta residents?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I almost wish the hon. member had been in our subcommittee hearings when we were discussing the role of the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission last week. Although Lethbridge was not specifically singled out for treatment in the numerous questions that were asked, think it did become apparent that there is quite a new look to the commission this year. They are very concerned about the balancing of services in areas outside of Edmonton where a lot of their resources had been committed before, and the new chairman himself has expressed a strong desire to see that done.

In respect to Lethbridge specifically, all I can say is that I am not personally aware of the inadequacies that are intimated in the hon. member's question, but I will certainly be pleased to look into it and get whatever information and projections for Lethbridge are in the minds of the commission at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow followed by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

College of Clinical Social Work

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Premier. Has the Executive Council made a decision on the appeal of the College of Clinical Social Work of Alberta for incorporation of the society under The Societies Act?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I will refer that question to the hon. Attorney General.

MR. LEITCH:

The answer is no, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. When can they expect a decision?

MR. LEITCH:

Well, I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, that I can give a definitive answer to that but I expect it will be considered by the Executive Council in the very near future.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

Rural Street Improvements

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. Minister of Highways. Mr. Minister, has a ceiling of \$50,000 been lifted from the street improvement program planned for towns and villages which you announced during the budget debate?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, we will be considering that at the time of the Estimates and also by the number of applications that are made by the various towns throughout Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Cattle Rustling

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Has there been an increase in cattle rustling in the province, and if so, what measures do you anticipate employing to discourage this practice?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, the question of cattle rustling is a continuing problem in any area which has a substantial number of cattle, as we have in Alberta, and continues to be a problem. The House might be interested to know that the number of people who are applying for brands has doubled within the past year as a result of a variety of reasons, one of them being to encourage the identification of animals so that they are easier to follow up. We have made a number of changes in regard to brand inspection and the investigative services of the department, and we intend to continue that upgrading procedure to try and keep rustling under control. Whether or not it will ever come completely under control, Mr. Speaker, I have some doubt.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

Gas Royalties

MR. NOTLEY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct this question to the Premier and it is for clarification. During the Speech from the Throne it was indicated that the new royalty scheme for natural gas would be introduced during this session. It didn't say whether it would be the spring or the fall session. My question to you is, are you in a position to advise the Assembly when the position paper will be tabled with respect to a new natural gas royalty program?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, our present target on that matter is the latter part of the summer months.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question. In the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Premier, it was also outlined that the government would be specifying the details of the two-price system for natural gas. Again the same question. When can we expect a position paper on that matter to be tabled in the Assembly?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I believe that would be in the last quarter of 1973, and possibly during the latter stages of the fall session.

MR. NOTLEY:

One further supplementary question. In the budget speech of the Provincial Treasurer, it was suggested that there would be a completely new direction for participation by Albertans in the development of energy resources. Will that be tabled during the spring session or will it be held over until the fall as well?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, that is not one I can answer definitively with regard to date because there are a number of factors involved. I have to leave it at the state the Provincial Treasurer referred to in terms of the budget address, and that is, during the course of the session. In that sense, of course, the session would involve the fall session as well.

MR. NOTLEY:

One final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the new natural gas program when it is announced. Will it be for the latter stages of the year, will it be retroactive to include production for the full year of 1973, or will it be postponed until 1974 for introduction?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I assume the hon. member is referring to the royalty aspect of it in terms of that last question. No conclusion has been reached at this time as to its effective date. The effective date, of course, for the oil situation is during this calendar year of 1973. The budget itself for the current fiscal year has made no allowances for an increased royalty situation. However, we haven't closed that option, that the decision with regard to gas would in effect include some portion of the present fiscal year. But at the moment the position would be that no decision has been reached on that matter.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Natural Gas Policy

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the hon. the Premier. Was Premier Davis in good spirits and is he now prepared to accept the increased price for natural gas in Ontario?

MR. LOUGHEED:

You've got me choking on that one. No, I would have to respond by saying that Mr. Davis is well aware that our policies have a considerable impact on the economy of Canada. I think he appreciates the position we have taken and the reason for the position we have taken.

I can't say much more about our discussions because to a significant extent they dealt with his remarks that he proposed to make tonight, and I don't think it would be appropriate for me to say anything more about it. I would, however, be prepared to answer questions from hon. members tomorrow on the matter after the speech, the address, by Mr. Davis (a copy of which he has provided me with today) has been made public.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for --

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question to the Premier, and this isn't meant to be facetious at all. In light of the comments made by Mr. Davis' assistant, Mr. McKeough, on the oil and gas situation in Alberta, did the Premier offer any short course for Mr. McKeough so that his comments on what is happening in the oil and gas industry in this province would be more relevant for the benefit of the people of Ontario?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we said that Mr. McKeough received or was assigned his responsibilities not too many months ago. I think he made his remarks in Sarnia not too many months after he had received that particular and very important assignment. I sensed in my meeting -- and he accompanied Premier Davis today -- a growing understanding with regard to some of the complications involved. Having said that there is a growing understanding, one can't read into that, naturally, a growing acceptance of the very strong position the Alberta government is taking.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Calgary Imperial Oil Refinery

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Premier or one of his ministers could advise if there has been any communication between the government and the officials of Imperial Oil regarding the future operation of the Calgary Imperial Oil Refinery?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I think we would have to take that question as notice and respond to the hon. member tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican, followed by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

Food Allowance for Welfare Recipients

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. In regard to your recent announcement of a 9 per cent increase in food allowance for social welfare recipients, I was wondering if further to that statement -- you claim you are going to make some adjustments -- there is any move to adjust the same payments for female recipients who are single to the same allowance as male recipients for food allowances? Why the discrepancy?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there are several questions there. I think some clarification has been given publicly since the matter came up last week as to the \$31 under the old rate and \$34 under the new rate as to why some people didn't get that. Of course, some people are on partial allowances and that would be the reason for that. But the basic food rate for somebody who is on a full allowance was raised. The figure would be approximately 9 per cent but the amount of dollars involved for a person in a month is only about \$3.

As to equating the amount eaten by men and the amount eaten by women, it is something that I have regarded, on the whole, to be beyond my control.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question. If it is beyond the minister's control would the dieticians who advise you agree that they should be treated equally even if the minister doesn't?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I really doubt that very much.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. minister could advise us if the 9 per cent was based on the amount the people were getting at the time, or on some other figure?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the reference to 9 per cent is just a calculation based on the amount by which the basic allowance for an individual was increased, and the figure of \$3 taken over \$31 is about 9 per cent. So for those on that schedule, that is the extent to which they are involved. If they are on some other basis, such as partial support, then they would have a budget worked out for them in the usual way.

MR. TAYLOR:

One further supplementary. Will every family who is securing the maximum amount for food now receive the 9 per cent increase?

MR. CRAWFORD:

I would think so, Mr. Speaker. Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall.

The Labour Act

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Labour and ask the minister when we might expect The Labour Act to be introduced at this session?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, it is at the printers now. It is a lengthy volume and it is therefore difficult to estimate a particular time, but as soon as it comes from the printers it will be introduced in the House.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Mr. Minister, is it your intention to proceed with the Act through all three readings and royal assent at this session?

DR. HOHOL:

Yes it is, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall, followed by the hon. Member for Highwood.

Nursing Home Subsidies

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development regarding the present subsidy of \$7.50 per day to nursing home patients. Has the minister considered the application for an increase to this subsidy which was made on behalf of the patients by the Alberta Nursing Home Association?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the request for review of the amount paid to the contract nursing homes is something that comes up from time to time and when the representations are made they are, of course, considered.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the escalating operational costs affecting nursing homes, and in view of the fact that there hasn't been an increase for well over a year, do you feel that an increase warrants favourable consideration at the present time?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think the question of whether or not an increase is warranted certainly has to be looked at from a very businesslike point of view. If it would appear that the care of patients is likely to suffer in any way if the nursing homes which are receiving this money are not in a position to provide services, well that, of course, is a matter of considerable concern. But I don't think any presumption should be made that every nursing home on a contract with the government should look for something like an annual review.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister consider the increase to be in the area of \$1 per patient as suggested by the Alberta Nursing Home Association, and will such increases be effected in 1973?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think that considering the matter we are discussing is a matter of negotiation between the Hospitals Service Commission and the provider of the services, it would be more irresponsible of me to answer than it was of the hon. member to ask.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Highwood, followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

Fish Protection and Pollution Control

MR. BENOIT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Lands and Forests. Mr. Minister, in the 1972 annual report under the Fish and Wildlife Division, there is a section dealing with aquatic habitat protection and pollution controls.

My question to you is, are all the activities carried out under this particular section by the biologists, or does the Department of the Environment come into play in areas of this type?

DR. WARRACK:

So far as I know, Mr. Speaker, although I might have to check the point to be precisely correct, this work with the aquatic habitat, beyond the water quality of the water body that might be referred to, is done by the Fish and Wildlife Division of the Department of Lands and Forests.

MR. BENOIT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Do the fish and wildlife officers have at any time responsibility for enforcing The Clean Water Act?

DR. WARRACK:

Well, certainly, Mr. Speaker, there is a coordination between the two departments and the respective divisions in each of the two departments, the Department of the Environment and the Department of Lands and Forests. As the hon. member knows we have considerable field staff in the Department of Lands and Forests and there are many ways in which we are able to aid each other by having our field staff in a position to do work on behalf of the other departments.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller, followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

New Hospital Buildings

MR. TAYLOR:

My question is to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Will there be a complete freeze on building new hospitals in the province during 1973-1974 fiscal year?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the capital program of the Hospital Services Commission is something that had been made the subject of an inquiry in a Return that will be answered, I hope, very shortly now.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

School Board Assistance Fund

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Education. Can the minister advise how many school boards have made applications to him for assistance under the special \$2.4 million fund? The \$2.4 million fund to assist the rural jurisdictions?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it should be made clear that that is not a funding program for which boards make application. The monies are automatically

sent out to school boards on the basis of the number of individual pupils which they have. And as I mentioned before, the total sum, somewhere exceeding \$2 million, will almost invariably be going to smaller rural jurisdictions throughout the province.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. I take it that this is supplementary funds, however, that would not show up in the information you tabled yesterday. Or would it be incorporated in the information that you tabled yesterday?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it would be incorporated in the information which I tabled yesterday in the per-pupil grant figure which is multiplied in each jurisdiction by the number of students.

MR. NOTLEY:

One further supplementary question. Is there a specific criterion set out by which this extra money is allocated to the rural jurisdictions? And if there is, would you table a copy of the criterion or guidelines in the Legislature?

MR. HYNDMAN:

No, Mr. Speaker, there are no criteria. I think there is a basic misunderstanding which the hon. member has concerning the difference between the previous plan which paid monies only when there was a cluster of 26 students and one teacher. And failing a cluster of that number of students and teacher, or 13 students and one teacher for half of what was called a classroom unit, monies were not paid.

Now this resulted in many school boards who had loose ends in terms of those figures not getting aid for pupil grant that was fair. What we did, in effect, by injecting the additional \$2.4 million was to make the per-pupil grant monies available irrespective of the number of groups or students in a group which a small jurisdiction would have.

