

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 217 -- The Public Officials Disclosure Act

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Public Officials Disclosure Act. This is an issue that has become very current throughout Canada, and a number of jurisdictions, provincial governments, are looking at it.

This bill is based on the bill which has been introduced in the British Columbia Legislature. It would require members of the Executive Council, members of the Legislative Assembly, members of the council of a municipality or members of a school board and also senior government officials to disclose their interests in businesses and perhaps land holdings with certain exceptions as set out in the bill.

The reason I am introducing this bill, Mr. Speaker, is that I believe the issue is very timely --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The introduction of bills is becoming perhaps a little too lengthy. The hon. member is entitled only to state very briefly the contents of the bill. The reasons for its introduction are, of course, part of the debate on second reading.

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I was merely referring to the precedent created on March 1 a year ago in the introduction --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. A precedent in the introduction of The Bill of Rights -- is this what the hon. member is relying upon?

MR. LUDWIG:

To the extent of remarks made with regard to the bill, Mr. Speaker. I don't have the speech given by the hon. Premier at that time, but it was quite a lengthy introduction and I felt that the same privilege would extend to me. However, I will abide by your ruling and wind up my introduction of this bill, Mr. Speaker. But it also has been common in this House for the members opposite to require a little more information on introduction of a bill, and I was going to accommodate the hon. members, Mr. Speaker.

They stated this bill is timely, it's a current issue and --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The timeliness of the bill and the currency of the issue are also matters of debate. If there was undue latitude permitted in the case of

the introduction of The Bill of Rights, the hon. member would have had the right to raise it at that time. At the moment I am not aware that there was. But in any event one, shall we say, stretching of the rules should not justify another.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not feel that because the rules were stretched at one time that's another reason why they should be stretched now. I agree with the hon. Speaker's ruling and I wish to state that this bill, as I have indicated, is based largely on the principle expounded by the hon. Premier of Ontario. I believe that it's a necessary bill here and I hope the hon. members will see fit to support it. And I beg leave to introduce the said bill, Mr. Speaker.

[Interjections]

You sure hate to be told, don't you?

You're no different, Peter, either.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 217 was introduced and read a first time.]

#### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you and to this Assembly 82 senior citizens from the Golden Mile Senior Citizens Group in Lethbridge. They are accompanied by their president, Miss Anne Farries. They were visited by the Premier in their very fine club rooms in Lethbridge on his official opening of the University of Lethbridge last fall, at which time he was made an honorary member.

This is a very active group and they travel extensively. They have visited the museum and were entertained at Government House at a luncheon which was hosted by the Premier.

We are proud of the part our senior citizens have played in the development of this great province of ours. We are pleased to salute them, and it is my very great honour to introduce them to this House. They are seated in the members gallery, and I would ask them to please rise and be recognized.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may have the liberty just to add to that introduction by saying how pleased we are that they have made this trip, and to direct to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the other members of the Legislature that among the group of the Golden Mile Senior Citizens' Centre is the Rev. A. T. King, who is the grandfather of our Member for Edmonton Highlands.

[Applause]

MR. BATIUK:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Legislative Assembly, 40 Grade 9 students from the Holden School in my constituency. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mrs. Ogrodnick, Mrs. McArthur and their bus operator, Mr. Kozaway. They are seated in the public gallery and I would ask them to rise and be recognized.

#### FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answers to Motions for a Return Nos. 129 and 157, as ordered by this Assembly.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table two documents, the first being the Alberta Livestock Operations Waste Management Survey, done in 1972. The second is the Status of Environment Protection in the Alberta Energy Resources Industries, done by the Energy Resources Conservation Board at the request of the Department of the Environment.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table answers to Motion for a Return No. 121, originally submitted by myself in 1968 and later this session by the hon. member, Mr. Anderson; Motion for a Return No. 210, copies of certain correspondence asked for by hon. members, Mr. Clark and Mr. Ho Lem; and Motion for a Return No. 139, also copies of correspondence asked for by hon. members, Mr. Clark and Mr. Ho Lem.

With respect to the last two Motions for a Return, Mr. Speaker, we were unable to get the concurrence by the authors to table four pieces of correspondence.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table answers to three Motions for a Return: the first one, Question 131, which became a Motion for a Return in relation to payments of social allowance and social assistance; the second one, Question 132, which became a Return, lists accommodations of the type of motels or the like where social allowance recipients stayed in Alberta as of December 31, 1972; and the third one, No. 150, is the number of applicants requesting space in senior citizens' homes as of October, 1972.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have the honour to table the Annual Report for 1972 for the Ombudsman, distinguished servant of this Legislature, who is seated in the Speaker's Gallery.

[Applause]

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

##### Craig Case

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Attorney General could advise the House as to whether he has had the opportunity of reading the transcripts relating to the adjournment of the fraud charges in the Craig case?

MR. LEITCH:

Not as yet, Mr. Speaker. I have asked for them but they haven't yet reached me.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

##### Suffield Well Drilling

MR. WYSE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals and it is just to clarify a point made yesterday with regard to the approval by the federal government for drilling of the 77 evaluation wells at Suffield. Did the minister indicate a request for proposals and terms of reference has been submitted to the oil companies, or the oil trade?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, we are presently in the process of preparing them.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question; so the drilling of the exploratory wells will be left to the private oil trade, and the government won't get involved with the Crown corporation or anything like that?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of the government at this time to set up a committee to really supervise the operation of the drilling of the 77 evaluation

wells and that will be accompanied by a request for proposal that will be submitted to industry dealing with the drilling of the 77 evaluation wells.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate what is the tentative starting date for the drilling?

MR. DICKIE:

No, Mr. Speaker, a tentative starting date hasn't been decided upon.

MR. WYSE:

One supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Will any of the exploratory wells be drilled, within the British Army training area that is ...?

MR. GETTY:

No, Mr. Speaker, I believe we will not be able to interfere with the British Army training sites. They have suggested they might restrict them should there be a problem in that regard, but it appears there will not be on the initial drilling.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Poncka, followed by the hon. Member for Bow Valley.

Companies Investigation

DR. MCCRIMMON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. the Attorney General. A week or so ago the Attorney General was asked about a request by the shareholders for an investigation into PAP Holdings Ltd., Cosmopolitan Life Insurance Company and other companies. As a shareholder and one-time director of PAP Holdings, I would like to know what action the Attorney General's department is taking on this matter?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, as I recall it when that matter was first raised I answered rather briefly by saying that it was being looked into and I should perhaps now expand on that by saying that for some appreciable time now the members of the police force and members of the Attorney General's department have been looking into the affairs of those companies. In fact, that inquiry has been going on for something like two years. I anticipate that within the next few weeks we will have reached a position where a decision will be made as to whether or not there have been any breaches of the law and whether there ought to be charges laid.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that if charges are laid, I would then anticipate -- at least until the charges were disposed of -- there could be no further public proceedings into the matter because such public proceedings are bound to get into the area covered by any charges that might be laid. On the other hand, if the decision is not to lay charges then a decision at that time will be made as to what alternate courses of action should be taken.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney General. What provisions are being devised to ensure that files of Alberta citizens without criminal records will not be placed on computers used by the RCMP and other police forces in the course of their investigations?

MR. SPEAKER:

As it is phrased, the hon. member's question is hypothetical since that has not yet occurred. If the hon. member wishes to consider rephrasing it while the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview asks his supplementary, perhaps he might do so.

MR. NOTLEY:

I wonder if I could ask the hon. Attorney General whether he has made a decision yet with respect to the request by the agreed shareholders' steering committee that there should be a judicial inquiry into the operations of PAP holdings, Cosmopolitan and associated companies.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question was at least implied in the answer to the earlier question from the hon. Member for Ponoka. As I indicated, if the inquiry that is now being conducted leads to the laying of criminal charges, then I would think that a judicial inquiry would be inappropriate at least until after those charges are disposed of, because I am sure it would have to get into the area that would be covered by the charges.

On the other hand, if charges aren't laid, then a decision will, at that time, be made about a judicial inquiry.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary to the minister. Are RCMP computers now being used to investigate private citizens without records in the course of this investigation that you referred to?

MR. LEITCH:

Sorry, Mr. Speaker. I didn't hear the last few words to the question.

MR. HO LEM:

In the investigation which you have referred to regarding the insurance question brought up in the various investigations, are RCMP computers being used in the course of investigating the various citizens that come under the scope of this investigation?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I don't know.

MR. NOTLEY:

I wonder if I might put another supplementary question to the hon. Attorney General. By way of explanation, Mr. Attorney General, one of the concerns of the aggrieved shareholders was the role played by the Alberta regulatory agencies such as the Securities Commission and the Director of Insurance.

My question to you is, will there be any report to the Legislature after you have completed your investigation of the role of the government officials involved in this particular case?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that I can, at this time, indicate to the hon. member the nature of the information that might be available to the Legislature because I think that depends on the kind of proceedings that are taken in the future, whether it be by judicial inquiry or otherwise.

Nonetheless, I can assure the hon. member that it is my intention to ensure that we are fully informed as to what the regulatory agents did or should have done and I would expect that information ultimately to be given to the Legislature, although I can't at this time, conjecture on what form it might be in when it comes to the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Southern Alberta Teachers' Negotiations

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Would the hon. minister be able to report to the House the

progress that the negotiating committee has made since the teachers were ordered back to their classrooms last Monday?

DR. HOHOL:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. The progress is positive enough to permit them to continue their work. I will be in a much better position in a day or two to make a major and an important and final report to the House on this matter.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Fincher Creek-Crowsnest, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Automobile Emission Devices

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of the Environment. This has to do with automobile emissions. Is there a benefit when the accelerated use of fuel is considered in having these emission devices on automobiles, having regard for the fact that the fuel used is probably 30 per cent more?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, there has been quite a great deal of confusion as to what changes have been wrought on the automobiles in the last couple years by virtue of federal government legislation, and what effect this has had on the fuel consumption. And if I may be permitted just a minute or two I would like to indicate to the House the changes that were made prior to 1972 which did, according to the federal government, have no effect upon fuel consumption.

There were a whole series of changes requested. One was positive crankcase ventilation systems, another was carburetor changes to improve regulating carburetion and choking, ignition timing changes, idle control, solenoid with overhead heating protection --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. minister is finding it necessary to go into considerable detail in answering the question. I shall have to ask the leave of the House if they wish to have the question answered in such detail during the question period, or would the hon. minister prefer to make a statement on Orders of the Day?

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, it's vital information because nearly all the members drive automobiles and I'm sure they would be pleased to go along with the idea of allowing the minister --

MR. SPEAKER:

Under the circumstances then, in the event the question does require this amount of detail, perhaps the hon. member would put it on the Order Paper.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I can answer the question specifically and indicate that during 1973 a number of changes were made to reduce oxides of nitrogen. The federal government informs us this will --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. If the hon. minister is answering the question specifically, it related to the possible economic advantages of additional fuel being used by the vehicles.

The hon. Member for --

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Would an individual, operating an automobile, who removes these controls on the automobile be charged?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, these devices are under the control of The Motor Vehicle Act under the Minister of Transport of the federal government. There is no provincial legislation in regard to making it mandatory that these devices be maintained on the automobile.

MR. DRAIN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is there a pollution benefit or a pollution loss when the total fuel consumption is considered?

MR. YURKO:

There is a very substantial reduction in pollution to the extent of greater than 75 per cent in oxides of nitrogen. It was this change in 1973 that resulted in the fuel loss consumption of between 3 per cent and 20 per cent according to prototype model indicators done by the federal government.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of the Environment. To your knowledge have any anti-pollution gas devices been removed from government-owned vehicles?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure I can assure the hon. member that the government doesn't remove the anti-pollution devices from its automobiles.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Are you contemplating any legislation in Alberta forbidding the removal of these devices?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I have given the matter a great deal of thought and consideration and recognize there is a considerable inequity in doing this type of thing -- that is legislating -- recognizing, of course, that the problems are mainly in Edmonton and Calgary and not throughout rural Alberta. So that, in fact, if the government did consider legislation in this area it might perhaps limit it to cars registered in Edmonton and Calgary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking, followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge East.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker --

MR. SPEAKER:

Sorry, I had recognized the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, followed by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

Incarceration of Juveniles in Calgary

MR. DIXON:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question today is directed to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Serious charges have been levelled by citizens in Calgary regarding the treatment during incarceration of juvenile offenders and children under the Child Welfare Department in the detention institute in Calgary. I was wondering what investigation or action the minister is going to take on this very serious situation?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the matter did come to my attention yesterday as a result of the hon. member (who asked the question) having raised it, and I thank him for giving me advance notice.

I'm aware that a letter from, if I'm not mistaken, a reverend gentleman in Calgary has arrived in my office today, but I have not read it with care yet. I have, however, a report on the incident as it was related to me yesterday which might be of some interest if I comment on it.

I think it should be said at the outset, as might be expected in such cases that there is more than one side to the story. The first thing that might be said is that the institution in question is not a provincial institution. It is one that is operated by the City of Calgary.

I know the thought has been expressed that the mere fact of jurisdiction falling in the hands of the one government rather than the other shouldn't cause us to be unconcerned if it's an area where a legitimate concern should arise. I think, within reasonable limits, that is a valid observation. However, I don't want to say that things which are clearly within the responsibility of a municipal government would be lightly interfered with, no matter what field it falls in.

The lad in question, who I would prefer not to name at the moment because I don't know if his name has been made public in other communications, is a temporary ward of the government and has had a record extending beyond two years of being placed in preventive detention of one sort or another. It is apparent from the report I have that every effort has been made to place him in facilities where he would have more liberty than he has at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. minister able to conclude shortly?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I really am. Almost right up to date, as of this point, the youth was recently charged with public damage. This was consistent with the type of difficulty he had been in before. The report given to me orally, in addition to this, indicated that the damage he caused was extensive and serious.

At the present time he is being held in a closed unit upon the recommendation of a psychiatrist. Alternative placement arrangements are being considered on an emergency basis in the hope that something less confining can be justified and obtained.

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary question to the minister. Am I correct in assuming, though, that most of these children are wards of the government so the provincial government is directly involved? Also, we do assist financially very substantially the operation of that case, so I think there is no way that we as a province can sidetrack it and say it is a city responsibility.

My question to the minister, Mr. Speaker, is this. This is a holding institution. Have we no facilities where these children can be moved, because the staff has no way of treating them and some of them have been in there for five and six weeks waiting to be sent somewhere else? Now just what is the situation in our province?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, in regard to the last part of the question, I think the issue is rather too large to answer in response to a question. No doubt, as the hon. member suggests, most are wards of the government. However, when a youngster has been before a family court my understanding is that the institution he would be referred to is one that is determined by that court. Of course the province funds the city facilities.

I would have to say, in fairness to the City of Calgary, that despite the allegations, I don't yet have information sufficient for me to say that in my view the facilities are not appropriate for the purpose for which they are used. They may well be. In view of that, without denying for a minute the relevance of the hon. member seriously questioning the quality of the environment and the absence of treatment in some of these cases, my understanding is that the situations are short-lived in duration, almost without exception, and active attempts are always made to place the child in an atmosphere where he can benefit from instruction and from rehabilitation.



MR. DIXON:

Two final questions, Mr. Speaker, to the minister.

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly we might have one final supplementary and then go to another topic.

MR. DIXON:

I'll place them together then, Mr. Speaker, if it would be more convenient.

Mr. Minister, are you aware that the rules are more stringent there than in any of the federal penitentiaries that are operating in Canada, as far as visiting hours are concerned and as to who can see those people.

And my other question is, can't we have some sort of rule whereby an elected official, asked to go by the parents of a child, is able to interview that child -- which I wasn't able to do on Saturday afternoon?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, in regard to the last part of the question, expressing only a personal opinion and not a policy of the department, I'm surprised that the hon. member wasn't able to get to see the child. I would think that ordinarily a member of the Assembly would be able to do just that, literally at any time. I will take that matter up through my officials with the officials in the City of Calgary.

On the other interesting proposition, I have not done a comparison of the rules of this institution with any others. But once again, I think through that particular channel, not forgetting that what we have said so far about the institution being a civic-run one, does have two sides to it. I'd certainly be glad to look into the other part of the hon. member's question too.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking, followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge East.

#### Unpasteurized Milk

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Mr. Minister, has the Department of Health and Social Development considered a request from the province's public health inspectors and the Alberta Public Health Association for legislation banning sales of unpasteurized milk in the province?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, consideration has been given to the representations that have been made in that regard and are still the subject of consideration.

MR. COOPER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister tell me how many municipalities do not require the pasteurization of milk for sale to the public as permitted by Section 10 of The Public Health Act?

MR. CRAWFORD:

That information may be available, Mr. Speaker, and I'd have no objection to seeking it. At the present time the law is that if it's a city or a town, or possibly a village, it can be regulated by by-law, but hamlets and others would perhaps be subject to provincial regulation. In the areas where they are regulated by by-law, they are at the present time subject also to a plebiscite.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge East, followed by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

---

Mandrax Sleeping Pill

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Have members of the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission forwarded a recommendation to your office regarding the apparent serious problem of abuse of the sleeping pill Mandrax?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have not seen a submission in regard to that particular drug, but once again I'd be glad to make inquiries.

MR. ANDERSON:

A supplementary. Would the minister assess the abuse of this drug in Alberta as reported by a member of the commission and determine whether your department would make representation to the federal government to have this potentially dangerous drug transferred to the restricted drug abuse schedule of foods and drugs?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I'm glad the hon. member is able to indicate that a member of the commission has already had the matter under advisement and I will discuss it with the chairman of the commission. It seems to me that if it appears the drug is dangerous and is appropriate for being included in the federal schedule, there is no reason why representation shouldn't be made to the federal government.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Craig Case (Cont.)

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Attorney General. Mr. Minister, as a result of the announcement today by the Edmonton Social Planning Council of its resolution calling for a royal commission into the investigation into the Craig case, and the operation of the lower courts in the province, are you now prepared to act?

MR. LEITCH:

No, Mr. Speaker. In the sense of acting on that recommendation, no.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney General. Will you advise the Assembly and the people of the province --

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please address his question to the Chair.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, would the Attorney General advise the members of the Assembly just how many more organizations have to make this kind of request before the government is prepared to --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member is debating.

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

Alberta Nurses' Salaries

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Can the minister advise the House why Alberta nurses receive lower salaries than nurses in either Saskatchewan or British Columbia?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the whole question of the amounts paid is in the hands of the boards with whom they do their collective bargaining.

I would just comment that the hon. member is giving rather than seeking information in his question. And without wanting to make the whole matter an issue, surely a statement to that effect in regard to levels of pay is something that has to be considered in the full context of when the collective bargaining agreements in question were consummated, what the fringe benefits are in each case and what the employment opportunities are in the environments in which they work. As well there are the different classifications of people who might be included under the heading of "nurse" that the hon. member used in his question.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In light of the fact, Mr. Minister, that the government will now be assuming 100 per cent of hospital costs, are you giving any consideration to the thought of provincial bargaining for nurses in the Province of Alberta?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question is no, not provincial bargaining at the present time. The hon. members will be aware though of the interest that is always taken by my colleague, the Minister of Manpower and Labour, in situations, including some in this field, where industrial strife may appear imminent at any time.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise the House whether the grants structure for hospitals this year will automatically pick up wage settlements for nurses, or whether there are any guidelines that will be provided to the hospital boards when they negotiate with the registered nurses in their hospitals?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the hospital boards have been negotiating with the registered nurses under existing guidelines. The matter of their overall budget -- a global budget for each board in each case -- is a matter that is taken altogether as between the Hospital Services Commission and the individual board rather than with reference specifically to wages, despite the fact that they form a substantial part of any budget.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

School Curriculum

MR. BENOIT:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Education. It is a repetition of one I asked seven weeks ago, and he indicated at that time that he would give an answer some time during this spring portion of the session. That has to do with the disposition of petitions and letters requesting equal time for Creation and Evolution in the schools.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, on the whole subject of controversial issues in the school systems of Alberta, of which this is one, I would anticipate, as I said before, making a statement in the House, perhaps in Estimates, regarding the position of the department and the government.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Calgary Children's Service Centre

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Has the Department of Health and Social Development been advised that the lack of year-round recreation facilities constitutes many of the problems at the Calgary Childrens Service Centre?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question, like some of its predecessors, is in the nature of debate. If the minister wishes to answer briefly, he may do so.

It's a great difficulty for the Chair, where a debating question is asked, to intervene in the debating answer.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, in the greatest spirit of cooperation and willingness to provide the information which I do not have, I'll check into it.

MR. WILSON:

OK, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. When is the government going to grant the City of Calgary Children's Service Centre a permanent lease on their ten-acre Ghost River Forest Reservation recreation and rehabilitation site?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the hon. member has read the brochure that was tabled by the hon. Minister of the Environment with respect to the hearings of the Environment Conservation Authority covering that area -- and also noting that no long-term land dispositions will be made until these matters are dealt with and the hearings are held.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Has your department been advised that the Children's Service Centre is only able to use the site in summer months with the temporary lease facilities that they now have?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is giving rather than seeking information.

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking, followed by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

Wildlife Crop Damage Fund

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Mr. Minister, is the Department of Lands and Forests considering including the loss of livestock through action of predatory animals under the Wildlife Crop Damage Fund?

DR. WARRACK:

The losses to which the member refers, Mr. Speaker, have not been considered thus far in the Wildlife Damage Fund. The reason is that the money for the Wildlife Damage Fund has come from the sportsmen, and pertains to the species that are hunted for purposes of sportsmen. This does not include predators generally, and for that reason it has thus far been inapplicable.

MR. COOPER:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, did the Department of Lands and Forests receive a resolution to this effect from the East-Central Alberta Grazing Association?