MR. NOTLEY:

One final supplementary question for clarification, Mr. Speaker. I take it then in the case of Northland School Division for example -- I use this example by way of explanation -- where the total amount of money funded by the province dropped from \$2 million down to \$1.5 million, that there is no fund that the divisional board can go to now if this money has already been incorporated in this other fund?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I'm not sure of the figures quoted by the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, but the Northland School Board, being as it is a rather unusual and unique board and very different in many respects from the elected boards in the province by reason of the school children that it serves, has in past years received a special grant and this year I imagine they will be applying for a special grant as well.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican, followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

Advertising of Alcoholic Beverages

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Premier and it is following your announcement some time ago, hon. Premier, about the liquor advertising that is going to be allowed on TV stations in Alberta. I was wondering if the guidelines have been set and when can we expect the first ads to appear?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, the matter that the hon. member is referring to is the government's advice to the House that, in fact, there will be a restricted form

of advertising on wine and beer allowed and that that would be under strict guidelines which would be established.

However, the meetings which will establish those guidelines are scheduled for just after the session ends.

MR. DIXON:

I was wondering, Mr. Minister, maybe this could be to the Minister of Education rather than yourself. Have you had any representation from youth workers who are a bit concerned with extra advertising towards the youth of the country as far as wine and beer are concerned. Because apparently in other states where advertising is allowed, there has been a lot of discussion on that. I was wondering if you had any representation from youth workers?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to speak for my hon. colleague the Minister of Education. However, I've had no representation in this regard.

MR. HYNDMAN:

I've had no representations from youth workers.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall.

Railroad Abandonment

MR. WYSE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Is the provincial government negotiating with or asking the federal government to extend the freeze on rail track abandonment that will expire on January 1, 1975? This is very important to the people of southern Alberta. If the freeze expires, up to 375 miles of rail in southern Alberta could be abandoned shortly after. This could mean a loss of many jobs.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member appreciates that while it is a very important subject, it was a hypothetical situation he was referring to. However, I could pass the matter on to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce who is responsible for transportation and who may wish to discuss the matter of railway abandonment. I know he's been discussing that with the federal government.

DR. BUCK:

I knew you were a good passer.

MR. PEACOCK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, in regard to railroad abandonment and the deadline of 1975 we are seriously considering the impact that this will have on Alberta communities and analyzing the cost as well as the number of people that it will affect, the number of communities for which it will eliminate service and the responsibility we will have as a government of supplying other services when that abandonment takes place. So we would hope to have a report on that within the next six months.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall, followed by the hon. Member for Little Bow.

Magazines in Legislature Building

MR. HO LEM:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question directed to the hon. the Attorney General. To your knowledge, did the fire in the downstairs cafeteria ignite as

a result of excess heat generated by the display of Penthouse and Playboy magazines?

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair should perhaps share some reliable information received this morning that the fire was due to some smouldering embers from last night's debate in committee.

[Laughter]

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker to the hon. minister. Does your department consider the Legislature Building an appropriate place for the sale of such publications?

AN HON. MEMBER:

You bought it.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to draw to the hon. member's attention that this is a public building.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, in view of your reply, can the hon. minister advise the members of this House when one might be able to purchase copies of The Happy Hooker in this building?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I'd leave the place to purchase that to the member's ingenuity.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Little Bow.

Agricultural Development Corporation

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture with regard to the Agricultural Development Corporation. My question is, will he be adding any staff to offices such as Lethbridge or Calgary at the present time to take care of the terrific load of applications? There are a number of applications that have been made and land is waiting to be appraised and appraisers are needed. Will the minister be taking some action in this area?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, we've already taken that action. As a matter of fact, if you will recall when my estimates were before the House, there was some comment in regard to the expansion in the number of people involved in the department. Most of these are involved in the area of the Agricultural Development Corporation, in the area of credit counselling and appraisal. But I should point out that we have attempted to go ahead with appraisals throughout the winter months. The Farm Credit Corporation has a mandatory policy in which they don't do that.

I might also say, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the whole question of agricultural credit that, in fact, the deluge of applications for credit of a long-term nature have become necessary or have happened because of the real scarcity of long-term credit to farmers over the previous four years.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate what the minister has said. I understand at the present time there are some 80 applications to be processed at the Lethbridge office. They indicated that they wouldn't be able to get them done prior to the time the farmers will be going on the field. Is there any consideration of, (a) bringing in private appraisers, or (b) transferring staff from other offices, say Calgary or Edmonton, on a temporary basis?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, we have already transferred staff from other offices in an attempt to catch up with the backlog. But there is only a certain amount that can be done. The other important thing to remember is that we are restricted in the total number of dollars we have for direct lending, and that the express purpose of the Agricultural Development Corporation is not to develop into a straight banking operation in which we make all the loans for land buying in the province. This development corporation is, in fact, reserved for those special cases in the areas that I have outlined on many occasions in the House.

Again, I want to say that the primary responsibility for ordinary long-term capital loans in farming has to rest with the Farm Credit Corporation. We are using our organization and our ties with them under the small farms program to put the pressure on farm credit to make these loans and do it as soon as possible.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

Travelling Cabinet Meetings

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. Will the hon. Premier report to the House whether there will be cabinet meetings held outside of the capital during the summer months?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I certainly will. As I mentioned earlier, we were very pleased with the reaction to our having a full cabinet travel through the Peace River area in October. It is our intention to have the cabinet move through the central Alberta area, concluding with a cabinet meeting in Red Deer in the latter part of May. In addition to that, we will be considering other parts of the province later during 1973. We find that this approach is an excellent way of being responsive to the people's interests in many of the things we are doing.

We told the people from Red Deer, when they came up here and presented to us -- I believe there were seven points if my memory serves me right -- various matters that concerned them, that we would take them under advisement, and when we returned as part of that central Alberta cabinet tour we would try to respond as best we could to some of the requests to which we were not able to give a full response at the time of that meeting.

I do feel that it is a very important activity for the Executive Council, and we intend to continue it.

MR. SORENSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. Premier look favourably to holding a cabinet meeting in east-central Alberta, perhaps at Lougheed?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, either Lougheed or Strome or any one of the communities. We'll give it thought.

[Laughter]

MR. SPEAKER:

We have a further question from the hon. Member for Calgary McCall.

'Playboy' Tabled

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might table this for your perusal, the magazine that I mentioned earlier in the question period?

MR. COOKSON:

Mr. Speaker, could we have copies made for everyone?

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair will study the rules before studying the magazine.

[Laughter]

ORDERS OF THE DAY

QUESTIONS

225. Mr. Wilson asked the government the following question:

(1) What is the number of full-time female employees hired by the Alberta Government since September 30, 1971?

(2) What is the number of full-time female employees released or retired, or separated for any other reason, from employment by the Alberta Government since September 30, 1971?

(3) Of the female employees hired in (1) above, how many received salaries of:

(a) over \$10,000 per year;

(b) from \$8,000 to \$10,000 per year;

(c) from \$6,000 to \$8,000 per year; and

(d) under \$6,000 per year?

(4) What is the average starting salary of full-time male employees hired by the Alberta Government since September 30th, 1971?

(5) What is the average starting salary of full-time female employees hired by the Alberta Government since September 30th, 1971?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, we will accept the question.

226. Mr. Clark asked the government the following question:

What assistance has been made available to the Olds Community Development Co-operative Association limited by the Department of Industry and Commerce and/or the Alberta Opportunity Company during the calendar year 1972?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, we accept the question.

227. Mr. Henderson asked the government the following question:

(1) With regards to the Priorities Employment Program, what level of remuneration is paid to a man and wife who are both taking a training course, simultaneously, under the program?

(2) Is the level of remuneration paid to the wife, under question 1, the same as for a single woman?

(3) Why is payment to the wife, under question 1, included as part of the payment made to the husband?

(4) Are participants in the Priorities Employment Program informed before commencement of their training program as to the level of remuneration they will be receiving during the training period?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, we accept the question.

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. Mr. Gitter proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Farran.

Resolved that the government consider the introduction of legislation to this Assembly designed to remove existing group discrimination currently experienced by residents of Alberta under the age of twenty-five years and designed to encourage the establishment of social equality and fair treatment for young Albertans.

MR. GITTER:

Mr. Speaker, in presenting this resolution for the consideration of this Assembly, I do so primarily because I am of the view that the attention of this Legislature should from time to time be directed to a segment of our population whose impact upon our often more sedate ways of life is most meaningful, and whose continuing influence upon this House will grow immeasurably in years to come. I refer, of course, to one of our most valuable human resources, the young people of this province.

Before embarking on an explanation as to my concern which caused me to place this motion before this Assembly, I hasten to suggest that in any discussions relating to our youth, it is very dangerous to generalize.

It was only a few years ago that we were bombarded with reports describing the confrontation politics of the youth of the world. During the period 1967 to 1972 one could not pick up a newspaper, or view a newscast on television or listen to a radio report without receiving information as to the youth in action of the late '60s. The youth who were marching in our streets; the youth who were conducting sit-ins at our universities; the youth who were battling the police in Berkeley or Chicago; the youth whose drug culture, acid rock music, blue jeans and beards caused the elder citizens of North America, and for that matter the world, to look at them with chagrin and a worrisome frown of fear in contemplation of what was in store for the world when these apparent wild-eyed, long-haired radicals, disrespectful of all our hallowed institutions, became the leaders of the future.

But that was the late '60s, Mr. Speaker, and the writers of the books like *The Greening of America* who talked in terms of "Consciousness III", "the lost self," "the failure of the form" and "the anatomy of the corporate state" are now outdated, their views seemingly swallowed up by the rapidity of the change in the society in which we live.

The prevailing attitudes of our young in 1969 are no longer outwardly evident in the styles of the youth of 1973. It can, I think, be fairly said that the youth revolution seen in the streets of America in 1967 is as fleeting and is as past as the shadows that darken the deserted streets of the Haight-Ashbury district in San Francisco. Confrontation politics, as exemplified by the students of Sir George Williams College in Montreal or the Black Panthers of Oakland are now passe.

The politics of the young today have now become the politics of involvement. And the involvement of the young is the involvement of a Bobby Seale running for the Mayor of Oakland or the students dramatically involved in the election campaign in Canada in October of 1972 or the presidential race in November of the same year, working furiously for a Trudeau, a Stanfield, a Nixon or a McGovern. Indeed the impatience of youth of five years ago has been replaced by a subtle form of involvement, in that our youth have now come to understand that the road to social change is slow and tortuous albeit worthy of the journey.

It is vital that we as legislators strive to understand the changing mosaic presented to us by the challenges of our youthful citizens. It is only in this way that we can respond to their ideals and aspirations in a realistic way. Whether we like it or not a considerable amount of influence is subtly exerted upon us by the youthful segment of our society, for it doesn't seem wrong for a mother to adopt her daughter's love beads or a father to enjoy a James Taylor record or a general faculties council to appoint student representatives to take part in its hearings.

I personally recall a situation back in 1959 which eventually brought me to the conclusion that the impact of youth in our society is very real. I recall standing on a street in Kyoto, Japan, when there was a rally of young Japanese students decrying the fact that the Japanese were intending to revise the

security pact with the United States. Standing on this one corner for some two hours I viewed Japanese students arm in arm walking six across down the streets of Kyoto. Some two million students apparently were involved in this demonstration, and after the demonstration, having been from this part of the world and having never experienced such great numbers, I became involved in a lengthy argument as to where the action really was. Was it the older people in the world who were providing the leadership or was it in fact the youth?

The leaders of the world at that time were the Adenauers, the Eisenhowers, and the De Gaulles and the mantle of leadership appeared to rest on the shoulders of the elderly. My travelling companion of the day argued vehemently that it was from the young that the leadership of the world truly emanated and that it was in this youthful idealism that the ideas flourished that forced politicians into action. I resisted this argument well into the night, only to find in ensuing years that rapid changes in our political environment were in fact indeed caused by the changes that youth to a degree strove to impart to all of us. In fact, the Security Revision Treaty was signed at that time by the Japanese but the following time when it came up for revision it was not.

The pressures, Mr. Speaker, are subtle. The results are enormous and the impact of our youth upon our thinking is everywhere. It is, then, against the backdrop of an overview of the changing life styles of youth in Alberta today that I address the motion to the members for their consideration. We must continually ask ourselves: what are these changing attitudes and styles of our young people, what are their aspirations and where are their involvements?

To better understand these questions there are certain general conclusions that I feel one can validly arrive at to better understand the attitude of our youth today.

First, the youth at our universities are totally the children of television, whereas the youngster of earlier generations discovered reality by exploring outside his own front door where he encountered the world of the farm, the city streets, the dogs, the horses, the stores and traffic and tested them, as matters, in a real sense. Our society today seems to insist that our children first be taught by the prescribed mythology in schools and films, and earliest and most universally, on television.

The television world is what our society claims itself to be; what it demands we believe. But when the television child finally encounters the real world, he does not find families like 'Father Knows Best' or 'My Three Sons'. He does not find the clean suburbs of television, but often the sordid slums of reality. He does not find the high-minded statesmen of the screen, but finds instead politicians whom he often regards to be small-minded, and even in his view, sometimes corrupt. He does not find perpetual smiles or the high spirits of a Pepsi Cola ad, but he finds anxieties, boredom and monotony. And when he stops believing in this mythic world the breach of his credibility is irreparable. Society and television ask for total belief; when their picture of the world is unmasked the result is often unbelief. As a result the child becomes a sceptic.

In the words of Joni Mitchell's famous song where she says; 'He has found the clouds, love and life must be seen from both sides now -- Ice cream castles in the air, and feather canyons everywhere have become clouds and rain and snow on everyone. So many things I would have done, but clouds got in the way. It's life's illusion I recall, I really don't know life at all.'

The words and the melody are light and sentimental, the theme of youthful disillusionment. It's timeless, but it is a great mistake not to recognize that this is one of the songs of the youth of today and it expresses a message.

Against this shock of reality our young have come to face there is a deep finality to the issues existing in the world today; a finality that is symbolic of the problems of the world, a finality that our young people fear and fret about.

The world they have inherited is a world that faces an energy crisis; a world that is challenged by over population. It is a world that is dominated by corporate structures, machines and technology. It is a world where rivers often run black and skies are clouded with smog. It is a world that creates sceptics more easily than idealists.

It is a world that requires action, not rhetoric, and thus our youth are asking, why? For that matter they are asking, why not? They will not in their early maturation process accept easy solutions for they now know that these solutions will not work.

Yet within this process a new humanity among our youth is becoming evident. It is a humanity which demands in personal relationships a keynote of honesty. It is a humanity which demands that to be dishonest with another person, to be dishonest in love, is a major crime. It is a humanity which suggests that one must be true to one's self and that loyalty is something to be valued and not merely an artificial duty.

The result is that our youth are becoming involved in activities which are both novel and laudatory. They have restructured our work ethic. Many no longer intend to work just for the sake of work, as they well understand that the majority of Americans who are working seem to be bored.

Instead, youth become involved in programs some of which, indeed, are failures, but programs which involve personal relationships with people in need through LIP grant programs, Opportunity for Youth grant programs, non-medical use of drug programs, PEP programs and countless others.

The human reactions of today among our youth are more intense, they are more honest and they are more transient. For as the adult moves so do the youth. Studies that have been taken in the United States show clearly that many Americans find they are moving like they have never done before. One hundred and eight million Americans took 360 million trips involving overnight stays of over 100 miles away.

In matters of jobs the United States Labour Department reports that among 71 million people the average duration of their jobs is 4.2 years, whereas three years prior it was 4.6 years. The average 20 year old in the United States, in the work force, can be expected to change his jobs six to seven times. Indeed the situation in the world today is one of transients as adults move around and as youth move around, and it seems that anyone who is looking upon youth movements today must understand the transient nature of the society in which we live.

Possibly it is from this overview of transients that one looks upon youth as being permissive. Indeed, a much higher intimacy rate is created at a much earlier date, because of the transience of relationships in this society of rapid change. Marriages no longer have the bonds they used to. Family structures and relationships seem to be shorter in term, but deeper in feeling, as a new generation strives to find depth in their personal relationships within society.

The book Future Shock, which many members have read, Mr. Speaker, talks in terms of the fractured family. It talks in terms of the changes in society and suggests that we may expect many among the people of the future to carry the streamlining process in our society further by remaining childless, cutting the family down to its most elemental components -- a man and a woman. Two people perhaps with matched careers will prove more efficient at navigating through education and social shoals, through job changes and geographic relocations than the ordinary child-cluttered family. Indeed anthropologist Margaret Meade has pointed out that we may already be moving toward a system under which, as she puts it, parenthood would be limited and families would be streamlined and the fractured family will continue and will thrive.

It seems that the impact of our youth is causing a shift of our standards whether we like it or not, and this Assembly should be cognizant of it in the conduct of our affairs in dealing with legislation that affects us all, and particularly our youth.

It is in this area that I am concerned, for I fear that many, including some of the members of the Legislature, tend to stereotype our youth into one bag of permissive, disrespectful, lazy individuals. This is an attitude that many adults seem to have and which symbolizes both a misunderstanding of what is occurring in our youth movement of today as well, possibly, as a fear that the approach of our youth is destructive to the work ethic that our adult population seems to relate to. Many suggest that the moral fibre of our society is decaying because of the new attitudes of our youth in their approaches to life.

I do not intend for one moment to suggest in the difficulty of describing this area that many of our young do not fall into these categories that I have suggested. But my concern lies in the fear that this very stereotyping of our youth is the very basis of prejudice, for, by definition, the moment we psychologically create a mold in which we place our young people, the mold becomes prejudicial and unfair.

Judgments by governments, by landlords, by employers should not be based on stereotyped judgments that youth are lazy, or irresponsible, or slovenly, that

youth are here today and gone tomorrow. Our judgments should be based on individual criteria whereby we judge each individual for what he is, not for what we allude them to be on a group rationale.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, The Individual's Rights Protection Act assented to by this Legislature in November of 1972 set out a number of provisions suggesting that no person shall be discriminated against as to public accommodation, tenancy, employment practices and advertisements due to age.

Age is defined in The Individual's Rights Protection Act as meaning any age of 45 years or more and less than 65 years. At the time the bill was being debated some hon. members from both sides suggested that the age category should also include the 'under 25' segment of our population or, for that matter, should not be restricted in any way.

It was the concern of the government at that time that there were more acute problems of discrimination which involved our older citizens between the ages of 45 and 65, particularly as to employment practices. I subscribed to that view then and I still subscribe to that view and although we have made progress in assisting our over 45 age citizens, particularly in matters of employment practice, there is still considerable to be done.

However, in matters particularly relating to employment practices I am coming to believe that the problems are becoming even more acute with respect to the employment of our young people under the age of 25 years. The most recent figures for January of this year indicate that a total of 688,000 Canadians were unemployed. Fully 300,000 of those were under the age of 24 -- almost half, Mr. Speaker, of the total number of unemployed in this country and one in nine of the people in that age group who wanted to work.

Indeed our governments are endeavouring to alleviate the problem somewhat but an examination of the figures would show that our Opportunities for Youth program last year employed approximately only 3,000 non-students for the summer. The LIP program works less well among the young than among other age groups of the unemployed. In 1971-72, 41 per cent of LIP workers were under the age of 24. In hard figures, LIP that year created only 37,000 temporary jobs for Canadians under 24 and there were 300,000 out of work in January of this year.

Undoubtedly our PEP program which has created some 3,200 jobs in this province has had an effect in creating jobs for our youth. But these government programs can only go so far and our youth must have equal opportunity to obtain jobs in the market place.

Now some will argue, and I regard it to be a myth, that the young in Canada are lazy, that they are transient, that they are unreliable, and as a result employers in some cases are not willing to take a risk on youth today. Undoubtedly, as there are many adults who are lazy, there are many youth who fall into the same category. But these again are the stereotyped judgments which should not prevail in our society, and each applicant should be judged on his or her own merits, not on the general stereotyped prejudice that prevails with many today in their relationship with our young.

The problem, I fear, Mr. Speaker, is one that is growing, not diminishing, and it is one that in my view is now becoming more acute than the problems of employment of individuals between the ages of 45 and 65. It is in this context, then, that I recommend as one of the legislative changes envisioned in this motion that The Individual's Rights Protection Act be amended and the definition of age either be amended to incorporate those under 25, or, for that matter, be removed entirely.

In this regard, I wish to read a portion of a letter that I have received from a student at the University of Lethbridge when he suggests to me.

To reiterate: if I am discriminated against on the basis of religious beliefs, colour, race, or sex, do I have recourse through The Individual Rights Protection Act? I realize that I am void of these rights if I am discriminated against on the basis of age since I do not meet the standards for the legislated definition of age. But if I am discriminated against for some other reason (cf the nature mentioned above) do I then still have these rights in the field of employment, housing, service in public, etc.? Or does the definition of age automatically make the whole Act of no importance or meaning to me? What rights am I entitled to?

You ask what areas youth are discriminated against. All areas that you mention in the Act should, in my opinion, be covered by the Act. A simple extension of the definition of age would be satisfactory I would

think. Why shouldn't all people from the age of majority, (18 yrs.) to the age of retirement (approx. 65) be able to enjoy the same rights? I find it hard to believe that one could rationally argue that this is too far fetched an idea to be implemented into legislation.

I find it hard to believe that one could rationally argue that this is an idea that should not be carried forward.

I cannot understand how your amendment proposal can justify limiting new rights legislation to only those under 25. I believe they should be entitled to the same rights as those presently of the age bracket, 45 - 65. At the same time I don't think that you for a moment should ignore those from 25 to 45. They are most certainly open to discrimination in the main areas that your act mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other areas that I would like to bring to the attention of the members where areas of discrimination could be argued as being existing.

The prime area and the one we hear so much about is the ridiculous situation our youth find themselves in with respect to car insurance rates which skyrocket if you are under the age of 25 years even though you have never experienced an insurance claim. The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill who is seconding this motion will elaborate in the area of insurance rates, and indeed the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight has also commented in this area.

Mr. Speaker, this is probably one of the most severely criticized areas in Alberta today from the point of view of our youth and I would like to read a letter that I received from a young member in our community referring to the situation. He states in his letter to me:

...I am referring to the practice of insurance companies to charge young people a considerably higher premium on auto insurance than those over twenty-five. The question is whether or not insurance companies are justified in charging young people a higher rate.

Most of the arguments are based on what statistics show. Supposedly statistics show that people in my age group get into more accidents. They do not show that I, personally, have more accidents, nor do they show that because I am young I am more likely to get into an accident. All the statistics show is that a group (of which I am a member) have more accidents per capita than some other reference group.