DR. WARRACK:

Yes I did, Mr. Speaker, and I discussed it with the association when I met them roughly eight weeks ago.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Eurke-Hartke Legislation

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Labour. I ask the Minister of Manpower and Labour if his department or the province has made any representation or had discussions with the federal government regarding The Foreign Trade Investment Act which is presently before the U.S. Congress, sometimes referred to as the Eurke-Hartke legislation, because of the implications regarding jobs?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, not personally through our department.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, can I ask the same question of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, we have not made any presentation to the federal government in this regard.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Calgary Power

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to redirect the question I posed yesterday to the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities, and that's with respect to the interim rate increase granted by the Public Utilities Board to Calgary Power. My question yesterday and is today, to the minister: is that rate increase on an across-the-board basis 15 per cent, or does it vary?

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the increase in rates authorized by the Public Utilities Board in the interim order dated April 1, 1973, is not 15 per cent across the board. The increases vary according to the various classes of customers. I believe that the retail has an average increase of 17.5 per cent; wholesale and REA customers, an average of 14.2 per cent; and industry averages 14.3 per cent.

I believe the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview referred yesterday also, in particular, to the City of Red Deer. The increase for the City of Red Deer, based on 1973 forecasts is 17.4 per cent, but if you calculate the increase on the actual 1972 figures it works out to 20.9 per cent increase. I think it's important to remember that the cost of power represents only about 1 to 2 per cent of the total operating costs. The rate base includes so many other things. In the case of the City of Red Deer, there is a variation in the figures because of the varied consumption.

The PUB, of course, is still in the middle of the hearings into this application for a rate increase, and no precedent is established by the granting

of an interim increase. The government has advanced an interest-free loan to the City of Red Deer in the sum of \$37,500 to assist them in the presentations they make to the board.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise the House whether or not the interim rate increase is the same or the full extent of the applied-for increase by Calgary Power?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. There is some question in the mind of the Chair whether the question as originally put was in order, inasmuch as the order made by the board would undoubtedly be a matter of public record. Possibly if the hon. member were to inquire into the order itself he might determine whether it would be necessary for him to put further questions afterwards.

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Alberta Bill of Rights

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Premier. On November 10 the hon. Premier indicated to the House that it was the government's intention to answer all submissions on The Alberta Bill of Rights. What steps have been taken in this area?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that all the letters that were received by the government with regard to the Bill of Rights were answered. I believe the letters which either supported the bill in its entirety in the form in which it was left on the Order Paper over the summer months or merely made general comments were essentially acknowledged. The other ones which dealt with comments as to possible changes were responded to in a specific way.

MR. SORENSON:

Supplementary to the hon. Premier. The hon. Premier indicated that full Hansard transcripts of the committee discussions on the subject would also be sent to each one making submissions. Do you know if this has been done?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I don't. I will have to check into that matter and let the hon. member know.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Calgary Children's Service Centre (Cont.)

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. When do you expect you will be able to make a decision on the application for --

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please address his question to the Chair?

MR. WILSON:

I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. When do you expect the Department of Lands and Forests --

MR. SPEAKER:

Perhaps the hon. member would like to say: "When does the hon. minister expect ..."

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. When does the hon. minister expect that his department will be able to make a decision on the application for a permanent lease by the Calgary Children's Service Centre?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out earlier today, there will be no long-term dispositions of public land including that one until after the Environment Conservation Authority hearings are complete and we also have the benefits of the analysis from the Foothills Land Use Allocation study. For the hon. member's benefit, I would point out that the hearings will be held through the watershed basins involved in the Environment Conservation Authority hearings from June 11 on through to July 13.

MR. CLARK:

In light of the policy the government has taken, what is the justification for the decision to make land available to Chief Smallboy and his people in the Kootenay Plains area?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. Any question which asks for justification or support for any proposition is obviously a debating question.

The Chair should express regret for having intervened perhaps frequently this afternoon, but I think we should revert to the rule and recall that the question period is not intended for any kind of debate but rather merely for the asking and answering of factual questions of some immediate urgency.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Lands and Forests. Was the government's decision to make land available to Chief Smallboy's tribe in keeping with the policy you outlined in dealing with the question by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow, concerning no final disposition of land during the period of study?

DR. WARRACK:

No land disposition has been made to Chief Smallboy.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister of the Department of Lands and Forests allow the Calgary Children's Service Centre to construct permanent buildings on the site of their temporary lease?

DR. WARRACK:

No.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Department of Lands and Forests cognizant of the offer of free buildings by service clubs to the Calgary Children's Service Centre?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that will be very helpful.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative Government of Alberta -- since assuming office in September 1971 some 19 months ago, has not as yet authorized the removal by new permit of any additional natural gas from the province's reserves. TransCanada Pipelines made application to the Alberta Energy

Resources Conservation Board in 1971 to increase the volume of gas which TransCanada Pipelines may remove by permit from the Province of Alberta by 2,140 billion cubic feet. The Alberta Board heard the application in July 1971 and reported to the Lieutenant Governor in Council in December 1971 with the finding that TransCanada Pipelines had available to it under contract only some 410 billion cubic feet of additional volumes of gas but that substantial surpluses of gas would exist in Alberta even if the government granted the reduced volume of 410 billion cubic feet to TransCanada Pipelines.

The government, Mr. Speaker, in January 1972, in assessing this request by TransCanada Pipelines to remove additional gas from the province was concerned that gas was being removed from this province significantly below its value, which presented a serious situation because of the depleting nature of the reserves. The government therefore decided on a major change in policy from that of the previous government relative to permits for removal of natural gas from the province. The previous policy was to ignore the price that was paid for Alberta gas and leave this matter entirely to the buyers and sellers. As a consequence -- in our view -- millions of dollars have been lost forever to the citizens of the province.

The first action of the new government was to request the Alberta Energy Resources Conservation Board on February 16, 1972 to make an inquiry into field pricing of gas in the province. The Alberta Board thereupon held a full public hearing into the matter and reported to the government in August 1972, with the conclusion that the current average field price for gas in Alberta was only 16 cents per thousand cubic feet or less than 60 per cent of the current field value.

The Board's excellent report of August 1972 on Field Pricing of Gas in Alberta was endorsed by the Government of Alberta in its statement on New Natural Gas Policies for Albertans -- which I presented to this Legislature on November 16, 1972.

In the policy statement, the government advised that it had held in abeyance approval of permits for increased removal of natural gas from the province pending review of existing policies in light of current and anticipated conditions. In fact, as a matter of government policy, the government has held in abeyance the 1971 application by TransCanada Pipelines to increase the volume of gas which that company may remove from the province and in particular the 410 billion cubic feet found as contracted and as surplus by the Alberta board in its aforementioned report to the cabinet of December, 1971.

Mr. Speaker, we have taken the position as a government that we will not issue permits for removal of additional gas from the province unless and until we are satisfied that such gas is being purchased in Alberta at fair value in accordance with the Board's report of August 1972 and within the parameters of our New Natural Gas Policies dated November 16, 1972, with adjustments necessary to reflect the passage of time.

During 1972, TransCanada Pipelines applied for a further permit for additional gas of 2,590 billion cubic feet of gas over and above the 410 billion cubic feet contained in the Alberta Board's report of December 1971. A hearing with regard to this application was held by the Alberta Board in September 1972.

Last Friday, April 6, 1973, the Board made its report with regard to this application to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, copies of which were tabled, without comment, in the Legislature yesterday by the Minister of Mines and Minerals.

Mr. Speaker, the Board has found that after making provision to meet the annual and peak-day requirements of Alberta for the 30-year period -- September 1, 1972 to August 31, 2002 -- and to meet present permit commitments, including that of the previously referred to present permit by TransCanada Pipelines for 410 billion cubic feet, there still remains in Alberta a contractable surplus of 3,800 billion cubic feet which could be removed from this province without affecting Alberta's 30-year requirement. This contractable surplus makes no allowance for the possibilities of discovering substantial new fields of gas as a result of the extensive drilling now occurring within the province or for the possible reserves which may be proved in the Suffield Block.

Mr. Speaker, the Board has also found that TransCanada Pipelines does not have sufficient remaining reserves of gas under contract and available to meet the remaining permit commitments plus their application for an additional 2,590 billion cubic feet of gas. The Board found that TransCanada Pipelines has only an additional 961 billion cubic feet of gas or approximately 37 per cent of the gas requested in their application.



The Board has concluded that the reduced volume found available to TransCanada Pipelines is surplus to the requirements of the province and the province's present permit commitments.

However, Mr. Speaker, the Board further finds that the base prices in the current gas purchase contracts of TransCanada Pipelines, as of September 1972, are substantially below the field value, the price escalation is less than that recommended by the Board in its August 1972 report on Field Pricing of Gas in Alberta. And also TransCanada Pipelines' contracts do not provide for redetermination of price every two years in accordance with the new natural gas policies of the government.

As a result, Mr. Speaker, the cabinet has today concluded that it is not prepared to grant either of the two outstanding applications for permit of additional gas to TransCanada Pipelines unless and until TransCanada Pipelines have provided data to the Alberta Energy Resources Conservation Board that the pricing provisions in their gas purchase contracts are in accordance with the Alberta government's new natural gas policies for Albertans, dated November 16, 1972, as adjusted for the passage of time.

Accordingly, the government will hold in abeyance these applications for permits and will review them from time to time upon receipt of progress reports from the Alberta Board as to the extent to which new contracts and amendments to existing contracts reflect the pricing provisions endorsed by the government on November 16, 1972.

Mr. Speaker, we are not prepared to authorize the removal by permit from this province of additional gas unless we are receiving fair value for this very valuable resource.

[Applause]

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, on another announcement relating to TransCanada Pipelines Ltd., the government has reviewed the permit and amendments to Consolidated Natural Gas Limited under which it is authorized to remove from Alberta some 2,531 billion cubic feet of gas. It was approved by the Oil and Gas Conservation Board, now known as the Energy Resources Conservation Board, and by the previous administration early in 1970.

Following the approval of the permit, Consolidated Natural Gas Limited was unsuccessful in its applications to the National Energy Board for a licence for the export of gas from Canada and subsequently made arrangements with TransCanada Pipelines for TransCanada Pipelines Ltd. to take delivery of gas under contract to Consolidated Natural Gas Limited.

The government observes that the present arrangements involving the Consolidated Natural Gas Limited permit as amended is not the same as described in the application to the Board and the basis on which the permit was issued. The government therefore, in the public interest, is requesting the Energy Resources Conservation Board to enquire into and reconsider the permit to Consolidated Natural Gas and advise the government on the operations under the permit.

#### WRITTEN QUESTIONS

231. Mr. R. Speaker asked the government the following question:

- (1) How many loan applications have been submitted to the Agricultural Development Corporation since inception of the program?
- (2) How many applications have been submitted to each respective regional office of the Agricultural Development Corporation as of April 6, 1973?
- (3) How many of these applications are being held by the respective regional offices pending appraisal of the land to be purchased by each respective applicant?
- (4) How many applications were approved by the Agricultural Development Corporation by April 6, 1973?
- (5) How many applications were refused by the Agricultural Development Corporation by April 6, 1973?