To stress the point, take for example the hypothetical case where statistics prove that Indians commit more crimes per capita than society at large. Does this mean that we should somehow penalize all Indians regardless of their personal records? I'm sure, that most people would agree with me that this is absurd, but this is exactly what insurance companies do to those under twenty-five.

Another argument states that experience makes a difference. And therefore, supposedly inexperienced young drivers should be charged higher premiums. Once again statistics can be used to show that if you group people together into categories based on amount of driving years you will find that the group with the least number of years has more accidents per capita. Once again I suggest that people should be judged on their individual record and not on performance of a group.

There are, of course, other arguments used in the attempt to justify higher rates for young drivers but unfortunately I do not at the moment have the time to list them all and present counter arguments. If there is some good reason for the higher rates I would appreciate being informed of it.

This is one area, Mr. Speaker, that we should be looking at seriously.

Another area that causes me great concern in its relation to the young is the area of law and order. I am very concerned when I see young people coming before our courts of law who are fined some \$200 -- \$300 and if they can't pay the fine they are then told to go to jail. Those who have fathers who can afford to pay the price do so. Those who don't have fathers who can afford to pay the price often go to jail.

I am disturbed at times when I see stereotyped judgments made by law enforcement officers, made by judges on occasion, which suggest that when someone comes in to their dock who has long hair and blue jeans, this person is

particularly bad or someone reprehensible to our society. It is this type of attitude that we must endeavour to overcome. Each man is entitled to be judged on his own basis, not on a group stereotype basis. And unfortunately too often we see this situation arising in our courts of law.

I suggest that there are other areas for the hon. members to consider with respect to discrimination of our young. Anyone wishing to rent a car who is under the age of 25 must pay higher car rates. Many of our youth find it difficult to rent apartments in the central areas of our cities because landlords regard their position as being one of irresponsibility and danger to their suites. I think this is an area that should be considered again and would come into the overview of The Individual's Rights Protection Act.

I trust all hon. members will consider the views expressed today, that they will, for the afternoon, put their mind to the problems of the youth of the Province of Alberta in relationship to the various forms of legislation that we have. And I trust the hon. members will consider these views and enter into the debate so that we can all become better informed as to the prevailing views and concerns I know we all have and share for our youth in the Province of Alberta.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, before I begin I should point out that this is a motion listed as Motions Other than Government Motions. I seconded it in the days when I was a private member, so no special significance should be placed on my remarks other than that they will be very much to the point and wholly in support of my colleague from Calgary Buffalo.

We all know and respect the deep humanitarian conscience of the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo and I hope that his words will be weighed very carefully.

I take part in this debate as the seconder of this motion because I share the concern of many of my colleagues at the harsh treatment being meted out to Albertans under the age of 25, particularly by the automobile insurance companies.

Now there are various points in that opening remark that need to be clarified. First, who are these people under 25? Are they an important segment of our society? I say they are. In a previous generation they might have been fighting for their country at the age of 19, might have been leading battalions before they were 25, assuming the greatest responsibility one could imagine.

We have legislators elected to parliaments under the age of 25. Perhaps the most famous prime minister of all time was under the age of 25, William Pitt, under whose regime empire building in Canada began.

In a young country such as ours, a huge percentage of the population is under the age of 25. Population trends may soon change this, but in the past few years I've heard various statistics that those under the age of 25 constitute as much as 40 per cent of the population. Certainly these young people constitute a significant portion of the electorate, especially since the voting age was dropped to 18.

It may be platitudinous, even trite, to describe them as the Canadians of the future, because everyone knows that's true. It appears from statistics that they may well be the Canadians of the present as well.

Now we are anxious to impress upon these young people the virtues and values upon which we believe our country should be built. I suppose I am typical of the people in my generation when I suggest that those values should be the time-honoured, long-tested, old-fashioned virtues -- honesty, thrift, diligence, equity in justice. You know, recognition that with every privilege there goes a responsibility, with every freedom there is a requirement for moderation.

But above all, I suppose I suggest to these young Canadians that in this country we believe in the rule of law -- the rule of law according to the British precedent which believes people innocent until proved guilty, believes in fair trials and in equality before the law. In fact, these very principles are embodied in our bills of rights.

These young people we are talking about, as the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo explained, have been and still are going through one of the most difficult social periods in our history. With affluence all around, they can't get jobs. In the first place, egghead mentors at the university preached that

jobs are no longer important because both the work ethic and God are dead. We've reached the age when, according to these preachers of modern times, everyone can smell the flowers all day like Ferdinand, an age when pleasure of the moment means everything. Well, it's not only just like Omar Khayyan, and 'a loaf of bread and a jug of wine and thee.' Nowadays it is a pipe of hashish, a jug of wine and me.

Then they began to reason for themselves. They didn't buy this message. There has been a big change, a big "C" change in youth attitudes in the last couple of years. They said, "Let's quit all this game-playing and learn a trade. Let's get out of this academic nursery and see the world." But they still find it pretty tough. If their hair is long they may be suspect immediately, whether they are going to cash a cheque, go into a restaurant, buy a car or, particularly, buy automobile insurance. If they cut their hair the assumption is that they left Spy Hill yesterday.

All the time the intellectuals are preaching that doomsday is around the corner, that they are going to die an early death from a nuclear bomb or from pollution or from the population explosion or from one of these myths that are propagated so often today. Some nightmare or another is going to fall on top of all of us according to these Jeremiahs. Well, youth now is a little sceptical of this type of story and is beginning to fight back. So what do we hit them with?

They work over the summer, if they are lucky, to buy a second-hand car. If they are not ripped off by the dealer, which is a fairly common occurrence, they commit themselves to, say, \$2,000 at exorbitant interest rates. They suddenly find that they may be paying as much as \$600 a year in insurance. Probably they'll shave the premium a little bit by reducing their public liability to a minimum of \$35,000 or \$50,000, which is less than half the normal awards in the courts. They'll probably raise their deductible to \$250. They'll shave it by every way they know how. Then if they get a little bump which wrecks their car they are not like other people. They can't go to the insurance company to have it fixed, even if they are prepared to pay the deductible. They don't want the insurance company to know about it. So they'll try to repair it themselves with maybe spare parts from an auto wrecker.

Apart from the costs of running the car and of meeting the payments, they may soon find this vehicle a complete albatross around their necks. This may be even more true if they are no longer single and are trying to raise a family.

They look at the peers in their age group and begin to wonder if they wouldn't have been smarter to have not worked so hard over the summer, but to have bought maybe an unsafe, old jalopy from the corner used-car dealer for \$100. They get a lower insurance rate. Or even better, maybe they'll think it would have been best to have dodged the penalty altogether by driving Dad's car -- which can be insured for about \$150 a year -- as an occasional driver even though they may be driving it more than occasionally. Perhaps, and it is understandable, they will be tempted to drive without insurance even though it is illegal because they can't afford the premium for a further six months.

Someone will explain to them when they complain that they are being penalized so heavily because the insurance companies have statistics that show the incidence of accidents is greater for drivers under 25. These people who explain the situation to them will say they may get small reductions from what, in effect, are double rates if they are girls -- girls get a slightly lower premium from some companies -- if they have a good study record, if they have an accident-free record, if they have been through an approved driving school. But I can tell you, these reductions are not significant in the context of the total premiums and they are not offered by all companies.

They may also mutter that the insurance companies are gouging them and they have heard that things are better in areas where socialist governments have nationalized the insurance industry. In their frame of mind they may well accept such rumours at face value without checking the statistics from both sides. I can say after having studied them, the statistics are, to say the least of it, conflicting.

They may even confess that whatever the principles of free enterprise and its merits, if the only way they can get equity is through equalization of the rates through the tax structure, they won't stand very firm on principle. These then are the Albertans under 25.

Is the treatment -- second part of that opening statement -- is the treatment being meted out very harsh? Well, I read all the pros and cons of government versus public automobile insurance. The Saskatchewan traffic is

lighter, the roads are straighter -- that when you take into account deductibles coverage, higher rates for plates and licences, subsidies through taxes, losses by the provincial insurance scheme -- \$2 million a year and so on -- the government schemes are not all that hot. But all a 22 year-old will remember is how much it cost his cousin in Regina to drive a new MG as compared with his cousin in Edmonton.

First, is it fair? Even the statistics on the accidents by age brackets published by the insurance companies in their own Green Book don't seem conclusive. There doesn't seem to be a significant difference between early 20's and late 20's, for example. But who told these actuaries to select a bracket of say, 16 to 25, or 25 to 30, or 30 to 35 for their samplings?

To me the whole system smacks of group punishment. So far as I know this approach is alien to our principles of justice. Mussolini and Hitler believed in group punishment. Several times in our history tyrants have believed in group punishment. Tyrants in the classroom sometimes do it in schools. You know the sort of thing where in the days of the underground war if a soldier was sniped at by the Resistance in a village, then the Storm Troopers would go in and kill every man, woman and child. Surely we don't accept that sort of principle.

I reject this whole actuarial approach to insurance, as it is being administered at the moment, as being unjust. Who decides on the areas, on the size of the samplings, on the degree of the accident and on the age brackets of the drivers? Certainly a free enterprise business is free to insure whomever it likes. But I say that they are being unjust at their peril. Why should an innocent, accident-free driver be punished because the records of his comrades of the same age may not be good? Everyone should be innocent until found guilty.

I wouldn't object to throwing the insurance book, green or whatever other colour they like to have it, at those who have a bad accident record. But I object to the assumption that because there may be a number of sinners under the age of 25, all people under the age of 25 are sinners. That is as illogical as saying -- we demonstrate this in colleges and so on as one of the examples of logic -- that because there are a lot of green gates in Edmonton, all gates are green or suspected of being green. Praise God for the colour of them anyway.

In the field of public utilities we accept the principle that there should be equalization of rates, a form of cross-subsidy if you like. But the rates are governed to an allowable return in a franchise area. We do it in Alberta Government Telephones. It is equalized and averaged across the province.

Certainly competition still prevails to some degree in the automobile insurance field, although I must say that I do suspect that from the common approach they make that some degree of consultation must take place over the fixing of premiums, even though it may be illegal. But they are supervised to a degree by the provincial Superintendent of Insurance, and their rates are subject to review by a Vehicle Insurance Review Board introduced by this government. So there is some degree of control. And the free competition aspect has changed a little bit. Automobile insurance is now compulsory, so that people of any age are not free to decline their services. So one wonders if there shouldn't be some form of responsibility along with this to make all those rates fair and equitable.

I believe there is at least -- and this is just a personal belief as I stressed at the beginning -- an obligation to see that people are treated equally. If they have a bad accident record at any age, okay, they should pay more, but if they are the same at any age, they should pay the same. If they have a clean record they are alike so far as driving an automobile is concerned.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, after hearing the two hon. members who moved the motion read so eloquently their beliefs on the discriminatory position in which the young people find themselves in this province, I have to point out that it is to a certain extent an admission that the Bill of Rights and the Human Rights legislation is really -- and The Individual's Rights legislation -- is really non-effective where it matters most.

I would like to just read the motion. It says:

Resolved that the government consider the introduction of legislation to this Assembly designed to remove existing group discrimination currently experienced by residents of Alberta under the age of twenty-five years and

designed to encourage the establishment of social equality and fair treatment for young Albertans.