- (6) What are the reasons for refusal?
- (7) How many applicants were assisted directly from the fund?
- (8) How many applicants have received loans guaranteed by the government?

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

How many employees of the Department of Health and Social Development were working exclusively in the area of child abuse, as of April 2, 1973?

234. Mr. Taylor asked the government the following question:

With reference to legal aid during 1972:

- (1) What is the total number of clients who applied for legal aid?
- (2) How many of these were accepted?
- (3) How many of the applicants were on welfare?
- (4) What was the average cost per client?
- (5) How many clients were under the age of 18?
- (6) What were the main categories, under the Criminal Code and provincial legislation for which payments were made?
- (7)
  - (a) How many drug cases were paid for by legal aid?
  - (b) How many of these were under 25 years of age?
  - (c) What was the total cost of drug cases?
- (8) What is the total amount of reimbursement to the fund in 1972 by clients?

#### MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

229. Mr. Drain proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Ho Lem:

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

- (1) The details of the accidents involving snowmobiles in which the four fatalities occurred, as shown in Motion for Return No. 112.
- (2) The period of time in which these four fatalities occurred.
- (3) The period of time in which the 19 complaints were received by the Minister of Highways.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, when this Motion for a Return was filed I had the impression, relating back to Return 112, that there were 14 deaths related to snowmobiles. Subsequently this was corrected by the hon. Minister of Highways who referred to a typographical error. Additionally, the matter of complaints has been pursued in the estimates of his department. Hence I beg leave, sir, to withdraw this since I have now acquired the information required.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member have leave to withdraw Motion for a Return No. 229?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion is withdrawn.

230. Mr. Dixon proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Ho Lem:

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

(1) All correspondence between the Government of Alberta and landowners or people acting on their behalf from whom land was purchased or optioned for the Fish Creek Park in Calgary.

(2) All correspondence between the government and the City of Calgary and all others concerning the establishment of the Fish Creek Park in Calgary.

(3) The owner's name, legal description, amount of land, option consideration given and the agreed-to purchase price of each parcel of land held under option by the Alberta government up to March 31, 1973, for the Fish Creek Park in Calgary.

(4) The name of each landowner and legal description of land which has not been purchased or optioned by the government in the designated Fish Creek Park area.

(5) The names of realtors, solicitors or other individuals or companies who are or have acted on behalf of landowners who sold or have their property optioned to the Alberta Government for the Fish Creek Park in Calgary, and the name of the landlord they acted for.

(6) Names of individuals or companies who are or have acted on behalf of the government in land acquisition for the Fish Creek Park area.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the government finds this motion unacceptable at this time and I would like to take a few minutes to indicate the reasons for the government finding this motion unacceptable.

It is certainly recognized that the government in the public interest does make the nature of its expenditures public through public accounts and these public accounts are subject to extensive review through committee during the sitting of the government. Furthermore, under certain circumstances, the government does in fact recognize that certain expenditures can be made public prior to the examination of public accounts if the transaction that is involved is completed. However, where a transaction is current and where the publishing of information with respect to that transaction may prejudice the government's role in subsequent transactions, then there is consideration that it is not in the public interest to reveal any details of that transaction at that particular time. This is the case we have before us.

We have a case before us in which the government is involved in purchasing substantial land. We have a case before us in which the government, through its wisdom, declared a fairly substantial area as a restricted development area which subsequently led to negotiations with respect to purchasing this land. Now if a certain amount of information, or if the information that now exists in regard to these transactions were released, then this would jeopardize any subsequent transactions in terms of the public interest. And, in fact, prices may be accordingly adjusted in any additional purchases or transactions that the government would conduct.

I want to say that during the course of the estimates I assured the House that the government was acting in the best interests of the public in terms of purchasing property for the Fish Creek Park, and that it was acting on its own behalf in regard to the purchasers. And this is as far as I think, Mr. Speaker, the government can go at this time.

I certainly recognize that the old government had had some experience in this regard also, and that it certainly would not have made any of its transactions public while it was negotiating for massive purchases of land in regard to the Mill Woods purchases, or land assembly that, in fact, it put together.

So again, Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest that this government is not against making this information public eventually. It is against making this information public at this time. And as soon as these transactions are completed and the position of the government isn't jeopardized in regard to these transactions, then the government will very gladly and willingly make this information available.

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this motion, it is interesting what reasons and excuses the government can throw up when it does not want to give you information. The minister states that it might jeopardize the government's position. But he didn't say exactly how it will jeopardize the government's position. We've had all the whole runaround about, oh, this is a Crown corporation, or this is -- we've had everything but military secrets in this House, Mr. Speaker, and we find it very difficult to get information from the ministers.

This information, Mr. Speaker, is not necessary once it becomes public knowledge and becomes stale information. We all know, like anybody else on the other side, that if we wait long enough we can get it through Public Accounts. That is not the purpose of ministers supplying information.

If the minister can show that this is in the initial stages of negotiation, that it's a secret that people don't know that land is being bought in that area, and that there might be a few fast moves made by realtors or other investors or speculators, then we could understand why he doesn't want to give us information.

But that isn't the situation here at all. This is a well-known fact that they have bought land, that they have optioned land, and if they haven't optioned the land at a price by now, I'm saying that that department isn't on the ball and it is not acting in the best interests of the people. By now the secret has been out of the bag for many months and the minister ought to have that land tied up in one way or another. And I think the minister standing up now and saying, well, it isn't in the public interest -- it is in the public interest to know what is going on, especially when you have governments buying land in fairly wealthy districts at \$5,000 an acre more or less.

I don't know what else the minister can be afraid of. The price is certainly one that has been accepted, almost in every case, and perhaps he can give us the information that is by and large public knowledge now, with the exception of details of those transactions which have been concluded.

I'm of the opinion that in a proper businesslike manner they should have tied up all the land by now; otherwise they are just going to be suckers and the taxpayer will have to stand good for it.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this constant resistance to giving information has become sort of the hallmark of this government. I remember the hon. members opposite were jumping up and down throwing tantrums -- they want information, they want it now, and they don't want it tomorrow. Now that they are in office their attitude is, try and get it. Any kind of excuse is good enough, and I'm sure that no matter what the minister says the hon. members opposite will even without listening support him.

I think the opposition ought to insist and fight for the information when it is available -- and the minister did not say it was not available -- but when the information can do some good. It is no use us getting this information stale and cold when we can't advise or can't then take issue with the minister after it has been completed.

So for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the hon. minister's excuses ought not to be given too much weight and that where possible they ought to dig up the information and dig it when it's timely and important.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the motion I cannot accept the answer given by the hon. minister as being at all reasonable. If it is in the public interest that the government purchase some land from private sources, I think it should be revealed.

In this particular case, Mr. Speaker, many questions have been asked. Questions have been asked by the developers owning land in the adjacent area. Also, the members of the public, including members of the city council, are asking questions as to how this purchase is being made and what the actual purchase price is.

Rumour has it throughout Calgary that there are some favours being extended to others; some prices range from \$2,000 to \$6,000. In the area of the Agrimart people, they are wondering and are trying to compare prices of their land in that area as compared to this area.

I think that when we look at the Nose Hill development proposal, this area of land also has a relationship to the value of the land in the southwest part of the city.

So for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I feel that certainly it is incumbent upon the minister to provide for these answers.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, may I close the debate?

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. DIXON:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am very disappointed, Mr. Speaker, by the hon. minister's reasons for not divulging this information. My own batting record here is very bad. In three Notices of Motion the government has run behind the screen of "not in the public interest." And one of the really tight parliamentary rules is that you very, very seldom use that rule "not in the public interest."

There is no way whereby the government can show that divulging this information will result in the direct personal financial loss to any member or group. That's one of the restrictions in parliament. If you can prove that, then you could maybe have a reason for doing it.

I don't always go along with the argument the hon. minister put forward, too, that if you divulge information it will mean the price will go up. Sometimes the very opposite can happen. And in this case, we are in a unique situation because the hon. minister has in effect frozen the land that is going to be designated for the park. So there is no way that somebody else could come along to the government and say --

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the hon. member will want to be correct in his statement. Not all the land has been frozen. The Ys, the two parts of the Y haven't in fact been frozen.

MR. DIXON:

Yes. But, Mr. Speaker, by and large the minister may be correct that the total area is not frozen, but the vital part of the park complex is, in effect, frozen. And I feel that this information should be divulged if for nothing else than to hold off some of the ugly rumours that are appearing. And if there's nothing to hide, I would go ahead and divulge the information if for no other reason.

There is a lot of money involved. You are talking about \$11 million. You are not talking about \$1,100 or \$11, it's \$11 million. This could go on for years, too, so that we could never, Mr. Minister, get an answer on this situation because you could use the excuse until the last one acre is bought, no information is going to be given. And I think you are putting yourselves in a very bad situation as a government.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the government would be acting in the best interest of the people if they practised the open government that they talk about.

MR. HENDERSON:

They never do.

MR. DIXON:

Because I think this is a case where you can practise open government. The people want the park. There will be no objection to it from the residents who are around there, where you sometimes have to have confidentiality because you feel that you should have all the land in question before you are going to make your move.

The other point is there are no building commitments. There is nothing like that that requires urgency or secrecy. It's straight farm land or park land, agricultural land in most cases, being bought for park land.

I really feel, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to urge the government to reconsider its decisions, because the public is getting a little concerned about all the secrecy going on with all the deals this present government has been mixed up with. I've had three here in just this session of the Legislature. One of the rules in parliament is that you do make information available, and make it available as soon as possible, and in particular when you are dealing, as I say, in acquiring land that could take years to acquire. So I can see nothing in disclosing the land that has been purchased or optioned, because the government then can exercise its option without fear of the price being run up.

The other point or two I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, is the very point that you will not jeopardize your situation. I've often found, in my experience, that once people find out what prices have been paid, they will say, well if that's the kind of money you are paying I want to get in on it, not that I want to raise the price. I'll be quite satisfied if I can get \$5,000 an acre or \$6,000 an acre, which is the rumoured price of this park complex at this present time.

So I think in all fairness to the government I've given them every opportunity to become an open government, which the public of this province is expecting. So I would urge, Mr. Speaker, all hon. members to support the opposition in requesting that this information be made available, because I believe that a better deal will be made by the government, if there is still a lot of land to be bought, by disclosing what has already been paid to the landholders in the area. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[The motion was defeated.]

233. Mr. Wilson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Cooper:

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

- (1) Copies of sample menus for welfare recipients which form the basis for the Social Development monthly food allowances of \$34 for a male adult and \$30 for a female adult.
- (2) Copies of the studies conducted by the Government of Alberta, its departments, agencies or boards, which led to the \$4 differential in the food allowances paid to male adults and female adults.
- (3) A copy of the legal opinion developed by the Attorney General's Department which concluded that the differential payment in the food allowances paid to male adults and female adults was not contrary to The Alberta Bill of Rights, Section (1).

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make an amendment to the Motion that would be in the same course of amendments made regularly in motions of this type.

It relates only to 233, subparagraph 2, where it refers to copies of studies. The words, "other than inter-office communications within the government," are words that should be added. I'll write that out and provide it to you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

While the hon. Minister for Health and Social Development is writing out the amendment, would the House permit the hon. Minister Responsible for Northern Affairs to revert to introduction of visitors?

#### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS (CONT.)

MR. ADAIR:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly 58 students from Grades 7, 8 and 9 of the Dr. Mary Jackson School of Keg River. Along with them are their

teachers, Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Chorney, supervisors, Mrs. Roth and Mrs. Lariviere, and drivers Mr. Korad and Mr. Wilson. I would ask that they stand now and be recognized.

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN (CONT.)

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the House feel confident in dealing with the amendment without waiting for the written version?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

I guess it's coming now.

MR. CRAWFORD:

I've just reduced it to writing, Mr. Speaker. The seconder is the hon. Minister of the Environment.

MR. SPEAKER:

The following is the proposed amendment to Motion for a Return No. 233. As to paragraph (2) after the word "studies" there are to be added the words: "other than inter-office communications within the government." Moved by the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development, seconded by the hon. Minister of the Environment.

[The amendment was carried.]

Is there any debate on the motion as amended?

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, just a matter of a question to the minister rather than a debate.

I wonder if the minister could assure the House if he is re-looking at the section where the food allowance is different for a single male adult and a single female adult? There has been some concern in particular in my constituency of Calgary. A number of radio shows have aired it and the general public opinion seems to be that it should be equal, if not only for the fact that the Bill of Rights should say that we should all be treated equally. I did ask this question in the House earlier and so I am sure the minister is aware of the concern, but I was wondering -- if they are reconsidering the fact and maybe having the same allowance paid to the women as to men; that is in the adult class.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the reason for it is one that has been given effect to over quite a long period of time and maybe it is equal treatment to give a man more food than a woman. That may be equal treatment but I am not purporting to give the legal opinion which is sought under the other part of the question.

The point is certainly one very easily stated and that I would be surprised if any hon. members were not aware that the average food consumption of the average male is more than the average food consumption of the average female.

Now I have used the word "average" because I suppose it carries with it the acknowledgement that it can vary from individual to individual and that may be a point all its own. But certainly there is never any secret I am aware of as to the reason for it and it was one that most people, I think, would readily accept as an explanation for offering a man more food at a given meal than a woman, on the average.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has asked if I would be sure that it was a subject that was obtaining attention. Certainly in the course of going into this matter in the context in which it is raised in the motion I will be giving further consideration to that very point.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just comment on what the hon. minister just said. I think we do recognize that the average intake of a male is greater than the female but that is primarily based on the fact that the man is doing heavy, physical labour.

We are talking about welfare cases where neither is doing heavy, physical labour and consequently I would think that argument would not hold, unless, of course, we want to keep our welfare women nice and slim, and I think this is keeping them a little too slim.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That's right.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are you ready for the question on the motion as amended?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[The motion as amended was carried.]

#### MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. Mr. Anderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Strom:

Be it resolved that the Government of Alberta encourage civil servants to retire at age sixty with full earned pension benefits, and further that the Government of Alberta go on record as favoring the lowering of the age of eligibility for Old Age Security benefits, and the integration of other pension schemes with Old Age Security on the basis of retirement at age sixty.

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure all hon. members are concerned with the plight of unemployment in Canada. For years members of all political parties have expressed their desire to solve this serious situation. As far back as 1930, the Conservative party under the leadership of the late hon. R.B. Bennett promised to cure unemployment or perish in the attempt. His policies failed to cure unemployment and the Conservative party perished at the polls. The Liberal party won the election in 1935 under the leadership of the late Mackenzie King.

The Speech from the Throne in 1936, prepared by the Liberal party of that day, considered unemployment one of Canada's most urgent problems. They did not succeed until World War II, and then in a few weeks unemployment practically disappeared.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that unemployment under the old-line parties has been able to be controlled only by wars. Under their leadership in Ottawa, Canada suffered from unemployment and deflation in the thirties, and this ushered in the decade of the depression.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we suffer from unemployment and inflation in the so-called 'affluent age'. Today unemployment has reached serious proportions. Unemployment is on the rise and is projected to increase to more than 600,000, the estimated figure at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, of this 600,000, it is estimated that 200,000 consist of young people around the age of 21. If we do not provide employment for our young people the future of Canada is bleak. We must not deny our young people the opportunity to participate in and help mould the future of Canada. We must not deny our youth the opportunities to contribute to a happy and more prosperous Canada.

Mr. Speaker, it has also been estimated that approximately 400,000 in the age group of 60 to 65 are presently employed. There is no reason why this age group should not be encouraged to retire while they are still active and have the health to enjoy themselves and their retirement. If proper arrangements



were made to retire this age group at 60 years of age, we could provide an opportunity for younger men and women to secure employment, to become independent, and to have an opportunity to play a part in Canada's development.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if I encourage retirement at 60 years of age, I do so realizing their economic welfare should not be in jeopardy. The financial position of this age group would be, for the greatest majority of them:

- (1) property and savings which would have been accumulated during their years of working and saving;
- (2) their service pension which would have been paid into during their time of employment;
- (3) Canada Pension which is paid into the federal government by all working people, and
- (4) Old Age Security pensions, which all people now receive at 65, could be progressively lowered to 60 years of age.

Mr. Speaker, this should be enough under normal conditions to provide adequately for the majority of this age group.

I also believe that more and more people are recognizing that the use of machine power instead of manpower, the use of solar energy instead of human energy is resulting in fewer employment opportunities for our people. It has been stated by statisticians that the output per man in agriculture has increased 100 per cent during the past 20 years, and the output per individual in all other productive industries by 60 per cent during the same period. Unemployment is having an inimicable effect on the social and economic welfare of Canadians.

I believe this Legislature has an opportunity now to set an example for other levels of government and other institutions to encourage people to retire at 60 years of age.

I ask all hon. members to support this resolution, thus indicating our willingness to do something about unemployment.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, it's a real pleasure for me to be able to rise in my place today and to second the motion proposed by my hon. colleague from Lethbridge East.

At the time he asked me if I would be prepared to second it I was very quick to accept his invitation, not recognizing at the time that possibly he chose me because I was one of those who was drawing close to the age group he is talking about in the resolution. Maybe he was just trying me out to see whether or not I would agree to the proposal he is making in the resolution before us at this time. However, Mr. Speaker, all I can say on that point is that only time will tell whether I am prepared to accept the recommendation and put it into practice for myself.

I would like to say, however, that I do not consider this is a controversial motion, Mr. Speaker. I think it is one that we might all be prepared to agree to rather readily, and maybe the hon. members might well ask themselves as to why there is a need to introduce a motion of this type.

I think it will provide an opportunity for us to reassess again the attitudes that we have toward society as a whole and the opportunities it will provide for the various age groups within society.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the debate that went on the other day on another resolution that was dealing with the possible discrimination against the 25-and-under group. I am certainly one who would be prepared to recognize rather quickly that this particular age group is being placed, at times, in a very difficult position.

I am not sure that I am prepared today to accept the suggestion that there is not job opportunity for many of our young people if they actually wanted to work. And this is a matter of concern to me. I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, that we should not accept some responsibility for the attitudes which are developing within society today in regard to work. Maybe we have arranged it in such a manner that we are, in fact, encouraging the situation that exists at this time.

I am concerned with the number of people who come to me and report that they are unable to get people to take jobs that are available to them. But nevertheless having said that, I think there are three points we ought to look at this afternoon in giving consideration to the proposal that is made by my hon. colleague for Lethbridge East.

First of all, I think we should all recognize that there is a great deal of emphasis placed on training people for jobs and I agree with him. I think we all recognize, too, that society is changing so rapidly today that there will be a need for retraining several times. I think the hon. Minister of Labour suggested it was something like three or four times that an individual might be retrained prior to reaching that point in time when he will no longer be looking for work. And recognizing that fact, I think it is important that we provide the opportunity for the retraining and the job opportunity to the younger set rather than to the older.

I know there are a number of programs introduced from time to time to provide job opportunities for the younger people and yet we haven't given the attention that we might to simply say to those who are in the older bracket, "Why don't you retire?"

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say very quickly lest somebody rise in their place and remind me that civil servants do not have to work beyond 60 if they do not want to. Voluntary retirement is open to them -- I am well aware of that fact. All we are saying here is that the government should maybe do just a little more. Maybe they should encourage some of them, if not all of them, to retire earlier, particularly where we have a problem with unemployment.

I believe the figures which the hon. Minister of Labour gave to us were that there were some 300,000 unemployed under the age of 25 and this made up half of the unemployed group. It is a rather startling figure when you recognize that there are that many in that age group who are looking for jobs. There again I say this resolution will in part move toward providing job opportunities for them.

Today we talk a lot about the quality of life, the ability to enjoy living, the ability to enjoy leisure time. I think our young people are quicker to accept that philosophy than the older people, although I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that I can look forward with a great deal of anticipation toward having more time to enjoy leisure, enjoy many of the good things offered to us within society today. All I am saying is that in the efforts we are making in society today to provide job opportunities for the younger set, let's go a step further and let's encourage the older ones to move out of these jobs and provide opportunity for the younger people.

So this emphasis on training, I think, should not only be to make them skilled in the job but also to provide the job opportunities for them.

The second point I would like to deal with very quickly is a matter of developing attitude. This is something I have thought about a great deal, Mr. Speaker. I am inclined to the view, at this time, that the system as it presently works is discouraging younger people from looking for jobs or from taking jobs, simply because they can say, "Well, there are no job opportunities for me." Again I say, let's not permit them to get into a position where they are more satisfied to live from the provision that society gives them rather than trying to do something for themselves. I think they have the training. Let's give them the opportunity to get the experience so that they might fill the places that the older citizens have filled.

I suppose there is a tendency on the part of older people to say, "You know, with our experience we ought to be used more. We ought to be given an opportunity to display our skills, abilities, and to give society the benefit of our experience." I think there are ways in which this can be done other than simply having an older person hold a job on into later life. I think there are useful functions they can serve, or that we can serve, and I think this is something we ought to be looking toward.

The last point, Mr. Speaker, that I want to touch on is the matter of individual decision making. Certainly on this resolution placed before us today, we are not going to try to tell the older people that it is a must at this time for them to retire.

I would like to see that it be more on a voluntary basis and that there be encouragement, but permit a measure of individual decision making wherever that is possible.

Mr. Speaker, this I think embodies the intent of the resolution, that an emphasis be placed on providing job opportunities to younger people and that we be very careful that the attitudes developed are wholesome attitudes toward society as a whole where individuals are prepared to accept their responsibility. Finally, individuals should be given some opportunity to make individual decisions in this regard.

I hope that every member can see fit to support the resolution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add a few comments to this resolution and take into consideration several aspects, not only the employment aspect of younger people.