The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo stated that we don't need rhetoric, we need action. This is a good theme to follow throughout this whole debate. We have two government members, one an hon. minister, indicating that we need action.

You know the problem, and the human rights legislation that was so eloquently and solidly supported is roughly only three months old, but we find that it doesn't do anything for the very problems the hon. member just spoke about. So here is a chance to convert their eloquence into action. They are on the government side. They have had studies, representations and many speeches, lots of input on human rights problems. So here is an opportunity to show whether they can act or whether they just intend to talk.

I was rather impressed with a couple of remarks that appear to be critical of our judicial system. It was rather encouraging to hear a member from the other side raise this criticism. It points very much to the fact that we need some action in that regard. Talking about it isn't good enough now. I believe that perhaps we should have an inquiry, since we have so many now, in to this most important aspect of -- I'm talking about the lower courts -- the judicial system where, I believe, over 95 per cent of all decisions concerning young people are final. I believe it's the highest court in the land for most criminal and traffic violations and many others. So here is an opportunity to convert talk into action. There should be no excuses now. The government has been in some time and today it has so clearly indicated the problems that exist.

I got the impression from the hon. members who moved and seconded the motion that not all of what they are complaining about can be legislated against, and that a lot of the problems are a matter of human attitudes, attitudes of people. Perhaps it is not easy to legislate human attitudes, but I believe that where there are distinct problems and offences committed the hon. members have given themselves a challenge. I am sure they will not have too much opposition from this side -- in any event we are in the minority -- but let's see legislation. If we want action instead of rhetoric then live by your own words and let's see what you can produce.

I was rather impressed that these two hon. members who appear to be so concerned, as everybody else ought to be, about any discrimination against any group of any age should single out two or three matters clearly within the power of this government to legislate, but apparently it won't be done now. It may be done in the future sometime, but unless they do it now I would have to feel that perhaps they have not really assessed the problem as well as they indicate they have.

I was impressed with the remark of one hon. member that the other hon. member displays a deep humanitarian conscience. I have never known a politician who doesn't, Mr. Speaker. They all do, each in their own way. But when they talk about a deep humanitarian conscience I must state that the two hon. members had rather a traumatic experience in humanitarian matters, especially as their humanitarian image received quite a smearing when it appeared that the hon. minister of this government had flagrantly violated the Bill of Rights. The two hon. members spoke in favour of what happened and proceeded to dig a hole a little deeper for the government than it had dug for itself.

So when you talk about humanitarian conscience we have to live what we say, and not read some fine articles and some fine-sounding expressions that will appeal to the young people. Let's practise what we preach. Let's live the Bill of Rights and the Individual Rights legislation instead of talking about it. I agree with the hon. members who said that so far those two bills have had little individual application. I doubt whether in a year or two or three there will be much by way of court application of the statutes. Perhaps we ought to resort to another better way of giving a means of redress to these people.

But I say that a good place to start -- and I'll support the hon. members if they stand up and bring in legislation along the lines they stated. It's probably easier to speak in glowing terms about the problems we have, but not as easy to implement legislation. Nevertheless they have given themselves a challenge and we say, "Let's look at the action", in other words, "Put up."

So these are just a few brief remarks that I have, Mr. Speaker, concerning this matter. I believe their intentions are very good. They should look at the motion that we need legislation -- I am saying that perhaps not all in The Individual's Rights Protection Act and the Bill of Rights, because the attitude

of the government has a lot to do with whether these things are effective or not.

I believe there is a type of legislation in this province at the present time that has a thousand times more practical application than all the human rights and bills of rights put together. I am not saying we don't need the latter. I am saying it is on our books. It is commendable and we need it. But easy access to help our young people who find themselves discriminated against is one way of helping solve the problem. Perhaps the ombudsman, at local levels, school board and municipal, can solve a lot of the little discriminatory practices the youth complains about by being able to complain and expose the problems and bring these matters to the authorities.

So with those few words, Mr. Speaker, I will tell the hon. members that in the matter of tenancy, in the matters of employment, equal pay, advertising, membership and occupational groups, we have legislation to back. If we can't enforce the legislation then let's admit that we didn't do a job and let's put in teeth to enforce this kind of legislation. That has gone a long way and I still believe the Bill of Rights has more educational value than practical value and the sad part about the Bill of Rights is the attitude of the government. In order to protect the people from the government, we found out it is non-effective. In fact, we have had another flagrant violation of what we believe to be democratic rights. We have even had a minister suspend legislation because it suited his purpose. I believe it can happen again and probably will.

So with those few words, Mr. Speaker, I give the two hon. members my support for the motion, but the motion in itself is not entirely adequate. We need to educate the people in this province to do what the hon. members said, and I feel they should quit talking and not try to attribute to themselves a specific concern for the problems of the people of this province when, I believe, they do believe that everyone shares that concern.

There was a question raised about employment in this province, particularly in the age group 45 and over. The hon. Premier expressed a concern about this. He did express a concern but apparently his concern was not sufficient to motivate him to do anything about it. Every politician who has dealt with this problem has expressed a concern about it. It doesn't get anybody over 45 a job because somebody is concerned. It is easy to express concern. It requires little thinking and little intelligence to be concerned, but it requires some effort to bring in some specific remedies. I am saying that this government hasn't got a single specific remedy other than that which is resorted to in other parts of the world to deal with this specific problem. Of course, I would stand to be corrected if they did come up with a specific remedy to show the people over 45 that they can be employed and not just be given the sympathy of the government by way of a fine display of a speech -- rhetoric again instead of action.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that those few remarks will indicate to the hon. members what they should do now that they have given a challenge to themselves.

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, the seconder of the motion, the hon. member as he then was and now the hon. minister, quite aptly put the problems in the case of the young driver under 25, especially the young male driver under the age of 25, and sometimes the almost exorbitant premiums that that person must pay in order to enjoy the privilege of operating a motor vehicle.

The problem though has two sides and really as this matter develops you can see the quandary that people are put in. Because in one sense I agree with the problem as put by the hon. minister, but on the other hand I disagree with the statement that the insurance should be used and the insurance premium should be used as a sort of penalty. In other words, once you have had a claim on your policy, at that point your further rates should disclose a penalty for your previous transgression.

My feeling is, of course, that the whole business of insurance is not that of penalizing the guilty party. The insurance business, the insurance service is there to provide a broadening of the risk. That's the whole purpose of insurance. You want to spread the risk over as large a number of people as possible. And if you can do that, then the premium you pay for your insurance will reflect the risk that the insurer must bear on the overall statistical evidence which he has before him.

What has happened, of course, is originally the insurance companies in developing their premium structures before they reached their more sophisticated

methods, simply spread the risk over the number of drivers that they insured regardless of where the drivers drove, for what lengths of time they drove, how old they were, what sex they were, or what model car they drove. But as the ability to catalogue knowledge developed, these same insurers were able to show that in certain areas they found the risks greater. And in those areas they paid more claims and claims in larger amounts.

As a result you found that categories developed, and people who fell into specific high-risk categories paid higher premiums. Now for the people who fell into those categories, of course, this is highly undesirable. On the other hand, however, we must not lose sight of the fact that the people who were then not in the categories of high-risk, but fell into the low-risk categories, benefitted by this classification, because their premiums were reduced, in that they joined the class of risk where the risk was much smaller. That, in fact, was reflected in the amount of premium that they were required to pay.

So when we consider this area of the under-25 driver and say, well he shouldn't have to pay that high premium, we must not lose sight of the fact that if we remove that type of classification then the cost is then borne by the other insured drivers -- those over 25. So that if we reduce the premium of those under 25, we must increase the premium of those above 25. And this, in fact, was shown by the experience that the Manitoba government found when they nationalized the insurance industry. It was found that the elder, very good driver was the one who found his premiums going up because he then shared to a larger extent the risk of the poorer driver.

Now this classification is becoming more and more sophisticated. We find that lower premiums are enjoyed by those drivers who abstain from alcohol. Recently I read that insurance companies are now granting lower premiums to those drivers who do not smoke. They have found there is a relationship between a person's ability to operate a motor vehicle and whether or not that person smokes tobacco. The result is that those who do not smoke are found to be better drivers. So if we have a premium schedule that rewards the non-smoker, you could say that the smoker is discriminated against. And that cry could be raised. Really it's just a more proper allocation of the risk.

The only problem with this, of course, is that if you extend this into the future, and if the methods of collecting, categorizing and cataloguing information become so sophisticated that pretty soon you don't have a sharing of the risk because you can almost determine where an accident will happen, you put the entire blame on that person and there is no insurance. And that's the one problem, of course, that I can see if this whole area becomes too sophisticated. And then it really isn't insurance as such. You really find out where the accidents are going to happen and that person is going to be paying. So you might as well forget about insurance. Now that's maybe the extreme. It may never happen, but who knows?

So I think that what we're looking at here, insofar as the under-25 driver is concerned, is that type of a direction where we are finding where accidents happen and we're placing more and more of the blame on the people who fall within that risk.

In considering the motion I had originally, when addressing my mind to it, given some thought to perhaps amending it to change the age from 25 years to 27 years. And in that fashion we would have somebody in the House who could speak for the group discriminated against, and that's the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands who happens to be 26. But I think that, seeing there is nobody in the House who can speak for those under 25, perhaps I can --

[Interjections]

-- you're over the hill, Dave.

Perhaps I can leave with the hon. members a few quotations from letters that appeared on the editorial page of yesterday's Edmonton Journal. The letters are from boys and girls in the Grade 5 class at Braemar Elementary School, and they are of the age of 10 or 11. Now the 19 letters reproduced on the editorial page give a sampling of those which had been submitted. Interestingly enough, in the case of two of them the complaint is that there are too many adult movies and not enough movies for children, so that we have at least youngsters of 10 and 11 who feel that they are discriminated against in this area, that the movie producers are not producing sufficient film for their age category. And they have raised that complaint.

But the complaint, the subject matter, that is dealt with in my calculations most often is the matter of bicycles. Four out of 19 letters were

written on the subject of bicycles and cycling. And one of the letters reads as follows:

I think more people should ride their bikes to work. Instead of taking their cars that make pollution.

James Gibson

Another letter:

I think there are too many bicycle accidents in the summer so I think we should have a separate lane for bicycles only. I think it would be much safer. It might cost a lot of money but it would be worth it. Would you rather have more shopping centres than living people?

Kevin Elaschuk

That last letter sticks with me. I think that we all have experienced visually the tremendous increase in the number of people using bicycles in the last few years. You see them on the roads, you see them in shopping centres at the bike stands, and you see them at schools. A few years back all you saw at schools were cars. And now you see the return of the bicycle. And the comment that there should be a separate lane for bicycles, I think, is an extremely sage one.

For the longest time we have been directing our entire traffic approach toward the motor vehicle and nothing else. Even the pedestrian to a large extent has been overlooked. And I think, with the large number of people who are using bicycles, we should consider providing a separate lane for the cyclists. That would be a great deal safer than what we have now. I myself wouldn't mind cycling from home to the Legislature Building on a day like today, but I just couldn't bear the traffic on 109 Street.

There is a further benefit which I think could be experienced if a separate lane were provided for bicycles. In the winter time, as we all appreciate, when the snow builds up and the snow clearing vehicles get on the road, the road always seems to be narrower in the winter than it is in the summer because so much of the snow builds up along the sides and instead of having two lanes we have one and instead of having three lanes we have two.

Now very few people ride their bicycles in the winter time. That bicycle path which is available in the summer could be used in the winter as an area in which snow could be built up, that way freeing the same number of lanes for motor vehicle traffic in the winter as are available in the summer. I think it is, perhaps, a matter that the department here should consider and that the City of Edmonton department in the same area should consider.

Lastly, a comment I heard on television, just at the time when the Canadians were competing in the World Figure Skating Championships, sticks out in my mind. This was a comment that came on just after Toller Cranston had completed a beautiful performance, and it was that 85 per cent of all Canadians are not physically fit. Now that, to my mind, is a surprising figure -- 85 per cent of all Canadians are not physically fit.

That is, to a large extent, due to the fact that we can't go the corner grocery store without our cars, without hopping into our motor vehicles. And perhaps if we did consider the sage advice of the youth, those who are 10 and 11, and if we did provide a bicycle path, perhaps more of the adults would take advantage of this. And who knows, perhaps fewer and fewer Canadians would fall into that class of the physically unfit. Think about it.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this very excellent resolution. I'd, first of all, like to commend the hon. mover and the hon. seconder for two excellent addresses. I was rather thrilled by some of the thoughts expressed by the mover of the resolution and I liked the approach and the attitude he took toward the problem of youth, which attitude is not shared by a great number of people in our country. I certainly share that attitude and I think it was excellent.

I think one of the things that stands out in my mind in connection with present-day youth is their idealism, the fact that they are prepared to argue, debate, even fight for the things in which they believe and they are not prepared to accept the virtues and axioms handed down to them by the older people in the community. There may be some aspects of this that are not good, but generally speaking, I think it is an excellent attitude.

Most of the people in our generation were prepared to accept war as a reasonable thing. I remember debating this in high school days and there were very few who didn't agree that war was necessary to dominate the aggressors and so on. Today, I would think the vast majority of our young people are not prepared to accept war as a solution to almost anything. Certainly, they believe in protecting themselves, but when they look at the results of World War 1, World War II, the Korean War and now the war in Vietnam, most of them are inclined to say, "What did we gain? We killed hundreds of human beings, people we didn't even know and what did we gain?"

I think we could argue, certainly many of us who have served in the armed forces, that we felt something was gained. We preserved the freedoms we cherish in this country, we prevented the onslaught of fascism and maybe communism. It kept for us the right to live our lives the way we, as a democratic people want to live our lives and I think those are objectives that were worth pursuing.

But when I look at the misery that comes from war, when I visit the veterans' hospitals and hear some of them who have not walked because they left part of their life on the battlefield, when I visit widows and orphans who were left that way because of the war -- and I particularly hear the veterans say that we fought in order that we would have freedom from want, as many of our posters said during the last war, that we fought for the rights of all individuals, freedom of speech, freedom of association -- and then see actually what is going on, I can understand why our young people are disillusioned with war.

My Dad told me before the First World War that people were lined up by the scores in the streets of Calgary in order to get a loaf of bread. There was just no employment. These were the first to volunteer to fight in World War I. Not so they could come back to bread lines, but so they could come back and share in the vast production of the country that was able to produce an abundance. Many of them never came back. Some came back crippled, some came back whole and they came back disillusioned.

It seems like each war, as we study it in history, is fought to end all wars. And so I can well appreciate the attitude of hundreds of our young people today who can see no solution to our economic problems or our world problems through killing other human beings. I have read armament books that indicate there is a great deal to be gained through war and they mention the profits that come from the employment of those who make armaments. I can understand the attitude of our young people when they look at that and consider that much of that was really blood money.

Our young people today are realistic, they are not prepared to accept just what is handed to them. We have taught them in our schools and in our homes to think for themselves and that is exactly what they are doing. Mr. Speaker, because of that sometimes we wonder or some segments of our society wonder what is happening to our young people.

Another place where they are realistic was touched on by the point raised by the hon. member Mr. Ghitter. He said some think that young people will not work just for the sake of work, that they won't be stereotyped and this is true. Our young people today are not prepared to accept the fact that they must have dollar bills in their pocket in order to share in the production of a country and that they are not required to do a lot of menial work that could better be done by machines just in order to have a living and with that I fully agree.

I think we are past the age where we can say that our only right to live is the dollar bills we have in our pocket or that we have earned. I think the new concept shared by the vast majority of our young people is that we are entitled to a share of the production of the country in which we live by virtue of the fact we are human beings, whether we have dollar bills in our pocket or not.

It is disturbing to many people in older generations when young people say, "I am not prepared to work just for the sake of working." I think this is the beginning of a new era for the world. If our young people could just realize that this can be done with the use of machinery and with a minimum of human slavery or human labour, then we are getting close to the time when we can enjoy the vast abundance that technology and human genius has been able to produce in this country.

I remember as a young boy in the coal fields of Drumheller, going pretty hungry during the summer months when there was no work at the coal mines. And I visited a farm and saw a farmer killing little pigs. And I said, "Why are you killing the pigs when there are so many hungry people in the Drumheller valley?"

He said, "I am killing half of the pigs so I can get a better price for the ones I sell."

It is like the philosophy of not growing wheat in this country that was even sponsored by some of our federal governments and hungry people all over the world -- that wasn't too long ago. It is like the philosophy of asking the farmers of British Columbia and Nova Scotia not to grow apples because there is too much fruit, too many apples, in order to keep the price up.

Well, I think the young people of today are not prepared to accept that kind of thinking and I am glad to see it. I would hope that the young people would direct their minds to solving the problems that have brought this type of thinking about so that the people can share in the productive capacity of a country, also share in the living in a country, share in the production that a country through its technology is able to produce. And if our young people can once get that vision, then the age of leisure about which we talk, and which I think is going to come, will come that much faster.

I don't agree at all with the people who claim we must spend so many years of our lives in laborious tasks when machines can do that job better than we can. During the relief years I saw men working with wheel barrows and shovels. Today the hon. Minister of Highways would no more consider doing that type of work simply to provide employment than -- well, he just wouldn't consider that type of thing because it can be done so much more economically with machines taking the human labour, the human drudgery out of the

But where we fall down is that the vast amount of work that is done by machines is not passed on so that all of the people can enjoy some of the benefits of modern technology whether it is in farm equipment or whether it is in road building equipment or vast thousands of other types of machines.

I read a book many years ago and someday I want to read it again. It was called Looking Backwards and it was written by, if I recall right, a man by the name of Bellamy. And it was the age of somewhere beyond 2,000, where everybody in the community, in the country, was required to spend, I think it was five to eight years, in the productive capacity, producing. And the other years were spent in culture and recreation, enjoying the vast wonders of their country and of the world.

This is what idealists -- sometimes we say people are idealists when we talk about a world of leisure, when we talk about shortening the day. We always come back to the fact that we can't do it because we haven't got enough dollar bills. We can't live unless we have the dollar bills in our pockets.

I would hope that the young people of today will find a better way of distributing the vast production of this country than doing it by earned dollar bills. There are other ways of doing it.

The point raised by the hon. member, Mr. Ghitter, about so many of our young people being out of work -- and some of them deliberately stay out of work. They are not prepared to go to the office every morning, work six or eight hours, go home every night and spend their lives doing that. They want to spend their lives enjoying the paintings of the world, the literature of the world and the beauties of the world. I can sympathize with them. Under our present economy they don't get much of a living -- sometimes they live on crumbs and in flophouses because they haven't got dollar bills. But I think they are pointing out to the world that many advances are required in our day and age.

I think it's a challenge to our young people to find ways and means of distributing the vast production of the world. If we were able to do that it might do away with this thing on war that I started out with. If we could send butter, bread, pork and beef to hungry peoples of other countries they would be less inclined to want to fight us, to kill us, and there would probably be fewer wars and possibly no wars at all in the future.

The idealism of our youth is excellent. I think we who are beyond that stage have much to learn in listening to them, because they have their story to tell and many of them have thought it out excellently. We can't press a button and suddenly change things. The world evolves and it will evolve faster as more and more of our young people get the vision of what can be done in a world that knows how to solve the problems of production, but has not yet learned how to distribute that vast production. Well, I think that is basic to what I wanted to say.

Another item I wanted to deal with, one I thought of only after the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, Mr. Ghitter, was speaking, was the willingness of

young people today to give to worthy causes. I know of a vast number of projects in which young people are prepared to work for nothing if they believe in the project.

I was at a boys' camp one day and I saw a lad, high in the hockey field, using an axe on a burning hot day, building a campfire so the boys would enjoy it that evening. The Salvation Army officer who was also there watching said to me, "How can they get people to work like that? How much do you have to pay them?" Afterwards, when I told him about the conversation with the Salvation Army captain, he said, "Do you think I would work that hard for pay?" I think that illustrated what young people today are prepared to do to help other people.

An excellent project in this city every year is the Santa Claus Anonymous program operated every Christmas by CHED radio. I have often wanted to praise the work done by this station and by the people, the hundreds of volunteers who work and the thousands of people who give Christmas gifts -- not with their name on it, not knowing to whom it is going to go -- but they are prepared to do something that will bring happiness to the lives of others even though it costs them money and they get no pay for it.

Last year when I was driving from the city to go home at Christmas time I heard a story over that radio station of a man with his long hair and his beard. This was the story that was brought to my mind when the hon. member was speaking. He was delivering a Christmas gift to a very poor home with a mother who was without the aid of a breadwinner and who had told her children that Santa Claus couldn't visit them that night. Then a knock came to the door and this young man with his long hair and his long beard said, "I have a hamper and some Christmas presents for you." They took them in and the youngsters stood wide-eyed as they watched and the mother, through her tears and her weeping, was able to say, "Thank you". The man with the long hair and the beard went out and drove away. The story goes on to say that one of the little youngsters said to the mother as the young man left, "Was that Jesus?"

You know the spirit exemplified in that CHED program of Santa Claus Anonymous and similar programs, I think, gives us an insight into the thinking of our young people that just can't be found otherwise. So again I want to say that I commend the hon. members for bringing in this particular program.

When we are talking about some of the solutions to our modern world and some of the things we expect our young people to do, and how to do it, I think we can say are ways and means of distributing the vast production that we are able to produce. Even though we want to produce more, and properly so because there are still many hungry people in this country and hungry people in other parts of the world, I think our young people are going to have to look at other means of distributing the vast production we are able to produce through other means than work and earning dollar bills.

Maybe the guaranteed income program has merit in this regard. Maybe the national dividend of the Social Credit philosophy has merit in this regard. Maybe other people have other solutions. But I think one thing the hon. members should realize is that the present method is not doing the job, that we are not distributing the production we have, and our young people are realizing that. They, I hope, will not be prepared to accept the status quo simply because it has been done before.

There surely are ways in which we can distribute the vast production and ways in which we can do away with malnutrition in the bodies of young people in this country when we have the capacity to produce. Whatever method, I am not particularly concerned about which method is used or which method we find -- maybe methods we haven't even thought about -- but there are certainly better ways of doing it than are being used today, both for the building of unity in our country and in the world.

I think most of the difficulties in our country would disappear if everybody from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the 49th parallel to the Arctic had enough to eat, had a chance to enjoy the culture and the recreation that is possible today.

I think we would do away with the difficulties that arise because we speak French, or because we speak English, or because we speak Russian, Ukrainian, Italian or German. Those are insignificant things, in my view, compared to giving each individual a chance to live his life in freedom, in accordance with The Bill of Rights, and in accordance with The Individual's Rights Act. Certainly young people have a proper argument, when it comes to age, in that regard.