The resolution refers to earlier retirement with a full pension. I would say that has some implications which are perhaps a little broader than those indicated in a quick reading of the resolution, because full earned pension benefits would certainly be determined by the length of service in employment within the civil service or the number of years away from the full term, what may normally be considered as the time in which a pension would have been built up for an employee to have the benefits of a full pension. So that in itself would, of course, need to be a matter to be considered.

Whether there were the ability or capability of an employee then paying in to a pension fund such amounts as he may be short; if an employee wished or were encouraged to retire at an earlier age, age 60 as is suggested in the recommendation to be considered, whether that employee would have then the capability from his own resources to add such an amount in order that he might have the benefits of a fair and reasonable pension after his retirement -- these things would have to be considered.

Another area that would have to be considered, of course, is the preparedness of an employee to retire at this earlier age. And I can see many benefits in an earlier age retirement, from the point of view of a worker who is reaching this age of 60. He would still have, I would expect, the kinds of energies that one would require to perhaps become involved in a different program or in a kind of life he might be able to enjoy or wish to enjoy, when he can do the things he never had the time to do because of his work commitment.

I think that if we reflect, we have not really had in our society the development of courses to prepare one for an earlier retirement at an age when one is still capable of giving a great deal of knowledge and experience in another field of endeavour. So I think probably that this is a very timely kind of recommendation, but a long-term kind of recommendation. I can see a real necessity for developing such courses in preparing one to cope with retirement in a meaningful way -- and not only preparing one to cope with retirement in a meaningful way, but as well, to perhaps take courses to develop different skills for a new kind of living and perhaps develop programs that would be suited to absorb the kinds of skills and experience retiring people would have so they might contribute in their retirement years to such programs in leisure and recreation.

I think that there would need to be a preparation for work attitude. And this falls both into the area of one who is reaching very shortly the age for retirement, but also I think affects the young who are preparing themselves for the work force -- the work attitude. What are the capabilities or what are the availabilities and the choices of young people embarking into a work situation? What are the possibilities for advancement? And what are the possibilities of progressing and developing varied and numerous skills?

If we reflect on the change and the mobility in today's society, we see a greater need for this kind of program, for this kind of training in work attitude and in training and in abilities and capabilities.

I think, as has been reflected, that the age of the working society today has certainly changed a great deal. And so I think that some reflection can be made on the ability for the senior person, for the senior employee, to cope with the pace which is being set with the changes in technology, the requirement of the higher degree of productivity required due to the varied costs in the whole ambit of the work force in production in our living. Certainly that has its impact on whether it is a wise consideration to look at an earlier retirement age. And I think probably it is.

But if we look at the statistics, or take into consideration the statistics of the newly born and the increase in the 'again-young age', other than what we normally refer to as the third generation, of which I feel I am a part, I think we can see that there will be a span of time when there will not be quite the numbers of people available for the work force. However, if we reflect on this on an international basis, the birthrate in some countries certainly has not decreased, in others it has decreased tremendously. So that we probably need to look at a balance of the two and judge by that the coming years, the future, the kind, and the numbers we will have to consider in the work force.

As I have mentioned, certainly the development of recreational programs, not only for leisure time to absorb the earlier retiring group, but as well because of our changing work society and the kind of time in which we work and the time which we have for leisure and recreation, we require the development of such programs and facilities to accommodate both. And here I can certainly see the use of the experience and the knowledge and the skills of those retiring at an earlier age to be able to give boundlessly of their service in a kind of area that could take up very meaningfully their years, and they would not feel that they have been discarded by society and moved out, that they are of no value.

I can see that by the earlier retirement the young people would be absorbed into the working force much more quickly. And what has this to say for those who have not had exposure to work situations? Our young students are really in a dilemma as to what choice they should make in their future. What direction, what kind of vocation should they choose? And I can see the need for capability tests at a much lower age, and perhaps far more extensively, to assist and to guide these young people in making a choice. I think it would make far more effective occupational counselling for these young people -- not only for the students, but probably for those who have gone through their educational time and really still haven't been able to come to grips with what their vocation should be, and need some counselling. They have not had a great deal of exposure to work situations.

I think these kinds of programs or directions and considerations would certainly have a great impact on the work attitude of our young people. But I think, as well, it would not have the generally accepted kind of work attitude that we know today, but with a different meaning -- perhaps more down-to-earth values. Perhaps this would give more time for people to reflect on what this life is all about, what they are doing, what should be their contribution, where they are lacking, where there is a lack in what kinds of contribution. So this very broad kind of scope can be, I think, considered in line with the recommendation. And I think it needs a greater amount of thought and review.

I basically like the recommendation, but I think it needs more than what it says. And I think the impact of it needs to be considered on a broader scope. I've been advocating, and I think I've been putting some pressure for some time on the Minister of Manpower and Labour to consider the possibilities of putting forward the idea of earlier retirement. I recognize, on a short term, great numbers of problems are being encountered. So a plan of that nature cannot be on the immediate short-term kind of plan or consideration, but would have to be on a long term.

By and large I would have to say that I really don't have that much objection to this recommendation, but I do think it needs more thought and more review. Some of these comments I have made, I think, are applicable to it. Mr. Speaker, those are my comments with regard to this recommendation.

MR. DPAIN:

Mr. Speaker, I am in the unfortunate dilemma of not having heard what has gone heretofore. Therefore I will speak without bias and with a very open mind on this particular resolution.

Looking at it on the face of it, it appears to be something that could conceivably be well worth considering. If we are prepared to accept the projections of the Worth Report for the future that, in fact, we have arrived at the position, or we will arrive at the position, at which our technology and expertise will permit us to have the luxury of taking a significant portion of people out of the work force who are presently therein.

There is a tendency in 1973 to disregard the significant contributions which older people have made historically, and can make in the present, toward the well-being of mankind. I might cite as an instance Michaelangelo, whose best work was done from the years 75 to 80 and Sir Christopher Wren, the great architect who made such an historical impact on the architecture of the world

and whose thoughts are embodied in some of the architecture, the classic architecture, being presented today.

With this closed area and a firm policy of retirement, these great contributions could not have been made. I can think also -- and I refuse to pronounce the name because I am sure I will pronounce it wrong -- this great maestro, a conductor of the New York Philharmonic Symphony who, in his eighties, was acclaimed as one of the greatest conductors of all time. These are just a few of the people I can cite off hand that have contributed so much.

I will accept, Mr. Speaker, the premise that some people should retire at 18 because they are redundant before they start -- possibly from the psychological viewpoint that they have, possibly from the environment they are brought up in, possibly from the inability to cooperate and join in the development of the good of mankind.

I don't know, at this stage, whether the realities of the falling birthrate been dealt with by any of the previous speakers. But this is a very significant thing and the significance of this boils down to one particular thing, that more and more of the working population will be forced to keep fewer and fewer people because of what has happened with the birth rate.

Now consider the implications of this. Consider the economic load that is going to be placed on the young, working married people of the future, people who are forced to pay off 40-year mortgages on houses they cannot afford and probably never will be able to afford under our social system. This is one of the most significant things.

Additionally, there has been great medical progress and I recall some two months ago reading an article in the Financial Post. In this particular article they dealt with a longevity pill. Unfortunately it is only applicable to those who start taking this particular pill under 50, so count me out, I won't be around bothering you. But the result of this particular pill is that the life expectancy -- the aging process of mankind will be curtailed so the norm, instead of being somewhere around 69 years for a man, will now be brought up to 80 or 85. So it would be ridiculous to assume that people who are, in fact, because of expansion of the medical knowledge that we have, basically in their prime, should now be shelved or pushed aside and declared redundant in spite in all of the potentiality they have to contribute.

The idea that any country which, where people are prepared to disregard the expertise and experience of those citizens who have spent a lifetime learning the valuable tasks is wrong, because this is in effect too much of a loss for any society to properly accept.

What happens? The hon. member mentioned the young people, their attitude toward work and so on. I think that one thing that must be realized -- and I refer now to the Worth Report which deals with continuing education -- continuing education is what life is all about. Because, Mr. Speaker, anyone who is not achieving some more knowledge or expertise as he goes through life day by day, should properly die because he is just not living.

There are certain societies we have, such as the Japanese society where the industrial worker retires at 55, the Russian society where they retire at 60. But I question whether, with so much to do in this country, that this would properly be an attitude that we should adopt.

There are particular areas in the extractive industries, in the natural resource industries, where it would be proper for retirement age at 50. And I think this is something that should be recognized, that the social costs in certain industries, and I refer to mining, I refer to logging in the woods, as an area where, from the standpoint of safety, from the standpoint of human concern, people should be channeled -- not out of the work force and put on a shelf -- but channeled at the age of 50 into an area where they can still make a substantial contribution but which does not have the attrition on life and limb, or requires the total amount of stamina.

So then, Mr. Speaker, in concluding my very brief remarks, I think that this resolution at this time, is premature.

If the projections of the Worth Report are realized and we eventually evolve to the people-oriented society -- to the society where the push-button age will prevail, where through the development of our technology the push-button life will be a reality, that a factory will consist of an operation where a robot presses a button and the goods rush out the other end -- however, I think what has happened in spite of the enlargement of our technology, has been

an enhancement of growth in the service-end of our society. More and more people are involved in service areas, more and more people are involved in health areas. So where you have on one hand a curtailment of human input in industry, as such, there has been an acceleration of the service areas that people require. Hence, this achieves an equilibrium where in reality, there is a lot to do.

And in this country the things that can be done for people and the improvements that can be made in our country, require the services of young and old, and the expertise of the fine craftsmen that have evolved over years and years of trial and error, the knowledge that the older people have to contribute, unity of contributions which includes the young, the middle-aged and the old. I wish to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that there is a real problem facing society in the future in this country, brought about by the deceleration of the birth rate, the fact that people are living longer and longer and those who will continue actively in the work force will be packing a larger and larger load. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have misgivings about this particular resolution and therefore I am not prepared to support it at this time.

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to agree with the comments that have been made by my colleague from Pincher Creek-Crowsnest. I think, generally, his contribution to the debate has been worthwhile.

There are certain areas in which retirement at 60 or lower might be mandatory. The sports area comes to my mind. You don't see very many hockey players at the age of 60, you don't see many football players at the age of 60. However, I don't think we have very many hockey players and football players playing for the provincial government. So very few people, I think, who occupy positions as civil servants find themselves in the position where at age 60 they are unable to cope with their tasks. A number of people at age 60 are reaching their prime and have a great deal to contribute toward their tasks at that time.

However, I rise to enter the debate on this resolution just for a minute because it gives me an opportunity to bring before the House a problem brought to my attention by some of my constituents. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, other members of this Assembly have experienced the same problem in their own constituencies.

That problem, Mr. Speaker, arises when an individual who is 65 years of age retires. Perhaps the pension benefits that individual might receive from his former employment are not large. It may have been before the origination of the Canada Pension Plan. But that individual might have, Mr. Speaker, a spouse who is 60 or 61 and three, four or five years away from retirement. What happens is the former breadwinner finds himself in the position where the amount he is bringing home is substantially less than he was bringing home. The pension of that breadwinner is insufficient to keep the family -- husband and wife -- in the manner to which they should be accustomed.