I want to say a word or two in connection with one or two of the points raised by the hon. members. The mover and the seconder dealt with the matter of laws.

I too have heard many young people complain that there is a law for the rich and a law for the poor. Young people generally are in the poor class. They are not rich. They don't have an ample supply of money. Most people in this country are not millionaires. There is probably a third below the poverty line, a third in the middle class and a third in the upper class. The two-thirds below the upper class generally don't have enough money to do everything they want to do.

When they have a fine superimposed over their regular requirements to live, it becomes a burden and sometimes they can't pay. And when they see the wealthy simply paying a fine because their Dad happens to be in the upper-income class when they have to spend a few days in prison, it does build up bitterness. And it builds up something difficult to eradicate later on.

I visited a young man in Bowden who had been convicted of stealing an automobile. He couldn't pay the fine, was sent to prison, and he was bitter. He named another lad from the same community who had done similarly, not once, not twice, but three times and each time had been able to -- his Dad, who was in the upper-class, was able to pay. This lad in the lower-income class, the poverty class, was unable to pay and he was bitter.

It was difficult to explain to him that his act had to be punished. He wasn't prepared to accept that. He said, "Let the punishment be the same for all of us. If I must go to jail, then let the rich man go to jail too."

So there is a lot to be done in connection with our laws in regard to the rich and the poor. There is a lot to be done in regard to young people who can't afford a lawyer and who endeavour themselves to prove that they are innocent when they shouldn't be required to do so.

These are things that have to be corrected and I think the points made by the hon. mover of the resolution were well taken in that regard.

In connection with automobile insurance, again as outlined by the mover and the seconder, I think it has much merit. I recognize the points raised by the hon. Member for Edmonton who said that insurance is well -- to the effect that it is a science -- that whatever it costs has to be paid. And I think that is one thing about automobile insurance, whether it is operated by the state or whether it is operated by free enterprise, the fewer accidents you have, the better it is. Because the more you pay out, whether it's under a government scheme or free enterprise scheme, the more you are going to have to collect from the people. And there is just no two ways about that unless it is subsidized by somebody else. And normally that isn't done.

And so while that is true, it isn't the point that the young people dispute. They don't argue that if the total cost of insurance is "X" dollars, they have to pay "X" dollars plus a reasonable profit. No, I've never heard young people argue that point.

I have heard them argue about the amount they have to pay in relation to others, and particularly as the hon. seconder of the motion said, when they had been accident-free. They are being charged a premium, not because of their record, not because they are pccr drivers, but simply because they are under 25 and not married. That is the part that bothers them. They are not married or not females.

The insurance industry gives the better rates to the young men who marry; that is supposed to bring on responsibility they tell me. I don't know whether it's so or not, but I suppose maybe it has some merit in that regard -- or the record of young ladies is better.

But I think the young people have a very valid point when they mention that they are being charged a certain premium over something over which they have no control, their age. They are that age through no fault of their own. They have nothing to do with it. And when that argument is used I think the young people have a very sound argument.

I have argued with insurance companies and the heads of insurance companies in this country about this very point. I know they point out the arguments that were advanced by the hon. member from Edmonton that the record of this group, under 25, is bad compared to some other age groups. This is a type of group discrimination. I have said to the insurance industry and have even made a

proposition to them that, if this is so and they want to be fair to those who are driving, why not refund the extra premium to the young person at the end of 12 months if they have had no accident? To their credit they did consider this and then rejected it. I think their rejection was wrong. And I think I was getting close to the position where I was carrying the judgment of the former government in regard to enacting legislation requiring insurance companies to refund the excess premium that was over and above that charged to other people if the young person under 25 did not have an accident, or did not have a conviction -- did not have an accident that cost that company money. They should secure the best possible premium.

The insurance companies did, however, make some changes. They brought the young people where they had no accidents to the best rating when they first got the licences that were possible under the age 25. But it is still high, still high compared to those who are in other age groups. And that's the root of the argument -- the root of the discrimination and the root of the problem. If insurance companies today across this country would be realistic and realize that one of the major reasons the people of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and now British Columbia are going in for government insurance is the fact that the insurance companies refuse to be realistic with the people on this problem. They poke their heads in the sand and they think the problem will go away. But it won't go away. It will get worse and worse until the insurance companies become realistic enough to realize that they have to treat all people fairly in connection with this matter of premiums.

And if being fair to those from 25 under means a higher premium for some of those 25 and over, then I say, so what? If this is fair, then surely it should be accepted. I know the total amount has to equal the amount paid out plus a reasonable profit to the insurance companies. That's part of our free enterprise system. And as long as that profit is reasonable and fair, I don't think too many people have an argument against it. But a great number of people -- and it's a growing army in this province, because everywhere I go I find these sentiments, that people, particularly young people, are very dissatisfied with the fact that they're being charged more because they are under 25, because they belong to a certain group over which they have no control.

If the insurance companies of this country and of this province would be realistic enough to say to our young people, "We'll be fair with you. We're going to charge you the amount we are charging now, based on the surcharges and so on. But, at the end of the year, if you have not had an accident, if you have not had a conviction, we will refund to you that portion of your premium that should never have been charged." What an incentive it would be to our young people to keep their records excellent, to drive safely, to be aware of everything all the time they are at the wheel of an automobile. And that's the incentive we need.

As I have said before, I have argued with the heads of the insurance companies of Canada to adopt this plan and they finally rejected it. Whether it's too much bookkeeping, which was one item mentioned, or whether it was for other reasons I don't know. But I do know that it would do a great deal to enhance the picture of insurance companies in a free enterprise system if our insurance companies would embark on that program.

And when we get to the other end of the bracket it is similar. I've had people come to me, and undoubtedly the hon. Minister of Highways has had people come to him, and say, "I either have to give up driving" -- in the old days it was, "I'm going to drive without insurance," when the insurance wasn't compulsory -- "because I can't get a company to take me."

I've been with one company for 35 years and their policy is not to insure anybody over the age of 70. I think this is cruel and I have told insurance companies this. I'm sure the present government will recognize the same point, that a man should not be judged on his age. As long as he is able to pass the requirements of driving, then he should be entitled to get insurance.

And finally, the insurance companies of this country said to the people in Ontario and to us in Alberta, "We'll accept that policy, that if a person has a driver's licence, we will give him an insurance policy." But they forgot to say the words that made this almost a mockery. They forgot to say "at a price", and they have made that price ridiculously high.

Why should a senior citizen over 70 be paying more for his insurance than a person of 50, if he drives safely without accidents and without convictions? After he has had an accident then, of course, that record is destroyed and then there is reason to charge extra in fairness as a deterrent and because he has

brought on the extra costs to all the people. But not, Mr. Speaker, as long as he is driving safely and without accident.

I suggest that the potential for accidents on the part of many of our senior citizens is less than it is on those between the ages of 30 and 50 or 60 because they drive far less. They drive more carefully. Hundreds of them don't drive at night. They don't drive when they are tired. They are a safer risk and yet they have to pay more. So along with the discrimination in the junior group, under 25, there is also some discrimination in regard to this matter of insurance for those who are over 25.

Well the young people, I think, have an excellent example to show discrimination against their group when it comes to insurance. And I again want to emphasize that I have not yet found any group of young people who will put up an argument for the young person, even though they may be guilty themselves, for special treatment for young people, simply because they are young people, or favourable treatment if they have had accidents or if they are bad drivers or if they have had convictions. Young people will normally say, and I have yet to find the exception, that such people should be required to pay more. But the real cry is, why penalize those who drive excellently, those who drive with care, those who drive without accident, those who drive without conviction, whether it is on a motorcycle or whether it is in a car or in a truck?

I think that is the point I want to emphasize in this debate. The point that the resolution mentions, the introduction of legislation to this Assembly may be difficult. Yes, I agree with that. It may be difficult. But I think what the hon. members have to ask themselves is, is it fair and are we doing something to give our young people a more positive approach to life and a fair approach to life and a fair chance with others, irrespective of the economic group in which they belong? If they are treated the same in regard to items like insurance and law, then we have gone a giant step forward, at least, toward having our young people approach their responsibilities that they are gradually going to assume in a positive way and with a feeling of responsibility in respect for the past.

I am not suggesting at this stage what legislation the hon. members have in mind or what the government may, in its wisdom, decide to bring in, but I am suggesting one item and that is, if the insurance companies of this country continue to refuse to treat our young people fairly in regard to premiums I would welcome legislation that would require insurance companies to refund at the end of the year that excess premium, whatever it happens to be, to those who drove during that period without an accident and without a conviction. We would never have a more positive approach to safe driving than an incentive like that, and I think our young people would respond to that type of treatment in a very, very positive way.

Again, I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder for bringing in this resolution and I hope it will give us an opportunity to show that the young people of today are -- even though they are living in an environment more difficult than in any period in the history of the world as far as adjustment is concerned -- even though they are living in that difficult environment and even though they may have long hair and beards, their hearts are in the right place and their minds are very positive.

We have the opportunity in this country, as in any country in the world of having the finest young people approach their responsibilities of adulthood. It is up to those of us who have passed that stage to make sure they have the opportunity and whether they have long hair or short hair or no hair, whether they have beards or no beards, it couldn't be more immaterial, as far as I am concerned. The important thing is that they approach their period of responsibility with the desire to solve some of the problems of distribution, prejudice and negativism which we in our generation have not yet solved.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Smoky River.

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

[Interjections]

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak. I'm sure the hon. member ...[Inaudible]

MR. SPEAKER:

There is a motion to adjourn the debate and I am obliged to put it. Is there a seconder for the motion?

MR. COOKSON:

I'll second the motion, Mr. Speaker.

[The motion was lost.]

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, first of all I must say that although it is rather unusual I find that I have to agree with many of the sentiments expressed by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Possibly the Chair is guilty of a little informality in procedure here. Subject to having a later opportunity to examine the authorities, I believe that the hon. Member for Smoky River would lose his right to speak for having moved the motion for adjournment unless he speaks immediately. Under those circumstances, the hon. Member for Smoky River, as I say, subject to my checking the authorities, should have the right to take the floor.

MR. MOORE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. However I would waive my right to speak to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is hardly an assignable commodity but I think we will accept it.

MR. NOTLEY:

One of the members said, "Its such gallantry," so I accept that gallantry in the spirit of the cooperation and fraternity which is evidenced by this debate so far.

Mr. Speaker, I did not however entirely share the views of everything the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo offered during his discourse. He seemed to suggest that the youth of today are somewhat more responsible than those of the 1960's.

I would like to suggest that when we discuss the role of youth in North American society, the young people who took an active part in the previous decade, the young men and women in the United States who went on the civil rights marches, the university students who participated in the anti-Vietnam marches and the demonstrations, in my view, these young people had a tremendous impact on the society as a whole.

When we consider the fact that we, last fall, finally passed a Bill of Rights in this province, one of the reasons that the public climate in Alberta demanded a Bill of Rights was because of the fact that we had the great civil rights issues taking place in the United States during the 1960's. And, in large measure, a good part of the reason that the civil rights movement became a powerful force in the United States was due to the idealism of younger Americans of all races.

I think too, Mr. Speaker, that it is important when we examine the role of the young radicals in the United States during the 1960's to remember that in many respects these people brought to the attention of the American people some of the basic principles upon which the United States Republic was founded. In that respect their contribution to the public life of the United States is very great and, in my view, has had a pretty profound effect on the present withdrawal from Vietnam.

But I want to turn from a general survey of the role of youth during the 1960's to a discussion of youth today in Alberta. During the time between

sessions I have an opportunity to speak to many public meetings, and where possible I also like to take the time to speak to high school classes.

One of the things I find extremely interesting in touching the whole question -- in speaking to high school classes -- is the fact that you get questions which never arise at public meetings. I have travelled from one end of this province to the other and the number of times that anybody at a public meeting has got up and asked about the question of native rights is negligible. It maybe happened three for four times out of the many meetings I have held. But it is a very rare case indeed when someone will stand up at a public meeting and say, "Look, there is a problem here. What are you going to do about it, or what is the government doing about it?"

In contrast to that, Mr. Speaker, when you visit high schools, at least the experience I have had, and this is true all over the province whether it is in the north or the south or the east or the west, very often you get questions which relate to the civil liberties area and to the rights of native people.

I am not saying that young people are necessarily any better than the adults of today, but I think at least there is some evidence to indicate that there is a greater idealism, and that in my judgment, Mr. Speaker, is certainly very desirable.

Another thing I find refreshing when talking to high school students is their healthy scepticism, scepticism of politicians, scepticism of institutions, scepticism of ideology. I think many people today in our society tend to think in very narrow ways. They are just not willing to look at options or alternatives. They tend to accept either socialism or free enterprise or whatever it may be, without ever challenging some of these accepted doctrines over the years.

What I find rather different on the part of young people is that there is a healthy skepticism, a willingness to set on the table some of the shibboleths and say, "Alright now. You say that such and such is a good thing. But you can't get away by saying it's a good thing because it's free enterprise."

The young people today are very much like Harry Truman. He used to say he was from Missouri, you had to show him. That's about the same with young people, you have to show them. And I find that extremely encouraging.

I want to say just a word or two about the question of car insurance without belabouring the point. The fact has already been stated by almost all the previous speakers that younger Albertans pay far more than they should for car insurance and that in terms of their premiums they are really judged guilty before they have a chance to prove themselves innocent -- judged guilty on the basis of their age.

I frankly doubt that there is any way you are really going to change this kind of system as long as car insurance is controlled by the private sector. As long as there is a profit motive involved it is highly unlikely that the insurance companies are going to make any substantial changes in high-risk categories. You have to be pretty optimistic to think there is any way of voluntarily getting the insurance industry to turn over a new leaf.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that the examples of more reasonable rates for young people, the examples of rates cited in Saskatchewan and Manitoba, accurately reflect the proposition that only through a public scheme where you eliminate the profit factor is there any real chance you are going to be able to bring in rates for younger drivers which are at least reasonable.

A final point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the resolution talks about discrimination against those people under the age of 25. While there certainly is evidence of that kind of discrimination -- insurance is the one that comes most easily to mind, but the hon. member for Drumheller outlined other types of discrimination -- I suggest we should be concerned about the discrimination that exists within the age group of younger people in Alberta rather than discrimination against this age group.

One of the propositions we supposedly support, Mr. Speaker, regardless of our political ideology, is that we should all have the same equality of opportunity, not necessarily equality in the end result but equality in opportunity, that we should all start from the same starting gate. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that really doesn't exist in Alberta today. There's no way that you can tell me that a young child born on a Metis colony in this province is going to have the same right to opportunity as a child born in

a family where the breadwinner happens to be a millionaire. The ground rules are clearly stacked in favour of the latter.

So one of the things we have to consider when we talk about this issue, Mr. Speaker, is to deal with steps that would provide more equality of opportunity. We have to tackle the question of poverty, the disparity of income, the fact that low-income families don't have the disposable income necessary to provide their children with an equal chance to advance in life. We have to tackle the problems of the inner-city schools where studies have shown quite conclusively that the quality of education in our inner-city areas is just not up to the standard of some of the suburban sections of our two major cities. We have to deal with the special educational difficulties of some of the far-flung and remote rural areas.

In short, I suggest to the members of this Assembly that it is more important to deal with those inequalities that exist among young people today in getting a start in life than it is to worry about discrimination against the group as a whole.

I am not saying that we shouldn't make reasonable efforts and bring in legislation where necessary to eliminate discrimination against young people as a whole. But surely, Mr. Speaker, if we are really concerned about facing a society on the proposition of equality of opportunity, we should spare no effort in bringing in legislative moves which will deal with those long-standing inequalities which make it so difficult for some young people to advance through their lives with a hope of having a happy and satisfactory life.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I tend to support the resolution. I think it does have merit. I, like the hon. Member for Drumheller and the other members who spoke on this debate, have a good deal of confidence in the younger people of this province, their scepticism, as I mentioned before, their cynicism at times and yes, their idealism that this will be an ingredient to, in my judgment, create perhaps a public which is a little more aware of what is going on, and a little less willing to accept what they are told, and a little more questioning. That, Mr. Speaker, will ultimately lead to a better society.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, I have to thank the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo for putting this resolution on the Order Paper. He made an excellent presentation, Mr. Speaker, we have had a real fire raging debate on this particular subject. We have read The Greening of America. We have looked at Future Shock and we have ridden down 109 Avenue on a bicycle. Not to mention that we have moved dirt with the hon. Member for Drumheller with wheelbarrows in the dirty thirties. I am wondering whether they weren't moving it reasonably cheap at that time because the price of industrial machinery has gone up quite a way since then.

So anyway, this is a very refreshing resolution to have here. With the signs of spring approaching on the horizon and the grass flushing out green on the Legislature. We can now all think young, Mr. Speaker, and this is an important thing.

I think probably no one should ever, at any time, underrate the importance of youth and the significance youth has had historically. Amongst the great leaders of history, the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill has mentioned William Pitt the Younger. You could talk of Alexander the Great who at 19 wept because he had got to the shores of India and he said, "From here on I cry because there are no further worlds that I can travel on to conquer. So youth has had recognition in many areas.

It is interesting, of course, as we view some of the thinking we have had amongst our young people. We can talk about the rejection of the work ethic. We can talk about the thinking of static growth. But does this talk about how you are going to put the beans on the table tomorrow morning? That is the question I have to ask, Mr. Speaker, in all truthfulness. Because certainly in Canada, at least at this stage in our development, there is no way we can possibly afford the luxury of static growth.

The young people of today are probably the most sophisticated, best fed, best educated generation that has ever been fielded in the history of the world, fortified in their babyhood by pabulum, lulled to sleep by television, and awakened to an early morning program on the radio, with disposal diapers to take them through. What could be better, Mr. Speaker?

However, there has been mention of discrimination in the matter of age in relation to young people and mention of discrimination of age in relation to people over 45. And I can rationalize both of these positions. Strangely enough, I was talking to a friend of mine who once worked with me back in the Gay Nineties when I was a young fella, and I got him out from school, you know, and I think I helped to teach him whatever he did learn -- and probably he didn't learn very much. But anyway the supervisor of this particular --

AN HON. MEMBER:

How old were you then?

MR. DRAIN:

I was 17.

He was a supervisor in this particular mining operation. Strangely enough, this was yesterday I was talking to him.

This mine was a metal mine, and as the process of automation increased they increased the mechanization and added to the amount of explosives they used in order to reduce the amount of manpower. So they reduced the manpower from 800 employees to 400.

But as they put these large charges of powder under ground, a tremendous internal heat developed with the result that unless it was instantaneously dissipated the ore would burst into flame. This was an extraordinary thing for me to believe because I didn't think ore burned. I knew that coal burned. However, this would create hydrogen sulphide gas and also the rocks would turn molten white, and the men who worked in this particular area would have to pry this stuff with long steel bars or they would have to drop charges of dynamite onto it. And I said, "Well, this proves to me that there still must be some tough men in the world." And he says, "Yes", and he says, "You know, every one of these fellas is over 45." And this is very reasonable to me because you'd have to have men with experience, men who would not shatter under a crisis, but who would be tenacious, stay with it, and these are some of the characteristics of the over 45 generation.

Now on the other hand, if you were looking for young people, for people where enthusiasm was required, where stamina and the ability to carry on day after day with a limited amount of sleep, exposure to hardship and so on was required, this is where you'd have to have the young people.

So my contention, Mr. Speaker, is that there are places for both species, the young and the old, in our system of society. And I think that if there is anything that can be said in relation to the rejection of the work ethic, the static growth and the failure of our education to develop the entrepreneurs to field the private enterprise systems we talk about with such admiration and awe, I think it can be attributed probably to some lapse in the ability of our educational system to coordinate with the actual realities of the real world. Because certainly the people in charge of this particular venture have led a comparatively sheltered life.

I would like to talk for a small moment on insurance. And I can see the position of an insurance company when it says that in an industrial risk such as trucking no young Albertan under 25 shall be hired as a truck driver. At one time when I was in the construction business, we had this written into our insurance policies.

Now whether this is so now or not I don't know -- I'm out of that now. But anyway this said that you could not hire a truck driver under 25 years of age, because if you did, your insurance would not be valid and it would be considered just cause to cancel your insurance.

This is a case of judging one sour apple in a box and saying that all apples are sour. As someone mentioned previously in this debate, a green door, and came to the premise -- I think it was the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill who said that if he saw three green doors he could conclude that all the doors are green in Edmonton. But really they're not all green.

But when we talk about insurance I can sympathize very much with the hon. member who gave a succulent analysis. I think probably the proof of the pudding is the eating thereof. And I can refer to my No. 4 son and his experience in getting insurance. It went something like this and I can authenticate what I say. He bought this Datsun truck for \$2,000 and then of course, he had to get insurance. So he checked with agent No. 1, and agent No. 1 quoted \$450, agent

No. 2 quoted \$400, and agent No. 3 gave him coverage for \$385 on a cash deal. I assumed the discount was cash and the rates were pretty well consistent. So this represents 20 per cent of the cost of this particular vehicle.

So in the interest of trying to build a case in the defence of the private enterprise system I wrote to the Saskatchewan Insurance Commission. And I photostated the copy of the insurance policy. I also did the same thing with the Manitoba Insurance Commission and I said, "I am an 18 year old boy. This is what I have. I want to insure this particular vehicle. Can you give me this particular coverage and what is the price?"

Well, the answer to me, Mr. Speaker, was a disaster to the private enterprise system. Because the rate in Saskatchewan was \$75 for that particular coverage, \$250 deductible. The rate in Manitoba was \$92. However, there was a proviso in Manitoba that if you had an accident the rate bounced up to \$400, which, of course, at least you had a chance to survive.

There are many more things that I'd like to cover in this debate, Mr. Speaker, but time is running out so I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, the House will not sit tonight. The two subcommittees that have not finished their work will sit. I believe Subcommittee A is half-way through the estimates of the Alberta Hospitals Commission and if there is time this evening will move on to the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission. Subcommittee B, I believe, has to complete the estimates of the Department of Highways. And Subcommittees C and D, I believe, have nothing further to do in the sense that the Executive Council legislation estimates will be dealt with in Committee of Supply.

I move, Mr. Speaker, the House do now adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the motion for adjournment by the hon. Government House Leader, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

[The House rose at 5:29 o'clock.]