I would think this resolution may have some merit and that would be with respect to the lowering of eligibility for old age security benefits with respect to those situations where the breadwinner in a family is now on pension and the spouse is too young to receive pension benefits. I don't agree with the school of thought which suggests that the particular couple should apply for welfare benefits. I think the situation could be remedied in other areas.

Perhaps the resolution would be a proper resolution if it dealt with that particular problem which a number of couples experience -- in other words, where the breadwinner is over 65 and receiving old age assistance but his spouse is between 60 and 65 and is not receiving that assistance.

I would like to go on record, Mr. Speaker, as favouring a proposal by this Assembly to the government of the Province of Alberta and to the federal government of Canada that in those circumstances the benefits under The Old Age Security Act be extended to spouses between the age of 60 and 65.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to enter the debate today because it's going to give me an opportunity to express a concern of a constituent and this resolution brings it home quite nicely. The resolution is quite specific as I read it, in suggesting retirement at age 60 with full earned pension benefits.

Now the problem that has been brought to my attention by the constituent I have in mind, is simply this: he was one of those people who did service for

his country in the second World War. Prior to going overseas he was employed for a short time by a private company. Subsequent to his return he was employed by that same company and some time later became an employee of the provincial government.

As an employee of the provincial government he learned eventually that he could purchase pension benefits in relation to the period of time he had spent in war service. He also found out he would have to purchase that service at the commencing rate of earning of his employment with the provincial government, at the applicable rate of premium for pension adjusted for interest that the money would have earned had the provincial government had it in its pension fund from the time of his war service. He found, of course, that a small sum at a point in time becomes a large sum when it is compounded.

He also found, in looking around, that if he had happened to have been employed by the provincial government directly after he returned from the war, he would have been able to pay for his war service at the prevailing rate of salary at the termination of the war when he commenced with the provincial government. I believe it would be possible and, in fact, it might be the case that under certain circumstances war service could have been purchased by government employees at rates they were earning when the war commenced.

I relate this, Mr. Speaker, for one simple reason. That is, while this resolution may be well intentioned, it could, and should, suggest to us a very major problem. The problem is one of how to fund and finance -- to put it in dollar terms -- the kind of money this would require.

Currently my constituent, I think, probably believes it isn't worthwhile buying back that war service. Now that is a question which he can sort out with actuarial advice from the Public Service Pension Board.

But the point is this, if we were to go ahead and accept this resolution we would, in fact, as I read it, be agreeing with the concept that all provincial government employees, when they reach age 60, ought to be entitled to just what this says, "full earned pension benefits". Now maybe the 'earned' is a saving feature here in terms of major adjustments from the system as we now understand it.

I would like to suggest that our provincial employees are in a much more favourable position with respect to pension than the majority of employees in Alberta. I think that because of the nature of our pension program and because of the nature of provincial employment, many people when they begin employment with the provincial government continue to work for that employer until they retire.

It's quite common in industry for people to be employed by companies who have no pension plan supplementary to the Canada Pension Plan. It's quite common for people to change occupations, either voluntarily or involuntarily, to change employers either voluntarily or involuntarily in industry, and to lose by virtue of that circumstance any entitlement which they may have or might have gained to company pension.

So I suggest that we ought to look very hard then at the situation in terms of the total society in our province as opposed to our provincial government employees. And I think that if we were to look at that we would find, in terms of pension, a preferential or a better treatment for provincial employees. I'm not saying that it's not justified. I'm not saying that it's not warranted or that it's not a good thing. But I think it's a fact. And it's an important fact.

I would like to follow up on the remarks of the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest because I think that he was suggesting to us a very important point and that is that sooner or later somebody has to make, manufacture, grow, produce, process, deliver the goods and services for all those who are not actively engaged in that in our society. And, in fact, it is important what kind of -- to use a term that is often applied -- population tree we have. At the present time we are in a position where we have an unusually large proportion of our population either having very recently entered the labour force, or in the process of so doing, or at least at the age and at the level of training where they might logically be expected to be able to enter the labour force. That, as he points out quite rightly, will not always be the case.

So sooner or later we must take into account where the money comes from for reasonable pensions. Who is going to earn that money? And I would like to say again that the money has to be translated into goods and services, and who is going to produce those goods and services?

In other words, Mr. Speaker, I'm suggesting that, in making the kind of motion being considered here, we ought really to be looking at a very basic major income redistribution challenge, because that is what is involved. Basically it's suggesting that we're going to have to redistribute more income away from some of those who are capable of earning to those who either, because they are physically incapable or because society deems that they shouldn't need it, are not involved in earning. And I think if we will look carefully at that and start to suggest that whole classes of the population, much larger than we now are involved with, should be living without producing in the sense of producing goods and services, we would find we are in a very major transfer problem.

I might just draw to your attention from the most recent report of the Alberta Bureau of Statistics, 1973, that there were in Alberta, in the 65 age group and over, some 59,500 males of whom apparently 24 per cent were working. There were in the age group 55 to 64, 59,500, almost the same number of males, of whom 84 per cent were employed.

So the suggestion it seems to me, contained in this resolution, if one were to do away with classifications such as provincial employees and say that this should be applied rather globally across the province would suggest that we would be removing from the labour force in Alberta something in the order of -- I haven't done the calculations but my guess is 35,000 male employees. And there is a group of females, much smaller than that at that particular age level, who could qualify in the same way. So I'm suggesting that this proposition is one that ought to give rise to a lot more thought before it's acted upon with haste.

I'd like also to draw attention to a characteristic of our society that I suspect everyone here is familiar with, and that is the desire to have more of the better things in life, especially those better things that money buys. And our inherent drive, apparently it is so for many of us, to strive to get ahead and for some of us -- I can't speak for that group as yet, but I've thought a little bit about it and observed what happens in society -- for some that drive continues well past the age of 60.

I think it's well borne out by what we see and hear of discussions of the three-day work week. The three-day work week allows us to do all the things in three days that normally it takes five days of our time to do. So what do we do with the other three and four days? Studies have shown that a lot of people go out and moonlight with a second job. And that's a pretty important consideration.

I might say that I think that if we retire, establish a system with good pension benefits, we would find at age 60 that a lot of people, male, female, government employees, or what have you, would just not readily accept that at age 60 they want to sit back, relax, consider the great books, travel, et cetera. Some of them will find their satisfaction in life from some form of labour activity, production, management, what have you.

I might say that my observation is that there are certain groups in society who do retire at a very early age with a very good pension. I think among these we might classify airline pilots and some members of the armed forces. My observation is that among this group we often find them developing second vocations after their retirement, drawing one pension and working at the same time.

I have another concern, Mr. Speaker, which I'd like to advance and that is this. The problem, at least suggested by the mover of the resolution, was one of unemployment, and that this would be a cure, a partial cure, for unemployment. I can't accept that we need to cure unemployment in this fashion by 'unemploying' one group to make employment for another group. I just don't think in our society that ought to be the route that government need go, or for that matter that society need accept. It seems to me that there are lots of things, as the hon. Member for Pincher Creek suggested, there are lots of opportunities in our world. There are lots of challenges, there are lots of ways we can improve this good old earth and our society on it so that we needn't assume, as a basic underlying assumption, that some class, group or large proportion of able-bodied citizens have it suggested to them that they should retire from their participation on a constructive basis. I think that is a very unacceptable philosophy and one with which I disagree wholeheartedly.

I might, as an aside, Mr. Speaker, say that I listened with some misgivings the other day to the resolution and the debate on the discrimination, or at least the unfair treatment, against the under-25 age group. I have a tremendous abhorrence for considering one group in society against another on a



generalization of that sweeping nature. It is true that there are attitudes in society reflected by actions. Sometimes they may take on the appearance of group discrimination. But more frequently, I suggest, these attitudes and actions reflect some historical developments in our society and, perhaps, some general substance to the differential treatment. That's not to say that I disagree with everything that was said. It's just that I think, sometimes, in our rush to set all things right by classifying in a broad and general way, we may set as many things wrong in a general way for some members of those classifications.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask all hon. members present just what kind of life Oona O'Neill would have had if Charlie Chaplin had retired at age 60?

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member wish to ask a question?

MR. BENOIT:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour, followed by the hon. Member for Highwood.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to adjourn debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no, no.

MR. BENOIT:

I'd like to speak.

MR. STROM:

...[Inaudible]...the hon. minister to withdraw his motion by unanimous consent, because I realize there are others who would like to speak on it now. I appreciate the position he is placed in if he is not allowed to continue now -- he will have taken his place in speaking, and I certainly wouldn't want that to happen, Mr. Speaker. Therefore, if there is some way we can permit others to speak, I'd like to see it done.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to withdraw it. The reason for the motion is that the discussion has been most excellent from the mover and the seconder throughout, and I felt that I would wish to spend some time to consider the discussion and make a statement. However, I will withdraw the motion and will be happy to hear the Member for Highwood.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think it should be clearly on record in Hansard that the Minister of Labour has not forfeited his right to speak in the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it that's the general consensus of the House?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

By withdrawing the motion, it's as if he hadn't made it.

MR. BENOIT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate this. I have been inspired, and indeed compelled, to rise and speak on this motion. I won't belabour the House with what has inspired and compelled me, only to say that I will make a few brief remarks on two or three thoughts.

One of them has to do with the matter of the civil service. The resolution asks for the encouraging of civil servants to retire at age 60. Mr. Speaker, I would not like to limit it for the sake of the resolution. I am in favour of the resolution. I don't intend to change any wording here. I see the resolution as a stepping stone to something much more important in, I hope, the not too distant future so far as providing for people to retire at the age they feel necessary depending upon their health, upon their vigour and their vitality, and their desire to continue their service to their fellow man.

If provision is made in a proper way, I believe all people should have the privilege of retiring from their work at the age of 60. That is, the work they have been accustomed to doing. When I speak about retirement, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to leave the impression that the word "retirement" means they go out of the work service of the country, but that they can cease work at age 60 and receive enough to live on; they will be able to make whatever contribution they want from that time on until the end of their life.

This could conceivably mean that we would have a far greater diversity of service rendered to mankind and a far more experienced service rendered to mankind by these people who could take the area of activity they wanted to from that time on, instead of being compelled to stay in what we might term, 'the same old rut.'

A lot has been said, with which I agree, about this matter of putting people on the shelf at 60, 65, 70 or 75. Mr. Speaker, many people have made tremendous contributions in many ways after they have reached more than 80 or 85 years of age. I think there is a very bad psychology being suggested in our society today that we should have to retire at 65, making it compulsory -- and there are a lot of areas where it is compulsory. I appreciate the fact that in certain types of service, probably after 65 it is not practical for people to continue in that type of service. But certainly retiring, or the idea of retiring, or ceasing to work in that particular area should not leave us with the impression that person has no more contribution to make to society, nor indeed can they, because they have been put in such a position that they are forbidden to do so.

By no means would I want anything in this resolution construed to give the impression that it would be compulsory for civil servants even to cease work at 60. It says they should encourage civil servants to retire at age 60 and I would hope that is what it would be, and for those who wanted to continue, a certain discretionary limit be extended to their age over and above 60.

I think there is a bad psychology about the idea that we are getting old when we get to the age of retirement which is commonly considered to be 65. For the way people live today in their 90's, 100's and older, there is no reason in the world why their chronological age should have any bearing upon their actual age. And so many people 85 and 90 are much more alive than some of our friends at 25 and 30 because they have a desire to live, they have a zest for living, they have the will to live and they have goals toward which they want to aim. And so I believe we need to get that idea out of our heads that chronological age is a criterion here except as a measuring stick to make provision so if they want to shift gears, so to speak, in what they are doing in life, they would be given the opportunity to do so because they would be economically free to do it.

As has been mentioned already in our industrialized and mechanized and technological age, there is no reason in the world why we should expect that we would have a labour force fully employed in our society today. In fact, if I may say so without being misunderstood, it is not desirable that all of our labour force should be employed.

The desirable thing is that the machinery and the industry and the technology that we have, should be able to provide everyone with a living without everyone being fully employed, because a machine was intended to take the place of man. And so there is no reason in the world why the machine couldn't do the work while we enjoy life the way it was intended to be enjoyed.

And I believe that we need to have more time for preparation of life on the one end and more time for service to our fellow man to enjoy life in service at the other end. And indeed we are fast closing the gap because today with the child allowances and the possibility of going to university with loans and grants and scholarships and so on until we are 25 or even 30 years of age, and then if we close it down from the other end to 60, there will only be 30 or 35 years in which a man will be obligated to work.

But that 30 to 35 years is all that is necessary with the technology we have today, in order to supply all of our society with all the goods and services we need. Why should we work more than is necessary or longer in life than is necessary if that short period of time will do the job, and then spend the rest of our life enjoying life here in this world.

I believe that the primary reason for full employment today is in order that men might have food, clothes, shelter and some of the other amenities of life. If we can get them without full employment why should we be so insistent that everybody be employed in order to produce something. It just can't be done.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, if we look at our society today, there are a good many people who are on the payroll who are not producing any goods or services. In this bureaucratic age in which we live, there is no way they can earn the money they are making. It is just a case of filling a notch in society and we are already providing a great deal of what some people might term welfare if it were accurately analyzed. And so we are living long before we get to 60, on the money, the economy which someone else is providing who is actually producing goods and services.

And so I say, Mr. Speaker, full employment is not essential or even desirable in many instances. But full participation in all the resources and the goods and the services is highly desirable and necessary. And if we could have all that is produced equitably distributed, we have all kinds for everyone in this country in which we live and, in fact, Mr. Speaker, I think we could safely say that if all the goods and services that could be produced would be produced, they would be ample for everybody in the world. The only problem is that they are not properly and equitably distributed and it is partly caused by the economic situation that we have and our old, antiquated monetary system.

When I look at the welfare services being offered to us from the cradle to the grave, and I mentioned this before, Mr. Speaker, but I am compelled to do it again, I can see only one thing and that is that we could very easily be able to supply everyone with an adequate living.

Children's allowances, Department of Veteran Affairs' allowances, the Unemployment Insurance Commission, Workmen's Compensation, Old Age Security and its supplement, the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission and heavy subsidization, social assistance, social allowance, Canada Pension Plan -- we could name off at least a dozen, Mr. Speaker, varying types of social services that are publicly supported, some contributed to in advance by the worker who claims back accordingly, but many of them are subsidized and publicly supported.

We have today, a situation where there is no reason in the world why people couldn't retire -- if you want to use that term, having it properly understood -- at 60 and continue to enjoy life and serve their fellow men.

I don't think anyone should be taken out of service at any time. From the cradle to the grave, he should be given some definite responsibilities to carry out and he should be glad to receive them because he is sharing or participating in the overall economy of the country.

Some of my hon. colleagues remind me what the good book says: you "earn your bread by the sweat of your brow." I have no objection to that, but I remind them that the time has come when that can be changed because of circumstances through the years.

Another one that someone draws my attention to is, "Idleness is the devil's workshop." That's an old maid's fable, not the Bible of course. It could be Shakespeare.

But in any case there is no need for anyone to be idle. The whole point is, if people have an assurance that from day to day their food, clothes and shelter will be provided then they are free to address their minds, their attention and their efforts to the things they desire to do instead of continuing in the old rut they were forced to take until the time they become disillusioned with all of life itself.

So, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to suggest that I am strongly in favour of this resolution because I see it as one step toward a complete situation where there could be -- not a guaranteed annual income, Mr. Speaker -- but a possibility of a guaranteed annual supplement to income. Everyone then would have enough supplement so those in the lower wage brackets could have all the necessities of life, and somewhere those in the upper brackets could have most of that supplement siphoned off by taxation so we could have a certain degree of equality in our society.

The resolution is one step toward a fuller realization of the idea of complete participation by all people in the economy of our country -- the goods, services and amenities of life along with the enjoyment of life itself. Therefore I choose to support the resolution as it is.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a remark or two in support of this resolution. I think in examining it we must look at some basic assumptions that we use in our guidance of the affairs of Alberta, and some basic assumptions I think we believe in as leaders in the political arena.

First of all, we must recognize that what we want to preserve is individual opportunity so individuals can make their own decisions, determine what their future is, determine what challenges they have in their lives and every day living, and plan their goals as individuals in this society.

From that basic assumption I would feel that this move should be on a non-compulsory basis, on a voluntary basis rather than through compulsion. I feel we must that retirement is not the quitting of work or the ending of a person's life, but at that point in life it is an opportunity that gives the individual a chance to do something different or do some of the things he always wanted to do in life and not worry about economic security. At that point in life he will know that food, clothing and shelter will be adequately provided and that he can do some of the creative things he desires to do.

Members here in this Assembly mentioned such things as architecture, the acting talent of Charlie Chaplin, Wren and other people. At that point in life those individuals that had a certain degree of basic security could have certainly continued to go on and contribute to society equally and just as well. People who are writers, people who are artists, people who have talent in creative thinking would have the opportunity at that stage in life to put their experience on paper and to give it to others who could actually benefit from it at a younger age, or at a beginning age when they are starting employment, starting a medical profession or many of the other professions which we have represented in this Assembly. To me that would be a great thing for our society and Alberta. And to talk about guaranteed income or forms thereof, at age 60 or at an age which I have defined as retirement age, could be of great benefit.

During my time as minister for personnel, one of the goals which I established early in that responsibility was to make every attempt to see that the civil servants of this province would have the opportunity of retiring at age 55. I felt, from discussions with many of them, that a number were locked into their jobs -- locked in because they couldn't quit and because other opportunities outside, or other opportunities they went to would not give them an adequate income. Nor would the pension at an earlier age give them an adequate income.

But at the same time these people were saying, "We are doing our best job but we haven't got the real enthusiasm we would like to have. We would like to retire and go to a cottage. We would like to pursue another responsibility." They had some very legitimate responsibilities that they would like to pursue. I felt the opportunity on a voluntary basis should have been there.

We started an actuarial study, I think it was in 1969 or 1970, in an attempt to come to grips with this type of policy. It was unfortunate that the consultant group we had working took quite a while to come up with a recommendation and the government of the present time was the recipient of the recommendation and have made some adjustments to try to accommodate this type of program. I feel that any further accommodation certainly should take place. It can not be only a benefit to those individuals in the civil service but certainly to our society and government service as a whole.

On that basis, Mr. Speaker, I certainly support this resolution and support in principle the idea behind it.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, if I might be permitted to speak for several minutes, I might say at the outset that I have enjoyed what all the hon. members have said on this resolution. I find the resolution quite exciting and quite full of possibilities both on a short term basis and on a long term basis leading into perhaps future policies that might be of quite some consequence.

I won't take any exception to the resolution at all because it is not compulsory. It is purely suggestive -- of a voluntary nature.

However I do have some difficulty with the word "encourage" because there can be voluntary encouragement and somewhat forceful encouragement now and again. So I would have liked to have seen a better word used rather than "encourage", perhaps "permit" or some other word that might not have the same connotation. However I do want to suggest that I think the principle embodied in this resolution is very sound indeed.

There are people in the dynamics of government today -- and government is certainly dynamic and increasingly so -- many of the civil servants are under an increasing amount of pressure as government gets more complex and more dynamic in its role. They would very much like to opt out of the dramatic work ethic as experienced in government and retire, if you wish, to a more leisurely pace of work. This is good not only for the individual but it is certainly good for government. Because if there is one thing that government needs in certain strata of government organization, it is the replacement, or encouragement, or injection of new blood almost on a periodic basis. The reason for that is that things are changing very rapidly. The time span of development is much shorter now. New disciplines are constantly taught and as a result we need today retraining and so forth.

I find that perhaps, if I might call it, the 'older fraction' of society might find itself far more useful and needed in society, if in fact, it was extended a little bit and became somewhat younger on the front end. You know there are a number of organizations that are growing up in Canada that are really very dramatic.

I might say that civil servants who do retire, even at the age of 65, are very much in demand; particularly top civil servants who have had vast experience. Civil servants are in enormous demand for use on a part-time basis in under-developed countries right now; to set up governments in other countries; to direct governments in other areas; to set up programs.

Not only civil servants, but other members of society. For example, I might say that in Toronto a whole organization of retired engineers has grown. They are working for \$1 a year, just for expenses, and they are working all over the world building plants, starting new plants, setting up economic systems, setting up all sorts of disciplines that under-developed nations need very desperately but don't have the capacity to train for within their country. They need this guidance very badly. And I would suggest that our civil servants who were given the opportunity to retire, could certainly play a very major role in this regard.

Again, I can't see why, if some of our civil servants retired voluntarily at 60, the government itself couldn't use them on a part-time basis. Some of them only want to work three and four months a year and don't particularly want to work the full year. Perhaps they want to spend some of the year golfing in Arizona or perhaps on some major hobby to which they would like to devote some time. But nevertheless their experience and stamina could be used very effectively by governments, not only at the provincial level but at the municipal level, on a part-time basis.

So again, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that except for the word "encourage" which can have some undercurrent meaning, I find the resolution quite exciting. From my personal point of view I recognize that the trend in society is in this direction because the hard core group of productive people is going to be narrowed. That group is related to energy and to the ability to be regulated, the ability to be disciplined, the ability to work very specific hours. So that group is going to be more and more narrowed and the two spectrums are going to tend to enjoy perhaps a somewhat more leisurely type of life or a life more dedicated to a greater degree of education, participation in cultural affairs, working on a part-time basis and that sort of thing.

I just want to say again, Mr. Speaker, that I find the resolution rather exciting. Thank you.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I now wish to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it the House agrees that the hon. minister may adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until 8:00 o'clock this evening.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 5:25 o'clock.]